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Because the formally structured, or bureaucratic organization is a vital and integral part of contemporary society, voluminous research has been conducted concerning all aspects of formal organizational structure—the hows and whys of both stabilities and deficiencies. However, the formally structured organization is increasingly criticized for its negative effects upon individual members, who often perceive themselves to be stifled psychologically and professionally. The thesis of this professional paper is that organizations continue to devise means by which to maximize the odds in selecting individuals to populate their hierarchies, and then proceed to place these talented individuals in organizational niches which seemingly serve to repress many of the qualities for which they were selected as organization members.

This paper addresses these aspects of formal organization and their implications for the future. The focus is upon the ability of formal organizations to adapt to pressures of societal change, and the role that communication must play in the adaptations of organization structure which must occur. Whether formal organization structure can be adapted to those pressures, or if new structures must assume the formal organization's role in society, communication must increasingly become the cement which binds the structure. As a complex world grows ever more complex, communication must furnish
the means with which those complexities become manageable. And
more fundamentally, organizations of the future must afford the
individual the means by which he may communicate his needs and
desires in an atmosphere of openness and candor conducive to the
satisfaction of those needs and the realization of those desires.

Chapter I briefly outlines research efforts geared towards
isolating variables which contribute to managerial success; Chap­
ter II examines precepts of formal organization and communication
within the formally structured organization, along with criticisms
of the formal organization's ability to cope with societal changes;
Chapter III examines changes recommended to counter the problems
of formal organization—both within that structure and beyond; and
Chapter IV addresses the implications for society and organizations
of the future, and the vital role which communication must play in
reconciling the needs of the individual with the goals of the
organization.

The intent of this paper is not to present an indictment of
formal organization; rather, this paper is designed to examine the
present status of the formally structured organization, define its
advantages, expose its deficiencies, and provide suggestions for
the future through a communicative perspective.
CHAPTER I

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFORTS
TO SECURE MANAGERIAL TALENT

Introduction

In this first chapter, a very brief outline of the great amount of research conducted to determine variables contributing to effective managers within organizations is presented. In discussing the positive and negative aspects of formal organization structure, it seems to be pertinent to address the vast amount of effort expended by students of organizations to aid in the determination of what type of individuals best fill managerial roles within that structure. The formal organization has traditionally placed much emphasis upon methods to screen their potential members in order to populate their structures with the right person for the right position.

Therefore, the selection of managers and executives is obviously a vital aspect in any organization. Although situational factors have been shown to be significant factors in effective managerial behavior, the manager's own qualities and traits have been judged to be highly important to his success. Research indicates that success is more likely if certain characteristics and experiences are present, than if they are absent, although in recent years the importance of traits in leadership has lessened somewhat as the focus in
research has shifted to behavioral and situational variables. Although the presence of these success-contributing traits does not guarantee success, it would seem from research conducted that significant deficiencies will almost guarantee failure in top managerial jobs. It is logical to assume that in order to succeed in a top managerial job, certain capabilities in coping with one's environment are necessary. The managerial selection process has been referred to as starting with endowments at birth, particularly the endowment of intelligence; while other traits subsequently develop and modify each other as the person proceeds through his many experiences in the maturation process.2

Criteria for Success

Researchers attempting to predict managerial success have met with problems in the selection of criteria. A number of different criteria have been proposed or used, including actual occupancy of a high level position, ratings by superiors or peers, salary, rapidity of advancement, and combinations of such measures.3 Other measures which have been used or suggested are a company's growth rate, subordinate's ratings, and various measures of efficiency or inefficiency, such as work stoppages, turnover, and absenteeism among the manager's
The use of almost any criterion has certain inherent problems. For example, ratings by a manager's superiors may be inherently biased because the superior's prejudices may have affected selection for managerial ranks. That is, factors other than ability or performance may be major variables in selection. In spite of these difficulties in developing adequate criteria of success, the various criteria available, and those yet to be devised, are reasonable enough for meaningful research to be conducted and for credence to be given the results. Research provides data that demonstrates that there are attributes which, on the average, managers have to a higher degree than the general population. Traditionally, when compared with the general population and with various other groups, managers have been shown to be, on the average, different in certain ways.

Intelligence as a Criterion

Research has found that the average executive has significantly higher intelligence than the average person. One study of thirty-three top executives found that the executives scored higher than ninety-six percent of the general population of the Wonderlic Personnel Test. Another study of 250 executives found that the "typical" executive scored between the 95th and 97th percentile on the Thurstone Primary Mental Ability Test. Norms published in the manual for the Thurstone Test of Mental Alertness indicate that the average score of a sample of 60 executives was equivalent to the
89th percentile when compared with retail-sales personnel, stockmen, or clerical applicants. Studies of leadership among children, teen-agers, and groups at colleges lend support to these findings from business situations. In a survey of the literature, Stogdill found 28 studies which showed that, on the average, the level of intelligence of the child or student leader exceeded the average level in his group; only five studies were found which showed no difference in intelligence and no studies were found which showed lower intelligence. Thus, intelligence has been found to characterize leaders in general, regardless of the type of organization or situation.

**Personality as a Criterion**

Certain characteristics as measured by personality tests have been found to differentiate executives from the general population. Huttner et al. found their sample of executives to have better mental health than the average person as measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the Bernreuter Personality Inventory; the tests indicated the executives, among other things, had the ability to evaluate different courses of action and to push toward making a decision. Guilford found that a sample of 208 executives of a large chain grocery company exceeded a sample of 143 first-line supervisors on several dimensions of three Guilford and Martin personality tests; the executives were found to be more sociable, free from depression and inferiority feelings, emotionally stable, self-confident, objective, and
A major finding of a study by Henry, who used the Thematic Apperception Test and other personality tests and interviews, was that successful executives have drives toward high achievement and high mobility. That is, it was found that they have strong desires to get things done to assume additional responsibility, and that they have a strong need to obtain the financial and social rewards of accomplishment. Furthermore, Henry found successful executives to be active and aggressive, but their motivation was channeled into striving for prestige and status—not in the direction of hostility toward other people.

Wald and Doty, using the Adams-Lepley Personnel Audit, found their sample of executives to be above the 90th percentile on "measure of firmness"—positiveness and decisiveness. They were able to evaluate the facts, sort out the relevant ones, and reach a conclusion relatively easily and quickly. In addition, they scored above the 80th percentile on "frankness", which the researchers interpreted as indicating directness, sincerity, and honesty, but with an appropriate amount of tact, diplomacy, and skill in human relations.

Studies of leadership in situations during childhood or at school are generally in accord with these findings. In his summary of the literature, Stogdill found that research generally indicated that the average leader exceeded the average in his group in initiative, persistence, self-confidence, desire to excel, and sociability.
A common research finding in communication network analyses of organizations is that individuals occupying higher managerial positions tend to function as communication liaisons. These individuals interpersonally connect two or more cliques within a system, without themselves belonging to any clique. These liaisons are positioned at the crossroads of information flows in an organization. Liaisons have been called the "cement" that holds the structural "bricks" of an organization together; when the liaisons are removed, a system tends to fall apart into isolated cliques. Therefore, individuals who display tendencies to serve as communication liaisons are generally viewed as potentially successful managers and essential to organizations.\(^\text{15}\)

Experiments with a self-descriptive inventory are also of interest. Using a checklist of forced-choice adjectives, Ghiselli has found that people at different occupational levels describe themselves differently. Using a scoring procedure involving weights, top management and professional people were found to have a higher average score than other personnel.\(^\text{16}\) In particular, a scale of initiative derived from this self-inventory differentiated occupational levels in the direction suggested by the research above. In other words, the higher the rank within the organization, the higher the self-description in terms of initiative.\(^\text{17}\)
Interests as a Criterion

Harrell cites data indicating that a group of executives had significantly broader interests than a group of nonexecutives. In a sample of 52 executives, 94 percent scored above a t-score of 40 (B-plus or A) on three or more of the occupational-group sales of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank while only 15 percent of a nonexecutive group had similar scores.\(^\text{18}\)

Using the Kuder Preference Record, Wald and Doty found executives to score above or near the 80th percentile on the persuasive and literary scales. In addition, the group scored above the 60th percentile on the computational scale.\(^\text{19}\) The researchers felt this finding suggested that executives like dealing with people, words, and numerical calculations.

Knowledge and Other Background Variables as a Criterion

Research on the background of executives shows that the executive group greatly exceeds the average population in terms of educational attainment. Wald and Doty found 67 percent of their sample had college degrees, even though a college degree was relatively rare in the days when these executives were in school. Furthermore, Wald and Doty found that a large majority of the executives in their study had been active in positions of leadership in clubs and other organizations during their college or high school careers.\(^\text{20}\) The magazine Fortune also found executives, on the average, to be much better educated than the general population. In a sample of 900
executives of large firms, 65 percent had college degrees.\textsuperscript{21} Warner reports similar findings, with 81 percent of a sample of 13,000 civilian and military leaders in government service having college degrees in 1959.\textsuperscript{22}

The importance of knowledge per se is demonstrated by experiments in leadership summarized by Stogdill. The results of these studies strongly suggest that specialized knowledge and knowing how to get things done are essential attributes of leaders.\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{Differences Between Successful and Unsuccessful Managers}

Since research has generally shown that the managerial group tends to be a very select group in terms of intelligence and the other factors described above, it is to be expected that differences between the more and less successful will not be as readily identified as differences between the total group and the general population. Nevertheless, research does shed some light on the differences between successful and unsuccessful managers.

Mahoney et al., using a ranking of overall effectiveness as a criterion of success, found that the "more effective" managers, in contrast to "less effective" managers, were more intelligent, aggressive, self-reliant, and persuasive. Furthermore, they had more education and had been more active in hobbies and sports as young men.\textsuperscript{24}

Rogers and Rogers found that successful managers function as communication liaisons to a greater degree than less successful
managers.\textsuperscript{25} Using ratings by supervisors and peers, Hicks and Stone concluded, with the use of a codified Rorschach test (Structured-Objective) and the Guilford-Zimmerman Aptitude Survey, that the more successful managers had a high degree of emotional strength, did not plan and organize their activities to the extent of less successful managers, viewed things broadly and theoretically, and avoided too much attention to detail.\textsuperscript{26}

Although not a study of measured differences, a survey by Gaudet and Carli of opinions of executives on why other executives had failed, found that executives gave the following reasons the most weight, in this order: lack of breadth of knowledge, inability to delegate, inability to analyze and evaluate, lack of personnel and administrative knowledge, inability to judge people, and inability to cooperate.\textsuperscript{27} Thus a combination of intelligence, personality, and knowledge seems to have been operating, which is consistent with the majority of studies above.

**Summary and Conclusions**

An outline of the research on the characteristics of executives as contrasted with the general population seems to strongly suggest that, on the average, executives differ in the degree to which they possess several characteristics. Research tends to show generally that executives are more intelligent and better educated than non-executives, have strong drives and motivations in the direction of managerial activities, are active and aggressive, have an absence
of neurotic traits which would impair their ability to relate to other people or to make decisions, can force their way to a decision in spite of the complexities of the situation, have histories of leadership in high school or college, have stronger and broader interests in managerial or related fields, have experience and knowledge relevant to the executive role, and tend to exhibit greater interpersonal communication skills. Although all these characteristics may not be found in all executives and some, or most, may be found in many nonexecutives, the overwhelming preponderance of data from research paints this composite picture.

Chapter I has provided a brief outline of the considerable efforts undertaken by students of organization to ascertain the attributes which distinguish the manager or executive from the general population. Obviously this determination to secure the most talented and best equipped individuals as leaders with organizations has stemmed from the organization's desire to conduct its activities and pursue its goals as effectively and efficiently as possible. This entails populating its structure with the "best" individuals available--individuals who can best communicate with the organization members they manage. These efforts indicate a fundamental aspect of the formal organization--that absolutely nothing be left to chance, in order to facilitate the realization of the organization's goals. These efforts at maximizing the odds in recruitment of personnel appear to be of diminished importance when viewed in the context of the problems currently associated with formal organiza-
tions. The salient issue is: Does it really matter how talented or equipped an individual is if he must assume an organizational niche which is inherently incapable of either fully capitalizing upon the assets he brings into the organization, or satisfying his needs and desires? The paradoxical nature of formal organization's attempts to devise methods to recruit talented individuals, while positioning them in organizational roles seemingly designed to hinder many of the attributes for which they were selected, is discussed in the succeeding chapters.
Footnotes
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CHAPTER II
COMMUNICATION WITHIN
THE FORMALLY STRUCTURED ORGANIZATION:
STABILITIES AND DEFICIENCIES

Introduction

Individuals within contemporary formally structured organizations sometimes experience feelings of frustration and sensations of alienation, whatever their hierarchical position within the organization might be. Executives as well as assembly-line employees experience similar feelings of dissatisfaction which ultimately seem to be tied to the structural foundations of most contemporary organizations. In this chapter, those foundations are explored, as are the implications for the individual's perceptions of satisfaction as an organization member. This exploration includes examinations of the formal structure of organizations, informal structure, frustration, and fatigue within the organization, formal and informal communication patterns, communication flows, and organizational communication viewpoints as they have evolved and what it has meant as far as reconciling the satisfaction of the individual with the goals of the organization.

Criticisms of Formal Structure

A number of criticisms have been leveled against the formal organization for what is seen to be its inhumanity, its degradation
of the human spirit, or its subordination of the human will to that of the organization. William H. Whyte asserts that, with the advent of large organizations or bureaucracies, dominant value systems have swung far from those of imagination and independence to the requirement of conformity, unswerving and unthinking loyalty to the organization, and adaptability at the expense of individual ethics or values.¹

It would seem then that individualism is perhaps dying, and that conformity and subservient behavior are required for success in the formal organization, as are cooperativeness and being carefully attuned to the expectations of others. The result of those value systems and criteria for organizational success is:

"...artificiality and a facelessness in...organization life...the regularized and deadening uniformity of suburbia, the 9 to 5 beat of the 'man in the grey flannel suit'."²

Another major critic of the formal organization's effect on the individual is Chris Argyris, who contends that the basic formal structure demands are diametrically opposed to the needs of the human personality for full development. He contends that the personality tends to develop according to specific trends:

1. From a state of being passive as an infant to a state of increasing activity as an adult.

2. From a state of dependence upon others as an infant to a state of relative independence as an adult.

3. From being capable of behaving in only a few ways as an infant to being capable of behaving in many different ways as an adult.
4. From having erratic, casual, shallow, quickly dropped interest as an infant to possessing a deepening of interest as an adult. The mature state is characterized by an endless series of challenges where the reward comes from doing something for its own sake.

5. From having a short-time perspective...as an infant to having a much longer time perspective as an adult.

6. From being in a subordinate position in the family and society as an infant to aspiring to occupy at least an equal and/or superordinate position relative to his peers.

7. From having a lack of awareness of the self as an infant to having an awareness of and control over the self as an adult. The adult who experiences adequate and successful control over his own behavior develops a sense of integrity...and feeling of self-worth.⁴

Argyris contends that the structure of formal organizations is injurious to the development of personality. The structure, or arrangement of components within the organization, refers to the pattern of relationships among the units in an organization—relationships which may be expressed in terms of power or status, or other variables. This structure can be understood in terms of its various dimensions, like the degree of formalization, centralization, delegation of authority, span of control, and so on. This structure exists in an organization to the extent that all of the units are differentiated from each other, and this structure refers to the properties of the organization, not of its members.⁴ The organization maximizes its effectiveness in achieving its goals by requiring its members to work with certain individuals and not with others, to take orders from some persons and not from others, and generally to act according to the way the organization's formal structure
says they are to act. So, the organization's structure acts as a form of constraint upon the individual's behavior. These basic principles of effective organization, Argyris contends, create conditions that are detrimental to personality development. As a result of this analysis, Argyris cites what he considers a clear case of incongruence between the demands of the formal organization and the needs of healthy individuals. Work requirements create situations in which individuals are dependent and passive, and in which they use few of their abilities, and the ones they do use are relatively unimportant. As a result, frustration, failure, short-time perspective, and conflict naturally occur because of the injury to their own personality needs.\(^5\)

Alvin Toffler in *Future Shock* refers to these results:

"Since organizations appear to be growing larger and more powerful all the time, the future... threatens to turn us into that most contemptible of creatures, spineless and faceless, the organization man."\(^6\)

Toffler admits it is difficult to overestimate the force with which that bleak forecast grips the minds of many of us. He says:

"Hammered into their heads by a stream of movies, plays and books, fed by a prestigious line of authors from Kafka and Orwell to Whyte, Marcuse and Ellul, the fear of bureaucracy permeates their thought...the fear of being swallowed up by this mechanized beast drives executives to orgies of self-examination and students to paroxysms of protest."

The bureaucracy which Toffler refers to is not limited to "government by bureaus" which is often the meaning assigned to
the term; rather the term bureaucracy refers to any type of organization with a high degree of formal structure. Max Weber claimed that bureaucracy was man's greatest social invention:

"The decisive reason for the advance of bureaucratic organizations has always been its purely technical superiority over any other form of organization."8

These large scale organizations provide benefits to contemporary life that could not have been otherwise obtained, since bureaucracies can efficiently coordinate the work of large numbers of people. Because modern society has an obvious need for certain work, it would seem necessary that bureaucracies exist. As Charles Perrow says:

"Bureaucracy is a form of organization superior to all others we know or can hope to afford in the near and middle future; the chances of doing away with it or changing it are probably nonexistent in the West in this century."9

The main characteristics of a formally structured organization, or a bureaucracy as named originally by Max Weber and referred to by many others since, are the following:

1. Task specialization.
2. Unity of direction (or rules and regulations).
3. Span of control.
4. Chain of command (or hierarchy).

**Task Specialization: Plus or Minus?**

Administrative efficiency was presumed to increase with an increase in specialization. Each individual, therefore, fills a precisely positioned slot, in a more or less fixed environment;
he has traditionally occupied a sharply defined slot in a division of labor. After an organization's structure is developed, individuals are assigned to fit into the organization on the basis of the skills they possess. This division of labor in the organization usually is accepted as representing advantages in attaining high levels of efficiency. In this manner, workers on an assembly-line performing one specialized task can produce more output than if each individual tackled the entire project individually. Chris Argyris contends that specialization is detrimental to personality development:

"In concentrating effort on a limited field of endeavor in order to increase the quality and quantity of output, the individual is required to curtail his continuous, ego-involving process of growth and to use only a few of his total abilities. As specialization increases, it also requires use of the less complex abilities rather than the more complex abilities."11

Unity of Direction: Plus or Minus?

This aspect of the formally structured organization is based on the belief that "a man cannot serve two masters". It is believed that efficiency increases if a unit has only one activity (or one homogeneous set of activities) that is planned and directed by only one supervisor. Argyris says:

"Since psychological success is achieved when each individual is allowed to define his own goals in relation to the strengths of the barriers to be overcome in order to reach these goals, ideal conditions for psychological failure have been created, since no allowance for aspiration for psychological success has been provided."12
Argyris' criticisms notwithstanding, every formally structured organization or bureaucracy has rules, and these rules are created to enable members of the organization to deal with the information they are exposed to within the organization. The disadvantages occur when the rules are applied blindly and inflexibly.

**Span of Control: Plus or Minus?**

This feature of formally structured organizations refers to the contention that efficiency is increased through the limitation of the number of subordinates directly under the supervision of a superior. If the number of subordinates is kept to a minimum, great emphasis is placed upon close supervision. Argyris contends:

"This leads the subordinates to become dependent upon, passive toward, and subordinate to, the organization. Close supervision also tends to place control in the hands of the superior."\(^{13}\)

**Chain of Command: Plus or Minus?**

Hierarchy is based upon the principle that every member of an organization has one individual in a position above him from whom he receives directions. Each boss also has a boss, so the organizational hierarchy is shaped to form a pyramidal structure, with power and authority concentrated at the top. However, a hierarchy does not necessarily mean that all power is located at the top, for a lower-ranked member of the organization may possess more power to influence other members than an executive nearer the top. Hierarchy has been referred to as the most characteristic aspect
of a bureaucratic organization, even more so than rules and impersonality. A bureaucratic hierarchy can have a marked effect on communication behavior, by channeling communications vertically. Commands and instructions come down, and reports and other items go up. Organizational hierarchy quite frequently discourages certain types of messages from being communicated, since the nature of hierarchical structure and the reward system in the formal organization discourages subordinates from passing bad news to their bosses. So, bureaucracy, even though its main advantage is to rationalize human behavior in organizations, can lead to inefficiency and irrationality (i.e. the stifling of feedback). Argyris contends:

"...individuals are required to be dependent upon, passive toward, and subordinate to, the organization. As a result, subordinates have little control over their working environment. Time perspective is shortened because they do not have complete access to all the information necessary to predict the future." It could also be added that since practically every member of the organization is subordinate to another member, in varying degrees of course, each member of the organization, including executives, are susceptible to these counterproductive facets of the formally structured organization.

Alvin Toffler summarizes this structure:

"First, in this particular system of organization, the individual has traditionally occupied a sharply defined slot in a division of labor. Second, he fit into a vertical hierarchy, a chain of command
running from the boss down to the lowliest
menial. Third, his organizational relation­
ship, as Weber emphasized, tended toward per­
manence. Each individual, therefore, filled
a precisely positioned slot, a fixed position
in a more or less fixed environment. He knew
exactly where his department ended and the
next began; the lines between organizations
and their substructures were anchored firmly
in place. In joining an organization, the
individual accepted a set of fixed obligations
in return for a specified set of rewards.
These obligations and rewards remained the
same over relatively long spans of time.
The individual thus stepped into a compara­
tively permanent web of relationships--not
merely with other people (who also tend to
remain in their slots for a long time)--but
with the organizational framework, the structure
itself."17

Max Weber realized that bureaucracies had a contradictory
nature, and that even though they were intended to achieve rational
efficiency, they could also at times be counterproductive. In
fact, "bureaucracy" has become quite a hated concept, connecting
inefficiency and red tape.18 However, practically all organizations
are bureaucratized to some extent. They have rules and regulations,
specialized tasks, a hierarchy, and a type of machine-like imper­
sonality in handling interpersonal relationships. These character­
istics provide efficiency in handling large-scale administrative
tasks, but that type of structure can also be dehumanizing to the
people who work in the organization, or even who deal with it from
the exterior as clients. Many formal organization structures seem
to be based on a theory that assumes that people vary little in
personality factors, rather than that there are many varied differ­
ences. Under this assumption of homogeneity, people are arbitrarily lumped into uniform systems with uniform results expected. Bureaucracies, therefore, have the built-in potential of turning humans into robots, in a sense. Max Weber described bureaucracy in a way which exhibits a potential to remove emotions from an organization, so that people become like ball bearings in a wheel. If Argyris is correct in his contention that the human personality will inevitably reach maturation, then the bureaucratic organizational structure can be interpreted to inhibit that process. Grouping similar activities, rigid rules and policies, and more and more specialization, would seem necessarily to limit the initiative and creativity of the individual member (in varying degrees throughout the hierarchy). In Weber's words:

"Precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of the files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs—these are raised to the optimum point in the strictly bureaucratic organization."\(^{19}\)

The alienating potential of the formal organization is admitted by many writers on the subject. Follet saw conflict as an inherent part of the organization process, even though many viewed it as interruptive, something to be avoided within the organization structure.\(^{20}\) Barnard said that sometimes work was best accomplished through informal processes.\(^{21}\) Even Weber found alienation to be a product of the formal organization.
Alienating Characteristics of Formal Organization Structure

One consequence of alienation within the formally structured organization is the individual resisting involvement in the task because it has no meaning, and taking no risks because his security within the hierarchy would be endangered. Similarly, individuals succumb to detailed rules and procedures in a ritualistic way because of their desire to remain secure within the hierarchy. This situation potentially can cause a person to possibly lose his own sense of worth and identity as he is inundated by the rules and value of the organization. Within such a setting, an individual really can do nothing but to seek to get the job done and still survive as a person. Concerning the potential for psychological frustration, J.A.C. Brown comments:

"Sooner or later, every individual is confronted by situations in which his knowledge, innate intelligence, and experience fail to produce the results he desires. When a person is motivated towards a goal and something interferes with his progress towards it, he is said to be frustrated. In such a situation, the appropriate type of behavior is what Norman Maier in Psychology in Industry has described as problem-solving behavior, in which the habitual modes of response are replaced by new responses of a creative nature, which are well adapted to the solving of the problem with which he is confronted. But when, for one reason or another, the problem cannot be solved and the goal is not attained, a greater or less degree of frustration is likely to result. If the motives are relatively minor ones, the person may simply accept the situation and go on his way. But if the motives are strong, and the goals are important to him, more or less emotion is aroused, the energy output is increased, and activity is redirected."
The dilemma for the individual within the formally structured organization is that there often is no alternative for him within that structure. When the individual experiences frustration associated with his membership in the organization, and his attempts to alleviate his situation are thwarted by that very structure, then his frustration is often manifested in counter-productive ways—for both himself and the organization. This sign of untreated frustration has often been labeled "industrial fatigue".

Brown cites Bock and Dill in *Physiology of Muscular Exercise*:

"There are two types of fatigue, one originating entirely within the central nervous system, and the other originating partly within the active muscles. The former is of common occurrence, whereas the latter occurs comparatively infrequently. Industrial fatigue is usually of the first type. This type of fatigue is entirely psychological in origin...what this means is that nearly all so-called industrial fatigue, with the exception of a very few cases of physical exhaustion due to prolonged heavy physical work, is produced by purely psychological states of boredom, anxiety, and resentment."23

So, as a fatigued worker first experiences a lessening of interest in his work, unless the underlying causes are dealt with, it will be followed by an active disinterest or boredom. If the same work or occupation is continued, the amount of annoyance and irritation will be increased. At this stage the individual will begin showing some signs of unrest. Finally, if he still continues in the situation which is causing the frustration, it will tax his will and concentration to the breaking point. His production within the organization will be reduced, of course, and more importantly
he will be susceptible to emotional problems.

The conclusions reached concerning symptoms of industrial fatigue address the belief that there is importance in the primary group within the organization in maintaining physical and mental health, discipline, and happiness. Nevertheless, serious psychosomatic illnesses occur in industry, and these conditions tend to occur most frequently in the key-men of the organization, especially among managers and executives. Brown says:

"Managers and supervisors in industry show a considerably higher rate of peptic ulcer, coronary thrombosis, angina pectoris, and high blood pressure, than any other group in or out of industry."26

So, the impression of many people that only the low-level organizational members suffer because of the structural stranglehold of the system, quite obviously is incorrect. While the specific causes for frustration and unrest among individuals occupying varying levels of the organization hierarchy are seemingly different, the underlying precipitators are basically similar. These underlying causes stem from the formally structured organization's deficiencies concerning the needs of individual members. Brown summarizes:

"We have reached a state of affairs in which it is possible to measure not only the economic and technical efficiency of an organization, but also its social efficiency. Low social efficiency in the organization, for whatever reason, means frustration and unrest, and perhaps disease. The modern organization may merely be a manifestation of modern society as a whole, one in which the individual is increasingly reduced in importance. More than any previous society, it stimulates people's desires without
being able to satisfy them. More than any previous society, it is based on conflicting ideals which the individual finds impossible to reconcile. More than any previous society... ours is a mob or mass society. The old or primary groupings have been broken up—the family, the working group, the village council—and replaced by huge anonymous bodies in relation to which status, function, and personal significance are lost. Conflicting emotions arise between competition and success on the one hand, and brotherly love on the other; between stimulation of our needs and our factual frustrations in satisfying them; and between alleged freedom of the individual and all his factual limitations.  

This negative assessment closely resembles Alvin Toffler's description of the individual's plight within the formal organization:

"...each man frozen into a narrow, unchanging niche in a rabbit warren bureaucracy, as the walls of this niche squeeze the individuality out of him, smash his personality, and compel him, in effect, to conform or die."

So, the formally structured organization has been created for reasons of efficiency, expediency, and productivity. It is the primary device by which society orders specialized capacities of men and women toward cooperative and productive ends, and yet it represents a source of untold frustration, unrest, and unhappiness for the human beings within. Regardless of position occupied in the organizational hierarchy, human beings find themselves to be somehow reduced in that very basic property—their humanness.

This substantial price that the formally structured organization frequently exacts from its members can be translated into blockages
of communication which then lead to the symptoms of withdrawal, hostility, etc. The stifling effects of formal organization structure often have effectively blocked the individual's ability to communicate his personal needs and desires. Hence, the formally structured organization has traditionally seen its formal communication networks bypassed with informal communication networks. These informal networks provide graphic evidence that the formal structure of an organization does not completely predict communication behavior or individual need satisfaction. Therefore, the informal communication channels exist to provide an outlet that the formal networks will not and often cannot provide.

Formal and Informal Communication Patterns

An organization chart is a description of the formal structure of an organization. The chart shows lines of authority and the formal communication patterns among the positions comprising the organization. Argyris terms the organization chart:

"An organization chart is like an X-ray of the hierarchical structure within an organization."29

When looking at an organization chart, it is possible to learn much about a system's operation and about its formal communication channels. Even though an organization chart fails to capture the total dynamics of interaction within the organization, it nevertheless provides much information in a convenient way, partly because the organization usually has to come to consider relationships in
terms of the chart. Therefore, the organization chart expresses the expected pattern of formal communication, and also acts as a self-fulfilling prophesy to guide the patterns in the direction it specifies. The structure of the social system within the organization is not visible as the technical or economic systems. This social system sometimes cannot be seen, but must be inferred from the actual operations of the organization, and from the organization chart. The formal structure consists of the aspects of the patterns of behavior in the organization that are relatively stable, and that change slowly. As mentioned, one purpose of that structure is to provide a stable, regular, and predictable operation for the organization. The structure represented in the organization chart signifies the lack of randomness and the presence of patterns in the relationships between the units comprising an organization. There are various types of structure in the organization system, and the patterns of interaction between them form a communication structure in the organization. The arrangement of superiors and subordinates (recalling that practically every member of the organization is subordinate to another, and everyone, in a sense, is subordinate to the organization) forms that formal structure which comprises the hierarchy. So again, most organizations usually have a high degree of structure, and these patterns give them a stable and predictable quality. This structure is usually formalized in the form of the organization chart because it aids the organization in carrying out its goals. But the formal structure as depicted in the chart can
never completely explain or predict what the behavior of members will be, even in a very rigid system.

In addition to the formal hierarchically structured communication flows, every organization system has an informal structure that is also present. By failing to perceive this informal structure, it is quite simple to present an overly rational picture of organizational behavior. Keith Davis says:

"Both formal and informal systems are necessary for group activity, just as two blades are necessary to make a pair of scissors workable. Both formal and informal organizations comprise the social system of a work group."31

Indeed the alienating facets of formally structured organizations have given rise to "informal rules" which are usually passed along the informal or "underground" communication networks of the organization. One of the findings of the Hawthorne Studies was the important role of informal communication networks in determining worker productivity.32 This informal communication may be vertical or horizontal, and sometimes considerable overlap occurs between the formal organization structure and the informal communication patterns, while sometimes they are distinct.33 So, on the whole, it would seem that the perspective provided by the formal structure in understanding behavior within the organization is limited, since the informal channels sometimes provide different indications.

Concerning the informal rules transmitted through informal channels, Simmons and Dvorin in Public Administration comment:
"...they reflect the personalization of task demands and survival goals. They generally are humorous if quite cynical in their thrust. Containing a certain type of gallows humor, they set the 'hierarchical noose' more tightly around the employees' necks. They include 'conventional wisdom' which rationalizes the continuation of unfairness in the name of fairness. They encourage continued participation in the system, as the 'little good' the person may do is seen to alleviate some of the pain and despair so often meted out in the name of 'goodness'. Thus the alienated organizational member performs his work and rationalizes his despair through this device. In the final analysis, these survival rules for hierarchical living force the alienating nature of hierarchy. They may be destructive to the individuals succumbing to their use. They reinforce the hierarchical principles because they avoid challenging its inappropriate and inhuman nature, and they also reinforce role dependency."34

For example, an informal rule such as, "Don't rock the boat" has a hidden meaning of "Don't threaten your peer task group". It seemingly is meant to aid personal survival within the organization, yet it actually has an alienation quality of encouraging no member of the organization to assume responsibility. Another informal rule, "Information is power; dispense it sparingly" holds a hidden meaning of "Be careful what you say; know how it will be received". The rule is again seemingly meant to aid in personal survival within the system, yet it serves to further alienate members by encouraging them to play power games. Similarly, the informal suggestion, "Don't stick around long enough to clean up your mistakes" has a hidden meaning of "Avoid bad personnel evaluations; always look like a winner, everybody 'screws up'". This rule sup-
posedly is designed for personal survival, but in reality encourages organization members to avoid taking responsibility for their actions. The list of these informal rules by which to survive within a formal organization can be long, and although the specifics of each rule may differ, the essential significance will be the same. Individuals within the organization are inevitably placed within a system which necessitates adjustments for survival. In effect, those adjustments must still be internal to the hierarchical, formal system, for if an individual attempts to effect changes which upset the formal patterns of the organization, he must be removed from that structure. The irony of the process is that the nature of the system creates a situation in which an individual must play by the rules which he is alienated by, and the only way to survive individually within the system is to use those rules as beneficially to oneself as possible. Thus the cycle of alienation grows larger and stronger as individuals unwittingly attempt to become "islands unto themselves" within the organization.

Rumors: Indicators of Organizational Unrest Via Informal Communication Channels

Therefore, the traditional organization charts tell relatively little about the informal organization through which informal information is transmitted. This informal structure is also generally a breeding place for rumors. The term "grapevine" is commonly used to refer to this informal communication system, and it can be traced back to the Civil War period when telegraph lines were strung from
tree to tree like a grapevine. Messages sent over this haphazard system became garbled and any false information or rumor that came along was said to have come over the grapevine. The negative connotation of the grapevine carried over to contemporary times seems to have the following pattern:

"The informal communication system is equated with the grapevine, the grapevine is equated with rumor, and rumor is viewed as bad for the organization."

But Charles Redding in Communication Within the Organization says:

"If we desire to understand the dynamics of organizational communications, we must look for a variety of networks, and must probe beneath the formal channels shown on the conventional organization chart. The informal system of communication can spread false rumors and destructive information, or it can effectively supplement the formal downward, horizontal, and upward systems. There are both negative and positive connotations."

The impression that rumors within an organization are counterproductive and harmful is easily understood. Rumors have traditionally been interpreted as indicators of some type of underlying unrest or anxiety. This interpretation is correct in many instances, since obviously news of a negative nature will be transmitted over the informal networks within an organization. Also, the formally structured organization has traditionally viewed conflict as potentially damaging to member productivity. With this view, it is understandable why rumors, seen as being indicative of members' anxieties, have been assigned a negative interpretation. Quite obviously rumors can and do often pertain to areas of unrest within an organization,
but rumors also can pertain to other, more positive, areas. Therefore, the informal communication network, which is present in every organization to varying degrees, represents a means by which informal news is transmitted. These informal patterns are transmission lines for both positive and negative information, and, when viewed as such, can conceivably provide indices of the organization's members' satisfactions within the system. The informal communication networks must not be feared for what they might potentially transmit, rather they must be respected for what they represent. The fact that rumors within an organization are often indicative of deepseated unrest is reflective of the basic shortcomings of the formally structured organization. Perhaps in this respect rumors should be feared for the realities they tend to address. As Anthony Downs says:

"Prevalence of informal channels means that formal networks do not fully describe the important communication channels in the organization...the more stringently restricted the formal channels, the richer will be the flowering of subformal ones."38

Although the informal channels often do indicate unrest and unhappiness within the formally structured organization, it must be accented that the informal communication networks can contribute toward an organization's effectiveness in reaching its goals. This benefit of informal communication is very real, even though it springs up spontaneously within the organization. It is not controlled by the organization, which to a large extent cannot even influence it (unless drastic measures are employed), and it is mostly motivated by the
self-interests of individuals (e.g. the informal rules referred to above). Both formal and informal communication enables organization members to process information, and informal channels may address a need for communication not filled by formal channels. However, even if the formal communication is effective within an organization, there will still be informal channels, since informal communication is of importance to the members whether or not formal channels are functioning adequately.

Communication Flows Within the Formally Structured Organization

Task-related communication in an organization occurs in a highly structured context, but how does this affect the communication behavior of the organization members? Generally, the organization structure limits the flow of communication and serves to guide where the flows do travel. So, in effect, just by knowing the formal structure of the organization, it is usually possible to predict a lot about the nature of the formal communication flows within it. There are conflicting beliefs as to what comprises the main communication problems in organizations--whether restricted communication flows is the major problem, or the converse, information overloads. On the one hand, it would seem that for organizations to function effectively, information must flow freely and unrestricted, in order for organization members to become adequately exposed to relevant information. There are obvious destructive qualities inherent in any organizations which severely restrict
the flow of communication between members. The organization which severely handicaps the interactions of members by restricting the flow of communication will surely experience dysfunction. Yet, on the other hand, it is possible that less restricted communication flows may cause problems also. An organization's structure also operates to condense information, or else a sea of paper might engulf the members. An individual within an organization who is overloaded with information is most likely inefficient himself, but since he is integrated into communication networks with other individuals, he is the cause of inefficiency in others. The overloaded individual is as likely to neglect obligations to other group members, thereby increasing their error, as he is to neglect his own control responsibilities. This situation can very well spawn a new informal rule within the organization such as, "When in doubt--mumble" which means "Never admit you don't know the answer". Once again, personal survival motives create a situation in which deception is seemingly encouraged. Thus, one consequence of information overload for one individual in an organization is to cause information overload for others in the organization.

"Under pressure that greater amounts of required communication be handled at once, the individuals...probably neglected to forward some problem-relevant information; this in turn gives to information seeking questions. These questions, because answers are required, further increase the communication load."
As the situation regresses to a matter of personal survival, each individual within the communication network will make some type of individual adjustment to help him better cope with the situation. His adjustment may be nothing more than an attempt to merely survive within the organization structure, as he is either inundated with too much information, or isolated with too little. The adjustments he makes must necessarily be within the context of the organization's formal structure, for any attempt to circumvent that structure will cause the organization to impose sanctions in order to discourage any deviant behavior. An individual, therefore, must cope with the situation as best he can playing by the rules of the organization. If he is inundated with too much information, he must either increase the input-output channels by passing on the load to someone else in the organization; or the overload may be handled by filtering out certain information in order to reduce the amount. If an individual is not provided with enough information, he must adjust to his inadequate supply by camouflaging his predicament. He may do this by various means, but the end result is the same—he is being forced into a pattern of increasing frustration. And quite frequently frustrated individuals within an organization almost serve as "carriers"—that is, through their frustration, they, in turn, frustrate others.

Changes in Organizational Communication and Behavioral Viewpoints

At this point, it is helpful to address the changes in organization theory which have occurred since Max Weber outlined the for-
nally structured organization. While the scope of this section of the chapter is not meant to provide a detailed analysis of the changes in organization thinking which have occurred, which would be a tremendously difficult task beyond the scope of this study, it is necessary to outline briefly what has taken place within the context of the formal organization. The fact that frustration and alienation are contemporary problems in organizations accents the reality that what changes have occurred have not been panaceas, to say the least. However, it is important to note that organizational theories have evolved over the years, and conscientious and determined research has been conducted to change organization. This research, dedicated to achieving beneficial change for organizations, really has been directed in two directions; although not mutually exclusive, these directions at times seem to be incongruous. These are the efficiency and productivity of the organization, and the satisfaction and needs of the individual members. For the sake of brevity, this organizational research can be partitioned into "schools" of thought: Scientific Management, Human Relations, and Systems Theory. These schools of thought are not mutually exclusive either, nor has any of them become obsolete, and they represent a tremendous amount of research conducted to aid organizations in becoming more efficient and productive, and to aid individuals in deriving a sense of satisfaction and need fulfillment as organization members. A brief examination of each school is presented, followed by a discussion of where this research has
left contemporary organizations.

Scientific Management's View of Communication and Human Behavior

This school marked the introduction of scientific methods into the management of organizations. Scientific Management holds a mechanistic view of behavior: man is economically motivated, and will respond with maximum performance if material rewards are closely related to work efforts. Human engineering of worker effort and time is favored in order to achieve maximum production, efficiency, and profit for the organization. Frederick Taylor said:

"Science, not rule of thumb. Harmony, not discord. Cooperation, not individualism. Maximum output, in place of restricted output. The development of each man to greatest efficiency and prosperity."41

Scientific Management assumes that the worker is very irrational if left on his own, but he would respond to money. Man is seen as being made for the organization, and through his cooperation with its objectives he could produce to the maximum. So, the organization member is essentially perceived as only a human part of the organizational machine. The Scientific Management school did not see communication as playing a very significant role in organizations, and communication was essentially seen as limited to commands and control through the vertical, formal channels. This view of organization members as robot-like creatures, existing only to produce for the organization, was reacted to bitterly.
This opposition to the basic tenets of Scientific Management paved the way for the Human Relations school, which took a more humanistic view of organizations.

Human Relations' View of Communication and Human Behavior

The attack on Scientific Management reached a peak in the 1950's, and the proponents of Human Relations argued that conducting time-and-motion studies of individual workers, and offering them cash incentives as individuals in such a group-centered situation, would be futile. The Human Relationists felt a more appropriate strategy would be to assess the workers' needs and satisfy them, based on the belief that the increased job satisfaction would presumably lead to higher individual production, and thus higher organization production for the organization. The message of the Human Relations school was that "tender loving care" of organization members would pay off in higher productivity. The Human Relations viewpoint led ultimately to a focus on leadership, as discussed in Chapter I, as a means of attaining greater job satisfaction, which would then lead to the higher productivity. Organization researchers at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan were generally not able to prove that satisfied workers produce more than dissatisfied workers, and, in fact, sometimes the least satisfied workers are the highest producers in the organization. This unusual finding led researchers to investigate supervisory leadership as it related to production. So, training
programs for work leaders were subsequently designed, emphasizing the Human Relations approach as a means of raising production. The Human Relations school advocated the use of training programs to change human behavior, and thus solve organizational problems. This approach amounts to altering individual behaviors in order to bring about change in the system. Communication was seen as relatively important, but that importance was mainly limited to communication among peers. Not much attention was given to the communication of workers' needs to the organization. Thus, the main purpose of communication was seen as a means to satisfy workers' needs by allowing interaction among peers, and to facilitate some participation in organization decision making. Breakdowns in communication were usually thought to be due to rumors, as discussed earlier, and ineffective formal communication structures within the organization.

**Systems Theory View of Communication and Human Behavior**

This school views a system as a set of interdependent parts, and one essential element of a system is communication, which links the parts. The central belief is that the whole is more than the sum of its parts. The Systems viewpoint emphasizes the interrelationships between an organization and its environment; the Scientific Management and Human Relations schools often studied the organization as being isolated, looking within the organization to explain behaviors. The Systems school also looks outside, to the
environment. Communication is seen as very important, as it is considered to be what holds the units in an organization together. Communication is used to control and coordinate activities, and to adjust the organization to changes in its environment. The communication in organizations is seen as flowing in all directions within the system, as well as across the organizational boundaries with the environment. Breakdowns in communication are usually thought to be due to overloads, distortions, or omissions, and also unresponsiveness on the part of the organization to negative feedback from organizational members.

Organizational Tactics to Influence the Individual

The three main schools of organizational behavior differ in basic principles, assumptions about human behavior, and the importance of organizational communication; yet whatever differences do exist between the three, there is at least one feature that is shared. This feature is the fact that all organizations must distribute incentives to individuals in order to induce them to contribute activity to the organization. The organization wants the individual to contribute his efforts in the direction the organization has use for that contribution. These contributions of individual members can be viewed in the terms of a "psychological contract" in which the individual agrees to do certain things for the organization, in return for certain things. In other words, the organization wants the individual to do certain things and contribute
certain activities (i.e. to do what the organization wants them to do). This "getting the organization's way" may be accomplished through a wide variety of methods, ranging from force to no force at all, and the particular techniques of influence correspond with the organization's basic perceptions of man. An open model, such as the Systems school, appears to argue against the practice of manipulation of men by other men in an organizational context, or perhaps the school simply uses another term for it (e.g. self-actualization). Manipulation is seen in the Systems school as preventing the self-actualization of the members and as lowering their self-concepts. In contrast, the closed model such as that of Scientific Management has no reservations about using manipulative methods. Scientific Management advocates "using" people for the sake of the organization's ends, and the use of authoritative coercion in the manipulation of people is seen as the thing to do.

The above is representative of the differing values of the schools of organizational behavior concerning influencing individuals to contribute their efforts. The point being explored is that differences over influence tactics are really only a matter of style. In Scientific Management force is always a possibility in the organization's way; but in the open model, coercion is not seen as legitimate, and is discouraged. The fact is, however, that the influence tactics in the open model take on a more intricate character—suggestions replace orders, coercion is replaced by persuasion, education is favored over blind obedience, force is replaced
by socialization, and cooperation replaced authority. The fundamental idea is to induce organization members in such a way as to make them "want" to work for the organization. In this sense, influence is accepted as necessary by the open model as well as the closed models of organization, since only the techniques of that influence are different. The closed model theorists believed in orders and obedience and rules and regulations. The disadvantages of these manipulative features are obvious, just as the advantages of the open model's methods of influence are obvious: humanism, openness, and open, encouraged communication. But there are also disadvantages to these types of influence--they tend to disguise the exercise of power in organization. People in open model organizations may never really be sure "where they stand". The accompanying fact is that it may also be possible that if they think they do know where they stand, their feelings of knowledge may be the result of an influencing of their attitudes that is so subtle they do not realize it.

As addressed earlier, organizations have means by which to obtain the contributions of individuals toward the organization's goals. The net satisfactions which induce an individual to contribute his efforts to an organization result from what he perceives are the positive advantages, as against the disadvantages which are entailed. Inadequate incentives on the part of the organization means dissolution, or changes of organizational purpose, or failure of individuals to cooperate. So, in formally structured organi-
izations, the offering of adequate incentives become a vital task in their existence. However, in the words of Chester Barnard:

"If an organization is unable to afford incentives adequate to the personal contributions it requires, it will perish unless it can by persuasion so change the desires of enough men that the incentives it can offer will be adequate."44

Persuasion in the sense Barnard uses the term, refers to the organization's ability to secure the individual's contribution of effort toward the goals of the organization. As discussed earlier, if an individual perceives an organization as not offsetting the negative consequences of his association with the organization, he experiences distress in his continued association. It is at these times that the organization seeks to change the attitudes of the individual in order to secure his continued contributions of effort to the organization. This persuasion usually takes the form of the "rationalization of incentives."45 The rationalization of incentives is the process of personal appeal to contribute individual efforts, and it consists of emphasizing opportunities for satisfaction that are afforded, usually in contrast with those available otherwise. The organization attempts, through this method of changing attitudes, to elicit interest in those incentives which are most easily or outstandingly afforded. So, in effect, the organization, upon perceiving an individual's unhappiness with his organizational membership, attempts to change the individual's feelings by persuading him to accept what the organi-
zation offers him. And, in actuality, what the organization is attempting to convince him to accept as important, is what the organization has determined is the easiest to provide him with. For example, an individual who perceives his organizational involvement to be undesirable may attempt to leave or change the system. The organization may well attempt to counter this individual move by offering a higher salary and a higher position in the hierarchy, while counseling the individual that he should not resist such an opportunity. If he chooses to continue his association with the organization, his underlying opinion of the system will probably not have changed, but he will have rationalized his continued presence in a system he considers to be deficient. The organization will have guarded its structure and aided in its survival and productivity (barring the individual's drop in productivity) through the retention of the individual's contribution of effort, and the means by which these were secured were obviously much easier to provide than either losing a talented organizational member, or changing the organizational system. Generally, if the contributions of the individual are not perceived as adequately offsetting the "cost" of inducing him to remain with the organization, he would be let go without any organizational effort to persuade him to remain with the organization. This persuasive stance of the organization has traditionally affected the individual by effectively sidestepping the individual's indications of dissatisfaction, through these persuasive tactics designed to change
individuals' perceptions of their needs and desires. Although it can be argued that the individual does his own share of persuading in his attempts to convince the organization of his worth, this type of persuasive "campaign" is relatively inconsequential when viewed with the organization's efforts to induce individuals to contribute their efforts. The underlying difference in these two persuasive efforts is the power base inherent in the persuasive tactics. There can be no question as to where the power lies once an individual becomes an organization member. From that time forward the organization wields immense power in its relationship with the individual, as long as the individual remains an organization member. The individual's only real power lies in his option to sever his relationship with the organization—an option which can be used only as an extreme measure, for the individual must make sacrifices should he choose to sever his organizational ties.

Summary of Schools of Organization

The different incentives advocated by the three schools of organizational behavior discussed above are obvious and are based upon each school's fundamental view of man. It must be mentioned that these schools are not mutually exclusive, and there rarely occurs an absolute "pure" type. But for the purpose of this section it has been necessary to speak in ideal types in order to delineate basic premises of each. The rational-economic image of man of the
Scientific Management school was reflected in the incentive system and communication philosophy of the school. Man was viewed as economically motivated and was seen as working at maximum production levels if the material rewards were closely related to work efforts. This mechanistic view of man was reflected by the impersonal, formal channels of work-related communication and the fact that communication was not viewed as very important. Money and individual incentives were viewed to be the motivators of human effort. The fact that the employee's emotional needs were not fulfilled on the job was of little consequence because he was believed to not expect them to be, nor want them to be fulfilled on the job. The organization manipulated the individual through the use of economic incentives.

The social view of man acknowledges the existence of needs other than purely economic ones. This acknowledgment of social needs on the job opened the door to psychological contracts between the individual and the organization in which each expected more of the other. If the employee could expect the satisfaction of some of his important needs through participation in the organization, he could to a degree become morally involved in that organization. For its part, the organization could then expect a greater degree of loyalty, commitment, and identification with organizational goals on the part of the individual. So, organizations had to become aware of the social needs of workers' if the organization could meet those social needs, it could get individuals morally involved with
the organization and its goals. The organization became aware of the fact that its members had to be "contented" members, since contented members were members willing to "do what the organization wanted them to do". In the social view of man, informal communication is stressed as well as formal; workers are encouraged to communicate laterally with peers (because it had been shown in studies that group interaction facilitated productivity), and communication is used as a means to detect any possible sources of discontent. The organization's members did obviously make gains through these innovations, but these gains were merely by-products of the organization's attempts at higher productivity. The belief that contented individuals tend to contribute individual effort more freely, was no small contributor to the increased attention given to interpersonal communication channels.

This section has not been geared towards an across-the-board indictment of the contributions of the study of organizational behavior. The fact that improvements have occurred is not to be ignored because of skepticism as to the motives behind those improvements. The contention set forth is that the three schools of organizational behavior have given emphasis to communication and incentive systems which (1) reflect their basic view of human nature; and (2) influence individuals to do what the organization wants in a style of influence geared to that basic view of man. The means employed differ, but the ends are similar--the individual is doing what the organization wants him/her to do.
Are these attempts at influence to be viewed negatively? They should be viewed for what they are. It seems it would be a mistake to view them as syrupy, benign, humanistic additions in which everyone comes out a winner. Although the individual within the organization has made considerable progress since the inception of the formally structured organization, it is still a "stacked deck" with regards to where the power is located in most organizations. For the individual to be influenced by organizational concessions seems not too poor a position for the individual member to be in--yet there must not be a doubt that influence is occurring, and where the power remains. To make that point has been the intent of this section.

Summary and Conclusions

Bureaucracy refers to a system of organization having a high degree of formalization. It is characterized by precise channels of communication; by rules and regulations; a hierarchy of formal positions; and a specialized division of tasks. All organizations are bureaucratized to at least some degree, and while the purpose of these formally structured organizations is to achieve a high degree of rational efficiency, bureaucracy has become a "dirty word" in that it tends to lead to inefficiencies and to problems of frustration and alienation. The frustration and alienation potential of formal organization structure is not limited to only the
lower echelons of the organizational hierarchy, since managers and executives are plagued by essentially the same fundamental problems.

Frustration within the formally structured organization occurs for diverse reasons among individuals occupying different levels of an organization's hierarchy; however, the underlying precipitators of these symptoms often are the inadequacies of formal structure. Individuals within a system designed for stability, predictability, and regularity often perceive themselves to be "faceless" and "inconsequential" like "rabbits in a warren". This frustration eventually causes individuals to resist being involved within such a system because they perceive it as having no personal meaning. The insecurities of perceiving oneself as a faceless cog in a huge organizational machine create defense mechanisms in individuals to aid them in coping with their anxiety. These informal rules are seemingly designed to help combat the overwhelming influence of the formal organization, yet in reality often serve to further alienate. The individual who perceives himself as being manipulated may unwittingly apply methods of dealing with that manipulation which only entrench him deeper in that system, in a process of cycling through and getting worse and worse very similar to the dyadic communication spiraling process. This inevitable defense mechanism must occur within the context of the organization, since any behavior which deviates from the accepted norms of the organization will encounter sanctions. The frustrated organization member must adapt inevitably, consciously
or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, if he is to remain an organization member. The incongruity of perceiving oneself as being forced to fight to hold a position which is seen as personally unrewarding obviously can create untold distress—both physical and emotional.

The formal communication channels within the organization are, of course, indispensable, yet they often are inadequate in service to the individual member. The informal communication channels which exist in all organizations serve to provide the individual with what the formal channels fail to provide. These informal channels are often viewed suspiciously and negatively, as they often times transmit information indicative of the deficiencies of the formal organization. For this reason, information transmitted via the informal channels (e.g. rumors) has been seen as a chronic threat to organizations.

Although organization theory has evolved over the years in views of the importance of communication within the organization and views of the nature of the individual within the organization, contemporary formal organization structure, in many instances, serves to frustrate and alienate, and it would seem that ideal means to address individual human needs while addressing the goals of the organization have not yet been found. Perhaps the fact that the term bureaucracy has such a negative connotation in contemporary society is indicative of the unfortunate state of affairs. While bureaucracy is seen as something inefficient, unresponsive, and
alienating, the fact remains that most organizations have bureau-
cratic structures—the contempt people have for the bureaucratic
system must cause incalculable dissonance for all of us who func-
tion within such systems, for is it possible to participate in a
system perceived as basically undesirable without negative reper-
cussions?

Chapter III examines recommendations offered by students of
organization for solving the problems referred to above, while
Chapter IV suggests that new emphasis upon communication between
the individual, the organization, and the organization environment
is the means by which the adaptation will be made. Similarly,
individual organization members must be provided with more effec-
tive communication behaviors for dealing with organizational pres-
sures so that the individual's responses will not further increase
alienation—at the present time and as organizations make the
mandatory adaptations.
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CHAPTER III

CHANGE AND THE
FORMALLY STRUCTURED ORGANIZATION

Introduction

The preceding chapters have addressed two salient issues concerning contemporary organizations. The first, that of determining the variables which serve to make better managers and executives, is representative partly of a fundamental appreciation for the status quo in formal organization structure. The voluminous research conducted to delineate the factors contributing to an individual's ability to lead or manage effectively has stemmed, to a large extent, from the need perceived by organizations and society as a whole to obtain individuals best qualified to serve in such capacities. This desire to obtain "qualified" managers has quite obviously and understandably emanated from the organization's concern for productivity; the rationale being that the organization will be more productive if the organization members are suited to their roles, and the best qualified individuals assume managerial roles. Consequently, the search for the means by which to ensure higher organization productivity has precipitated the search for the means by which to maximize the odds in attracting talent to organizations and keeping that talent satisfied as organization members.
The outline of research presented in Chapter I is indicative of the considerable efforts expended in these attempts to discover the best, or combination of, "indicators" of managerial talent. And yet, contemporary formally structured organizations find themselves quite often to be faced with a very serious dilemma, as the viability of their basic structure is increasingly being questioned. This threat to the formally structured organization, which was outlined in Chapter II, represents a point of incongruity when viewed in conjunction with the research presented in Chapter I. The great amount of effort expended to secure creative, intelligent, capable organization members would, in a sense, seem to be for naught as one examines materials concerning the roots of alienation in contemporary formally structured organizations.

Is it not paradoxical to search on the one hand for individuals with greater ability to handle complex situations, while on the other hand creating organizational niches for those individuals which in many cases seemingly demand only faceless, nameless automons? Can society in general, and formally structured organizations in particular, continue to absorb the incalculable costs of organization frustration and alienation? There is nothing constructive in an indictment of any subject without a presentation of viable alternatives, and while this paper is not meant as an across-the-board indictment of contemporary formal organization structure, it is meant to examine the paradoxes
referred to above and to examine what alternatives might be available. It is only through such analyses that improvements can be found.

Chapter III examines alternatives both within the context of formal organization structure, and beyond that structure for the organizations of the future, while addressing whether or not the negative findings presented in Chapter II are inevitable and irreversible. Must the formal organization, in its pursuit of service to its environment, perform disservices to its members (whatever their hierarchical positions) by stunting their psychological growth or by conditioning them into conformist or robot-like roles. Frederick Thayer has asked a significant question:

"Is it possible that the effective conduct of social business occurs in spite of formal organization, not because of it?"

This type of fundamental examination must become more and more frequent in addressing prospects for organizations of the future, to ensure the ability of organizations to adapt to changing social conditions. It would seem that, given the bleak diagnoses referred to in Chapter II, changes must occur in order to remedy the ills within the system. The salient issue concerning those changes, however, is whether the changes made will be within the formal organization structure, or of that structure. For if changes occur only within the context of that structure, is that not a circumvention of what seems to be the underlying problem--that of
the inadequacies of the organization's formal structure in adapting to societal changes? One of those societal changes is the increase in the number of individuals within society who consider themselves to be "professionals".

**Increasing Professionalization: Balancing the Power Structure**

As shown in Chapter I, organizations have traditionally sought to recruit and employ as managers individuals who possess abilities conducive to their functioning as managers of other organization members' activities. Consequently, managers within the organization have been viewed in a different light than the average organization member. Individuals serving in a managerial capacity have been studied in attempts to isolate those unique qualities which serve to make them managerial "material"; in effect, managers have been seen as a "cut above" the ordinary organization member. This traditional view of an existence of a clear-cut distinction between the innate talents of manager and subordinate has perhaps become somewhat obsolete in a contemporary society in which the work force is increasingly becoming professionalized.²

The professionalization of the work force may quite possibly represent a fundamental explanation of the increasing dissatisfaction experienced in contemporary formal organization structure. Since it has been shown that there is an inverse relationship between professionalization and bureaucratic organizations,³ the increasing numbers of organization members considering themselves...
to be professionals may be responsible for the failure of the formally structured organization to satisfy their desires as professionals. The traditional clear-cut distinctions between manager and subordinate within the organization would seem to assume more complex dimensions in the increasingly professional membership. No longer will the distinction be a clear-cut delineation, since professionalization will serve to narrow the conceptual gap between professional manager and professional subordinate.

This is not to suggest that an increase of professionalization will necessitate autonomous organizational structures in which all members ought to be able to make their own decisions without external pressures from the employing organization. Yet there is a growing need within contemporary organizations to create a climate for professionals within which they may function effectively for both the organization and themselves. Throughout the recent decades, much research has been conducted concerning the employing organization and the employment of professionals. However, this research has approached the issue from a perspective which must now be altered as the number of these professional organizational members increases. It is no longer viable to isolate the professional from the majority, for we are witnessing a shifting of numbers. The United States Department of Labor defines a professional as:

"...any employee whose primary duty consists of the performance of work requiring knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study..."4
Obviously this broad definition is inconclusive of a growing segment of contemporary society, and while by no means does this encompass a majority, the labor force is and will almost certainly continue to become increasingly professionalized.

The reasons for this increase are necessarily diverse and difficult to identify since many variables are involved. These include greater demands for technological innovations upon organizations because of rapid changing technology; the average educational experience is increasing; and strong unionization efforts have served to enhance the shift to a professionalized work force. The United States Department of Labor in 1972 projected that by 1980 the labor force requirement for professionals would increase by 40 percent. This increase in professional organization members will require organizations to re-evaluate not only the traditional manager/subordinate relationship, but more fundamentally, the very structure of the organizations which will be employing these professionals. The directions in which organizations shift to accommodate these changes in the professionalization of society must adequately adapt to both capitalize upon the increased levels of skill possessed by these members, and the more complex demands which they will place upon the organization to satisfy their needs. In other words, increased professionalization is serving to provide individuals with a power base with which to deal with the organization. As individuals engage in conflict, it is useful for them to know what their power is in the relationship. Individuals who
perceive themselves to be professionals tend to perceive their power to be greater in their relationship with the organization. The trend towards professionalization will serve to afford low power individual organization members a vehicle through which he might gain more power so the conflict can be conducted on a more productive basis. However, unless organizations adapt to accommodate this increase in the individual's power base, the conflict will escalate in both severity and magnitude.

Richard Scott has distinguished three types of organizational bases for professional members. The first type is the "autonomous" professional organization, in which the work of the professional is subject to his own rather than to external or administrative jurisdiction. The professionals themselves are the major determiners of the organizational structure, since they are the dominant source of authority. The second type is the "heteronomous" professional organization in which the professional employees are subordinated to an externally derived system. In the heteronomous professional organization, the level of professional autonomy is correspondingly lessened in such a setting. The third organizational setting outlined by Scott is the "professional department" which is part of a larger organization. In this kind of situation, the professionals employed are part of a larger organization, and may or may not be able to affect the manner in which their own work is structured.7

Although the number of professional organization members is growing, the likelihood of all future organizations resembling
Scott's autonomous organization would seem to be less certain than the chances future organizations will correspond closer to the heteronomous organization, in which professional members enjoy autonomous activities within the parameters of the organization. Therefore, the conceptual gap between manager and subordinate will be narrowed as increased professionalization occurs, yet there will remain a need for managerial function. The manager within the increasingly professionally populated organization will be distinguishable from his professional peers in his talent for coordination and direction, yet that professional organization population will require a restructuring of the formal organization which was not conceived of nor designed to facilitate the activities of a professional work force. Perhaps the professionalization of the work force is but a natural progression of an evolutionary process of the organization of human activity, and the formally structured organization will now give way to a system which will better capitalize upon this societal change. The professionalization of organization members must precipitate a corresponding evolution of the organization within which these professionals function, for while the professional contributes more to the organization, he similarly demands more of the organization. The issue is whether or not the formally structured organization can balance the equation, for there seems to be no merit in placing talented individuals within a structure of organization not designed to respond to the abilities and needs of a professional membership. When it
is no longer feasible to distinguish the professional organization member from the average because the average member will be a professional, when managers cannot be chosen on the basis of a clear-cut distinction between his educational and professional expertise and that of his subordinate (since professional organization members possess new potential for increased autonomous activity), it will become mandatory for organizations to devise the means to adapt.

These adaptations should not be viewed in a sense of failure on the part of formal organization structure, for whatever the deficiencies of that system may be, without that foundation upon which to build, there could be no evolution of organization structure. To examine alternatives and the means by which to adapt organizations to meet the requirements for change, it is necessary to address the issue from both within the context of contemporary formal structure, and beyond that structure. Changes within the organization are geared to solving problems while essentially preserving the basic structure; changes of the formal structure obviously are dedicated to devise new structural systems which better suit both individual members and the organization's environment. Preceding the examination of these potentials for change, both within the system and of the system, an examination is made of the change process within the formally structured organization.
Changing the Formal Structure

As referred to earlier, bureaucratic organizations are created to handle routine tasks and to lend stability to relationships within the context of the completion of those tasks. Their efficiency as a means of organizing activities is in part due to this stability, which stems from the relatively high degree of structure that is imposed on communication patterns within the organization. This advantage obviously is best realized when the rate of change is slow. When the environment changes rapidly, causing a need for corresponding rapid change in the organization, the organization structure becomes so temporary that the efficiencies of bureaucracy cannot be achieved. However, change does occur quite frequently in almost every organization, even though at times it may seem that nothing is changing. Many organization scholars consider the change process to be one of the main functions in organizations, along with activities concerned with getting the work done (production) and maintenance. Because it is easier to be aware of what is stable about an organization, than of what is changing, the rate of change in an organization is usually underestimated. However, not all organizations are as receptive to change as others, and in view of the many negative interpretations of bureaucratic organizations, what changes do occur are not adequate. For example, one route presently used to change organizations is to reorganize an organization's subunits. This
type of change amounts to maintenance of the overall organization along with destruction of some or all of its subsystems. The reorganization approach to change is frequent in public organizations. Often it is done in a conscientious attempt to effect constructive change, yet too often it is done to give the appearance of change without really causing much real change:

"We tried hard--but it seemed that every time we were beginning to form up into effective teams, we would be reorganized... we tend to meet any new situation by reorganizing, and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency, and demoralization." 10

Boxes in the organization chart are shuffled and renamed, but the same individuals are usually retained in the organization, and the organization still fulfills about the same functions, and in approximately the same ways as before the reorganization. But reorganization does serve to highlight functions in a different way, and the reaction of the public to the reorganized structure is likely to be different. Thus, this type of change can be termed either illusory, in that nothing was really changed; or deceptive, in that the real reason for the reorganization was to create the public impression that real efforts to change the organizational system had been made; or palliative, in that the real problems stemming from the organization's formal structure were not dealt with, and the changes made dealt only with the symptoms of a serious illness that was not treated.
Another example of organizations seemingly avoiding changes of structure by concentrating on only treating symptoms of inherent structural defects is the vast amount of effort aimed at changing the individual within the existing organizational framework. One set of individuals may be removed from the organization and a different set of individuals employed, perhaps with different qualifications or attitudes than those of the members they replace. Yet, in either event, the organization structure is not directly altered, so the effect of the new training or new employees is usually offset by the unchanging formal structure. A common experience of organization members who are retrained is that when they return to their former positions within the organization, the effect of the training is shortlived because of the lack of corresponding change in the basic organizational structure which would be more compatible with those changes. The net result is usually little real change. Therefore, the majority of so-called changes in contemporary formally structured organizations would seem to be deficient as far as any real changes.

The changes which have been attempted have traditionally been directed at the individual member within the organization. For example, of 109 articles in sociological journals about organizational change, 84 were actually about changing individual attitudes or work behavior within organizations, not about changing the organizations themselves. This significant trend serves to
perhaps explain, in part, the widespread feelings of unrest and frustration within contemporary formally structured organizations. The individual who perceives himself as occupying a meaningless, faceless, self-defeating position within an organization has traditionally had his feelings of frustration and subsequent alienation answered by the organization's attempts to change the mind-sets of members. This persuasive campaign to change individual members' attitudes, and thereby ensure the continued contribution of members' activities, may now be proving to be inadequate as organizational members increasingly become more demanding in what they expect from the organization in return for their membership. The professionalization of organization members quite likely is requiring organizations to re-evaluate the inducements used to secure contributions of effort from individual members, and the environment within which those contributions will be made. Individuals have traditionally been adapting to changes instituted for them by the organization, and it has been in this sense most organizational change has occurred, and continues to occur. What this means is that the organization has traditionally attempted to deal with individuals' conflict within the organization structure through means designed to not change the power structure. The organization has effectively designed means by which the power ratio has remained essentially the same. Through the traditional reorganization methods referred to above, the organization has never relinquished power. Through its persuasive efforts geared
to change individual attitudes, the organization similarly has refused to increase the individual's power base. The reasons behind most of these changes having taken this individualistic direction perhaps stem from the obvious fact that the changes were sought to increase the productivity of the organization, and it was assumed that individual attitudes and behaviors were more manipulatable than organization structure. Individuals within the formally structured organization, in effect, have been blamed for organizational structural deficiencies, rather than the blame being placed upon that structure. So, organizations have induced individual contributions of effort through the use of a variety of incentives, and upon any failures of those incentives, organizations have geared their efforts toward the persuasion of the individual that his association with the organization is in his own best interest. Thus, the individual's attitudes have been the object for change in most instances, not the formal structure.

The organization has been saying to the individual: "There is no conflict here...the organization has high power in this situation and wants you to go away and pretend that you are not upset and that you were wrong for trying to stir things up."

The crucial questions must be: Can society continue to assume the costs (material and human) of a system of organization in which individuals must literally and figuratively be bribed into contributing their activities? Are not the rumblings of discontent from within formally structured organizations providing ample
evidence of the fundamental need for organizations of the present to begin to address the sources of distress, rather than continuing to direct efforts toward attitudinal changes of individual members to persuade them to remain with the organization? Will not these palliative efforts to treat an unhealthy system of organization inevitably result in disaster--just as a doctor's treatment of a seriously ill patient with placebos would inevitably result in dire consequences?

It is understandable that there has been a tendency to distinguish between changes within the formally structured organization system and changes of the system itself, since any system can evolve and improve only through changes which occur as a result of and in response to the changing needs of itself and its environment. However, what must now be examined is whether the formally structured organization may be at a stage of evolution which will necessitate a phasing out of some of the basic tenets of that system of organization. To determine that the formally structured organization is becoming obsolete is not to condemn that structure; rather it should be viewed as merely a recognition that societal changes have dictated an adaptation and new direction for the organization of human activities in a changing world. Many solutions to the problems of the formal organization have been and will continue to be offered within the context of that existing structure. Many solutions also are being offered which call for devising methods of organization beyond that existing
structure. It must be accepted that any change for the better, whether within the existing structure or through alternatives to that structure, is valuable. However, to become conceptually blinded by the precepts of formal organization to the point of becoming oblivious to any viable alternatives is dangerous; similarly, condemnations of the existing structure without provisions for viable alternatives which will preserve the positive aspects of that existing structure is also dangerous. Within the context of the formally structured organization many recommendations have been proffered to improve the system, and these recommendations are based on an acceptance of the fundamental principles of that system of organization. Any changes made are made within that basic framework. Conversely, in response to the criticisms outlined in Chapter II, many recommendations have also been proffered to improve the productivity of organizations and the satisfaction of members through changes of the basic formal organization system itself. These changes are based upon a belief that the present formal system has become obsolete and counterproductive, and will produce increasingly negative consequences if not replaced. It is these two contexts of organizational change which must be examined and interpreted—the changes which occur within the system, and those which are geared to change the system itself.
Changes Within the Formally Structured Organization

As referred to throughout Chapter II, the formal organization, in pursuit of its goals, seems to perform disservices to its members by stunting their psychological growth or by conditioning them into conformist or robot-like roles. In order for organizations to be consistent in providing some service or product, structure has been designed for continuity. This formal structure can become prey to rigor mortis (figuratively speaking), in which case the hierarchy becomes inflexible, concerns revolve increasingly around merely self-protection and survival, and the original purpose may become lost. When these happen, it can be said that the bureaucratic organization has "frozen".

Individual behaviors within the formal organization have traditionally been ordered because humans, under ordinary circumstances, have been viewed as responding capriciously to changing environmental forces, unless constrained by some external force (i.e. the bureaucratic organization). The formal organization was instituted, and is used, to impose some standardizing, stabilizing structure on that variable behavior. So a person within the organization performs much the same way from day to day. The freezing organization consists of individuals who lose interest in the end purpose of their organizational endeavors, as work becomes the result of the command to work rather than of personal motivation to work and participate. Additionally, increased specialization
is viewed in some sectors as creating narrow interests and jobs, with responsibilities becoming narrower in scope. Coordination becomes necessary to minimize the dangerous gaps that appear in the coverage of the total amount of organizational work to be done. Another indicator of the freezing process is the organizational members' movement from effective problem-solving behavior to merely a ritual performance of duties. Specialization and routinization of activities similarly can lead to loss of involvement and interest in the organizational membership, having removed the excitement and challenge of the unexpected from that membership. So, the formal organization is one in which the bureaucratic process effectively eliminates the individual from identification with the end product of the organization in many cases, as jobs are specialized and routinized in order to ensure maximum efficiency and predictability. This freezing process encompasses organization members throughout the hierarchy, and in public as well as private organizations.

Many recommendations to counter these alienating features have been made within the conceptual framework of the formally structured organization. For example, Norris Hansell suggests three strategies for fending off the formal organization freezing process:

"One strategy is the constant expectation that a person enlarge his role in the system by direct rotation of jobs, or changes in the location a job is performed, to keep him from forming arbitrary boundaries around his
concerns. The second strategy involves arranging the structure of small groups that work within the overall organization. Employee units are regrouped into small temporary group structures and assigned tasks that are not normally considered within their job scope. This is designed to allow a reorientation of the work group to the basic purpose of the organization. The third and final strategy is to design the culture of the bureaucracy in ways that make freezing less likely. Organization structure is designed to involve each individual in constant challenge and contribution to the overall organization, so as to form a tradition or organization-wide policy of redesigning structure and task toward that end.12

Through these processes, Hansell sees the potential negative effects that the formal organization has upon the individual effectively diminished.

Along those lines, over the past several decades, there has occurred a parade of organization development, personnel, and labor relations programs, that promised to revitalize organizations. For example, "job enrichment" was designed to provide more varied and challenging content in the individual's position with the organization. "Participative decision-making" was designed to enable the information, judgments, and concerns of organization members to influence the decisions that affect them. "Management by objectives" was instituted to enable all organization members to understand and shape the objectives toward which they strive, and against which they are evaluated as contributors to the goals of the organization. "Sensitivity training" or "encounter groups" are used to enable people to relate to each other as human beings, with feel-
ings and psychological needs, rather than as faceless, nameless
occupants of various organizational niches. "Productivity bar-
gaining" is used to revise rules and increase the organization's
flexibility with a quid pro quo, whereby the union ensures that
workers share the fruits of the resulting productivity increases.

These, and other, internal solutions to the formal organiza-
tion's problems seem to be based upon a fundamental acceptance
that formal organization structures are completely flexible, and
can learn to adapt themselves to any changes that might become nec-
essary. In actuality, and based upon the results of many of the
internal changes attempted and prescriptions offered, it seems as
though the barriers to any meaningful change within the formal
organization are very high. They include, in addition to the cal-
culated opposition of all who stand to lose by change, the inability
to change because of the mental blinders all of us wear, and sys-
tematic obstacles that most of those proposed changes never really
do surmount. Also, each of the preceding programs by itself is
an inadequate reform of the organization, and has typically failed
in its more limited objectives. This is not to denounce these
and other attempts at organizational change, for whatever the mo-
tivation behind them, or their end results, they represent natural
progressions in the evolution of the formally structured organiza-
tion. For example, the goals of sensitivity training or management
by objectives are not to be questioned for their sincerity in
attempts at improving the formal organization. However, the issue
at hand is whether or not the conceptual box (i.e. the bureaucratic organization) within which these conscientious (whether the motivation behind these innovations were organization-centered or individual-centered, they still represent conscientious attempts at improving the organizational system) efforts at reform were formed is becoming a time-worn remnant of the past, and grows incapable of coping with rapid societal change.

Therefore, it is in this sense of questioning the viability of that conceptual box that any internal changes should be evaluated; it then becomes a matter of overall system evaluation rather than the isolation of various, finely-defined reform efforts. There can be no constructive denial of the importance of these internal change attempts, for they represent remedial efforts within the organization; rather concentrated study must be directed towards the conceptual box within which these internal remedial efforts are made. Can these internal attempts at change be expected to remedy a system of organization in which introduced changes set in motion a series of reactions that dampen the extent and character of the changes? Granted, were it not for this, organizations would seemingly be so accommodating and adaptable that they could hardly be said to constitute stable formal structures at all. Yet, quite possibly, this built-in resistance to change within the formal organization may prove, and may have already proven, to prohibitively limit the degree to which any internal changes can actually improve upon the deficiencies of that basic structure.
Changes of the Formally Structured Organization

The conflict which occurs within formally structured organizations may be representative of an inherent inability to keep pace with the increasing rate of societal changes. Should this prove to be the case, the organizations of the future must adapt to societal changes from a new perspective, and effectively eliminate the destructive aspects of organizational conflict. It should be noted, however, that there is a positive side of conflict within any organization, and it is only destructive when it is viewed as a hindrance to the goals of the organization.

Lewis Coser, in a study of conflict, writes:

"...conflict tends to be dysfunctional for a social structure in which there is no, or insufficient, toleration and institutionalization of conflict. The intensity of a conflict which threatens to 'tear apart', which attacks the consensual basis of a social system, is related to the rigidity of the structure. What threatens the equilibrium of such a structure is not conflict as such, but the rigidity itself which permits hostilities to accumulate and to be channeled along one major line of cleavage when they break out in conflict."13

So, conflict may be essential to the maintenance and survival of any organizational structure. Katz and Kahn observe that organizations function through adjustments and compromises which occur among their competitive and conflicting elements.14 Therefore, conflict may well be an endemic part of the formal organization, some of which can be constructive as far as achievement of the organization's objectives are concerned. The cooperative effort
required to accomplish work within any organization may be fostered, as Coser suggests, by conflict and threats of conflict from the external environment. However, the situation may also be dysfunctional to the system and possibly threaten organizational survival if there is no effective institutional provision for flexible response.

The impact of conflict upon the alienating character of formal organization is apparent. Cooperative effort does not need to arise only in response to external threats to security and survival of the organization; yet formal organization structure appears to be a formidable barrier to the achievement of ideal cooperative possibilities. James Carrol takes to task these facets of the formal organization which do not relate to creative mental efforts, and he believes they will become increasingly dysfunctional to the conduct of satisfying, productive work and accomplishment. He concludes:

"Authority, the willingness and capacity of individuals to function in cooperative systems, needs to be reconstructed through open processes of inquiry and research, to direct constructively the growing tension between individual freedom and organizational order in a changing environment."^{15}

So here Carrol forges another important thrust toward loosening the iron grasp of formal organization on visions of the "ideal of organization". Administrative theorists seem to be edging up to a direct challenge of the precepts of the formally structured organization. More and more attention is being given to alter-
natives to the formally structured organization.

Viewing the organization not as monolithic but as flexible and open in its responses is an important step along the road to alternatives to the formal organization. James Thompson in *Organizations in Action* states:

"The organization must find and maintain a viable technology and it must have some capacity to satisfy demands of a task environment...these demands may be changing...a technology...effective yesterday may be inadequate today."

Morley Segal, building on the work of Thompson, focuses upon the relationship between the organization and the environment in which it functions. He has developed a typology of organization structures which may be used in response to a turbulent environment. The three typologies he presents are viewed as a "defense" of the organization against the vagaries and uncertainties of its environment. They are not fully alternative views of formal organization structure, yet they still serve primary organizational survival needs. Segal contends that organizations should center more attention on how their environmental setting links up with the internal structure of the organization, how organization decision-processes relate to the environment, and how organization boundaries with the environment are spanned. Segal suggests an organization's broader response to its environment is based upon its own selective perceptions, and that differing perceptions lead to variations in responses. He identifies three organization perceptions: chain
structured; mediatively structured; and adaptively structured.\textsuperscript{17}

**Chain Structured Organization in Response to Environment**

These organizations perceive their environment as static and homogeneous, and deal only with those isolated aspects of the environment which are directly related to its task. Thus, the responses are narrow and limited. The chain structured organization comes closest to the notion of a classical bureaucracy. The arrangement of organizational units precisely mirrors the way in which the organization can most efficiently operate. The organization structure often reflects the view that there is only one type of relationship between units, one legitimate flow of power, and that flow is identical to the direction of the arrangement of units. This point of view has naturally led to serious problems of job satisfaction. It is within this type of formal structure that organizations are finding it necessary to experiment with variations of the chain-linked structure, as referred to earlier. An assembly-line is the most dramatic example of the chain structured units, and here organizations are trying to find ways to maintain the basic chain-linked structure while allowing organization members to form teams organized around major functions. Because the sequential steps in a chain structured organization are so precisely ordered, the units can be managed on the basis of a standardized plan, so they can be managed on the basis of standardization. The support strategies for a chain structured organi-
zation are also relatively simple. Organizational units are arranged so as to screen out change and uncertainty in the environment, and the organization is characterized by a limited capacity for decentralization. Since organization units are supposedly arranged in the one and only way in which the organization can operate, decentralization is limited to very carefully defined functions. This means that any decentralized unit performing a function can have virtually no independent power or discretion. Variation resulting from such dispersed power would break the chains of organizational process. The chain structured organization is thus designed to accomplish a particular task with great efficiency but without the resources to easily change its structure in response to changes in the environment.

**Mediatively Structured Organization in Response to Environment**

The second of the types is designed to open its units to a wider range of phenomena than the singularly responsive organization, but the organization is still structured to channel external dissimilarities into uniform organization categories. The mediatively structured organization thus responds to its environment in terms of fixed roles and sets of behaviors. It responds to changes in the environment in the same way. Change is also comprehended in terms of fixed categories which respond to its existing structure. Because the mediative organization is structured to recognize some change in its environment, the relationship between
units is also structured to allow some degree of interaction. So, the environment is perceived as discrete, definable, and comprehensible, with understandable processes and units. The organization arranges itself so that it can respond and mediate between a world of diversity and uniform organization processes.

Adaptively Structured Organization in Response to Environment

The third type of organization responds to the full turbulence of its environment. Unlike the other two types of organizations above, the adaptive organization is not structured to screen out heterogeneity and uncertainty. This organization is designed to deal with problems of its environment and does not attempt to fit the problems into its own organization categories. This means that the units of such an organization are so flexibly structured that the organization is able to adapt and re-adapt its structure as part of its normal operation. Such an organization may be said to be fully responsive to its environment, for environmental change does not always take place in terms of fixed categories.

These three alternative organization perceptions which Segal identifies suggest that perhaps organizations of the future must resemble the adaptively structured model rather than the singularly responsive chain structured. The center of Segal's efforts is still the organization and its survival, yet his work suggests the development of organizations along non-hierarchical, non-formal lines.
Some scholars suggest that organizations be only "task" centered; the life of the organization should only be temporary and related to the fulfillment of its task, at which time it would be disbanded. Warren Bennis has observed:

"Formal organization is becoming less and less effective... hopelessly out of joint with contemporary realities, and... shapes, patterns, and mottos--currently recessive--are merging which promise drastic changes in the conduct of the organization and managerial practices in general. So, within the next 20-50 years, we should all be witness to, and participate in, the end of bureaucracy and the rise of new social systems better able to cope with the twentieth century demands."18

Bennis regards the decline of the formally structured organization as necessary to the accomplishment of social purpose. The traditional formal model of organization, with its narrow orientation toward human psychology and motivation, and its concern for routinization, specialization, and hierarchical structure has become rigid and unresponsive. In the thrust to define a more meaningful and more effective organizational context, the search for open models and experimental orientations toward organizations has occurred. Bennis predicts the emergence of temporary organizations which will accomplish these social needs.19 Alvin Toffler writes of the coming "adhocracy"20 as an alternative to the formally structured organization. He suggests as bureaucracy becomes more rigid, another future will emerge marked by the "breakdown of bureaucracy, not its triumph".21 He suggests we are witnessing a new form of organization which:
"...is increasing by challenges and ultimately will supplant bureaucracy. Hierarchy will collapse and the new organization will be temporary, fluid, and varied. A person's organizational ties will be mobile and alternating, turning over at rapid rates. Permanence, routine, and deadening ritual will be gone. Turbulence and change become the rule. In this setting, a new kind of 'organizational man' will emerge. One who, having no commitment to any organizational form, will be willing to use his or her skills and creative energy to solve problems with equipment provided by the organization, and within the temporary groups established by it. This the employee will do as long as he or she determines the time frame in which the work is done and as long as interest in the problem is maintained. More and more the worker will be primarily committed to his or her own fulfillment."

Obviously, there is and will continue to be a need for organizational efforts to perform on-going functions, yet non-formally structured organizations, primarily temporary, might well conduct their functions without the alienation so frequently marking formally structured organizations. Critics of that formal structure are saying that when organizational policy and service are delivered in an inhumane, undignified, denigrating way, the impact counteracts the desired results of the policy. They are contending that it is the nature of the formal organization to produce these negative results. They are saying that if formal structure receded or disappeared, organization would still remain, in a different context--more open, more adaptable to societal changes, yet capable of functioning efficiently.
Summary and Conclusions

In Chapter III an examination has been made of the solutions offered by organization theorists concerning the problems seen as inherent in formal organizations. These solutions are offered both within the conceptual framework of that structure, and beyond that structure, as there occur differing interpretations of the ability of formal organization structure to adapt to societal changes and needs. Opponents of the formally structured organization contend that the pace of societal change has served to render that structure obsolete. The fact that contemporary society is witnessing a sharp increase in the professionalization of its members would seem to accent the new demands upon organizational structure to capitalize upon the abilities, and satisfy the needs, of those professionals.

There exists a salient issue in contemporary society concerning the manner in which organizations of the future will adapt to change in society which someone like Max Weber could never have imagined. And the acknowledgment that Weber and other contributors to formal organization theory could not foresee such changes, represents a major step forward in the pursuit of a system of organization which will reflect such change. To see the need for change is not tantamount to an across-the-board rejection of the contributions that formal organization has made and obviously still makes to society. Rather, the ability to sense the need to strive
to move ahead, to evolve, to envision more from society, to see potential for better ways, these are not rejections of the past, but extensions of that past to capitalize upon what was learned and apply it to new demands and challenges.

So, there are conflicting interpretations of the ways in which organizations should change to meet future challenges. Some believe the organization can and should adapt to societal change, within the basic formal structure. Others believe that structure to be ill-equipped to adapt to changes within contemporary society, to say nothing of the challenges of the future. One comforting fact is that the search for the means by which to adapt organizations to those future challenges, whether within the context of formal structure or beyond that structure, is being conducted. Deficiencies have been diagnosed, and prescriptions are being made, and while the challenges are still ahead it would seem through these conflicting interpretations of the demands of the future, the basic foundation is being laid upon which organizations will be adapted to a rapidly changing world. Chapter IV addresses the vital role communication must play in the adaptation of future organizations to the societal changes discussed above, and those yet to occur. Only through communication will those adaptations be possible.
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CHAPTER IV

ADAPTATION THROUGH COMMUNICATION

Introduction

In the first three chapters, material has been presented concerning formal organization structure. Chapter I provided an outline representative of the considerable amount of research conducted to isolate variables that contribute to successful managerial behavior. Chapter II discusses the formally structured organization within which both manager and subordinate must function, and the problems which that structure has encountered and is encountering. Chapter III examines remedies which have been offered by students of organization theory to combat those deficiencies. Chapter IV now discusses the implications for students of communication of the material presented in the three preceding chapters.

Demands and Responsibilities

Time has not stood still for the bureaucratic organization, and that formal organization structure quite obviously is experiencing symptoms of its age. Yet, most contemporary organizations have bureaucratic structures. Organizations continue to seek means by which to screen talented individuals with which to populate
that formal structure, and the stigma attached to the concept of bureaucracy thrives and grows. Perhaps the future of organization requires not less of the type of study which has been conducted in the past, but rather a redirection and greater synthesis of that study. There is nothing erroneous in organizational attempts to determine which individuals will contribute most effectively; however, the error lies in the organization's apparent inability to perceive the paradox in recruiting talented individuals who often become stifled in a time-worn structure of organization. Similarly organizations must accept the societal trend of increasing professionalization of the work force as being indicative of a fundamental need for organizations to adapt to the changes of society. The stability inherent in formally structured organizations need not be sacrificed in such evolutionary processes, just as that formal structure must not necessarily preempt needed changes.

While the formally structured organization is not completely unresponsive to change, there remains the question of whether or not that system is inherently capable of coping with societal changes that could not be foreseen when this system of organization originated. Society has made obvious transitions since Max Weber wrote of the ideal organization (i.e. the bureaucratic organization), and the formally structured organization has experienced constant change processes. Yet the negative connotation of the term "bureaucracy", both in public and private sectors, continues to grow. This perhaps reflects a basic inability of formal organi-
zation structure to keep apace with those societal changes.

This is not reflective of any inherent "evil" of formal organization structure; rather it is reflective of an institution devised in a past period which perhaps cannot effectively adapt to a changing world. We must continue to place the right individuals in the correct positions which will capitalize upon their abilities; however, we must seek to create new systems for organizing human efforts which will no longer represent counterproductive and stifling relationships to those individuals. We must continue to organize human contributions of effort, lest we choose to sacrifice much that we have accomplished through such organization. However, we must seek to create new responses to organizational problems and strive to avoid the ease with which the stability of existing formal structures can cause complacency to accept the status quo, and avoid exploration of new organizational frontiers.

The role communication will play in those organizational frontiers will be an indispensable role. Throughout the first three chapters material has been presented concerning the stabilities and deficiencies of formal organization structure. The intent has been to draw attention to the very real need for organizations to adapt to changes which have occurred in society, and have tended to render aspects of formal organization structure as perhaps outdated. The vital role communication currently plays in contemporary organizations is obvious. Most of one's daily life is spent in organizations. We live in an organized society, and it is commu-
Communication that gives life to an organizational structure. Chester Barhard recognized that "in any exhaustive theory of organization communication would occupy a central place, because the structure, extensiveness and scope of organizations are almost entirely determined by communication technique."\(^1\) Katz and Kahn note that "communication is...a social process of broadest relevance in the functioning of any group, organization or society...it is the very essence of a social system or an organization."\(^2\) Herbert Simon probably stated it most conclusively: "The question to be asked of any administrative process is: How does it influence the decisions of the individual? Without communication, the answer must be: it does not influence them at all."\(^3\) There can be no overemphasis in stressing the vital importance of communication in the facilitating of organizational processes. Communication is the "life-blood" of an organization; if somehow communication flows could be removed from an organization, there would be no organization. Communication pervades all aspects of organization. It is a tool through which individuals cooperate to achieve their goals.

In this sense, communication must always be viewed as an invaluable commodity within any organization, and regardless of the fate of the formally structured organization, communication will continue to be indispensable. Communication will be the means through which organizations adapt to the changes of society.

The preceding chapters have addressed the two ways in which changes in organizational structure can be approached: (1) changing
the individual within the structure; and (2) changing the structure itself. These two approaches were examined and critiqued. The fundamental issue at hand is the power structure within the formally structured organization. The power structure must shift favorably in the direction of the individual, for such a shift will benefit both organization and individual. Communication will be the facilitator for this shift.

Communication will facilitate the solution to the problems of formal organization structure from two directions: (1) Communication emphasis will aid the individual within the contemporary organization as that structure begins to adapt to the societal pressures cited throughout this paper. Training individuals in conflict management skills or other communication behaviors will serve to invaluably equip the individual with the means by which he or she can effectively cope with the inadequacies of that system. (2) Communication obviously will be indispensable in future organization structures which will be less precisely structured, and therefore, much more dependent upon smooth and ready flows of information.

Obviously, equipping the individual with communication behaviors geared to aid him in dealing with the pressures of formal organization structure represents no panacea for the ills of that structure. However, the employment of effective communication behaviors for dealing with organizational pressures can effectively aid the individual in avoiding any further increases in alienation.
In short, through new communication skills, it may be possible to provide the individual with the means to deal with any organizational structure. Through new skills with which to deal with organizational pressures, the individual has tools of more power.

Power is essentially what is lacking as far as the individual within the formal organization is concerned, regardless of his organizational niche. As power structures are at the heart of any analysis of conflict situations, it is necessary to assess the power base of the individual within the formal organization. As shown in the preceding chapters, the individual is bargaining with the organization from a position of weakness.

There must occur a "balance of situational power" between the organization and the individual. Providing the individual with new communication and conflict skills with which to deal with the present imbalance is the first step towards that goal of a situational balance of power. It has been shown that the formal organization is experiencing serious problems stemming from that imbalance of power. That imbalance has been termed an inherent weakness of formal organization structure. Providing the individual with skills to cope with that imbalance more effectively is essential to not only the individual but to the organization in its attempts to adapt to those pressures.

The challenge exists to reconcile the stability of the formally structured organization to the demands of the future. It cannot be a sudden transition, nor can it be exceedingly slow.
Yet, while the transition occurs, new communication skills designed to equip individuals with the means to cope within the formally structured organization are essential.

The world presents more variables than ever before and with so much complexity we can hardly know what to expect next, let alone predict it or bring it about. Yet organizations must adapt to that complex, everchanging world. The formal organization originated to the demands of society; it will sufficiently adapt to societal changes or it will be replaced in response to future societal demands. The growing complexities of contemporary society forecast a future which will demand nothing less from organizations.

Communication will be the means through which organizations adapt to meet those pressures. The thesis of this paper, i.e. that formal organization structure, is incapable of fully realizing the potential of individual members and is seriously in need of renovation, accents the role which communication must play in the adaptation of formal structure to those pressures. The formally structured organization eventually must be altered to sufficiently cope with the complexities of society, and the complex needs of individual members. There can be no place for conceptual boxes in which the possibilities for change are restricted or ignored. Communication must be the cement which holds together the less rigidly structured organization, and which productively reconciles individual needs with organizational goals. Just as communication is invaluable in the contemporary organization, it must become the
very essence of organization as organization structure makes the mandatory adaptations for the future.

Summary and Conclusions

There obviously is no ideal, specific formula for solving the problems of the formally structured organization. While there are many "solutions" proffered by various students of organization bent on curing the bureaucratic illness through radical survey, the barriers to successful implementation of any such extreme measures are strong and firmly entrenched. To be sure, any person who has thoughtfully attempted to formulate viable, practical alternatives to formally structured organizations has inevitably realized the very real limitations involved. For this reason, the concluding comments of this paper must acknowledge those immense difficulties.

Students of organizational dynamics must continue to search for solutions to the problems of contemporary organizations, yet it is of obvious import that those solutions are viable and practical. For no matter how attractive descriptions of organizational utopias may be, without the means to accomplish the changes in the "real world", those descriptions must remain only dreams. There are no pat answers, no cure-alls, no panaceas. The difficulties in formulating alternatives to formal organization structure must be recognized. However, the fact that the difficulties involved in designing viable alternatives to formally structured organizations are tremen-
dous, need not prohibit the improvement of that structure. While radical surgery may be out of the question in a practical sense, thoughtful and insightful treatment of the bureaucratic organization may preempt the need for that radical surgery. With the proper treatment, the patient may recover without such extreme measures.
Footnotes


5. Ibid., pp. 97-101.
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Pamphlets


Articles


