

ENVIRONMENTAL TURBULENCE IN HUMAN SERVICES ADMINISTRATION:

A CONDITIONAL INTERPRETATION OF THE BUREAUCRATIZATION-

WORK ALIENATION HYPOTHESIS

by

JIMMY DALE CASE, B.A., M.A.

A DISSERTATION

IN

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved

August, 1984

175
801
T3
1984
No. 31
CC-2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to Professor Nelson Demetrius for his willingness to step into this research project and provide the direction and stability necessary for its completion. I am also indebted to Beverly Case without whose help and support this project would have been impossible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
I. BUREAUCRACY AND WORK ALIENATION IN TURBULENT TIMES	1
Notes	7
II. ALIENATION IN THE BUREAUCRATIC SETTING	9
Work Alienation Conceptualized	9
Bureaucratization Conceptualized	11
Bureaucratization and Work Alienation:	16
Empirical Findings	
Bureaucratization and Work Alienation:	28
A Second Look	
Chapter Summary	34
Notes	36
III. STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES AND METHODOLOGY	41
Stating the Hypotheses	41
Collecting Data	44
Variable Definitions	59
Techniques of Analysis	71
Chapter Summary	74
Notes	76
IV. FINDINGS	78
Bureaucratization and Work Alienation	78
The Turbulence-Alienation Connection	84
Control and Work Alienation	91
Alienation in Conditions of High Turbulence	100
Chapter Summary	101
V. A DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS: A CONDITIONAL INTERPRETATION	109
OF THE BUREAUCRATIZATION-WORK ALIENATION RELATIONSHIP	
Alienation in High-Turbulence Settings	111
Alienation in Low-Turbulence Settings	123
Patterns of Work Alienation in Texas Human Services	128
Programs	

Chapter Summary	146
VI. CONCLUSIONS	150
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	160
APPENDICES	
A. Listing of Cities From Which Responses Were Received	171
B. Survey Participants by Planning Region	172
C. Educational Background of Survey Participants.	174
D. Income of Survey Participants	175
E. Survey Participants By Agency Type	176
F. Survey Participants By Population of City	177
G. Ethnicity of Survey Respondents	178
H. Survey Participants By Agency Level	179
I. Agency Career Anticipation Among Survey Participants	180
J. Public/Government Career Expectation Among Survey Participants Who Do Not Anticipate a Career in Their Respective Agencies	181
K. Job Descriptions of Survey Participants	182
L. Sex of Survey Participants	183
M. Cover Letter to Survey Participants	184
N. Reminder to Return Survey	185
O. Questionnaire to Survey Participants	186

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Regional and Local Agencies Participating in Survey . . .	47
Table 2	Distribution of Survey Respondents by Agency Type	53
Table 3	Distribution of Survey Respondents by Geographical Regions in Texas . . .	54
Table 4	Distribution Measures for Research Variables	57
Table 5	Distribution Measures for Bureaucratization and Alienation Measures in High- And Low-Turbulence Groups	58
Table 6	Correlation Coefficients: Work Alienation With Measures of Bureaucratization (Zero-Order Partial)	80
Table 7	Comparison of Correlation Coefficients Between Aiken and Hage Study and Texas Human Services Study . .	81
Table 8	Correlation Coefficients Among Bureaucratization Measures	83
Table 9	Coefficients of Partial Correlations Indicating Relative Importance of Bureaucratization Measures in Accounting for Alienation	85
Table 10	Correlation Coefficients: Work Alienation With Measures of Environmental Turbulence	87
Table 11	Correlation Coefficients Among Turbulence Measures . . .	88
Table 12	Coefficients of Partial Correlations Indicating Relative Importance of Turbulence Measures in Accounting for Alienation	90
Table 13	Correlation Coefficients Between Control and Work Alienation, Bureaucratization, and Environmental Turbulence (Zero-Order)	92
Table 14	Coefficients of Partial Correlations Indicating Importance of Bureaucratization Measures in Accounting for Control	94

Table 15	Coefficients of Partial Correlations Indicating	95
	Importance of Turbulence Measures in Accounting for Control	
Table 16	Zero-Order and Partial Correlations Controlling for . . .	97
	Control Between Work Alienation and Bureaucrati- zation and Environmental Turbulence	
Table 17	Stepwise Regression of Work Alienation With Bureau- . . .	101
	cratization and Turbulence Measures in Low-Turbu- lence Environments	
Table 18	Stepwise Regression of Work Alienation With Bureau- . . .	102
	cratization and Turbulence Measures in High-Turbu- lence Environments	
Table 19	Percentages of Variance in Work Alienation Attributed . .	103
	to Bureaucratization in Low- And High-Turbulence Environments	
Table 20	Correlation Coefficients Between Work Alienation and . .	105
	Bureaucratization in High- And Low-Turbulence Environments	
Table 21	Zero-Order Correlations Between Work Alienation and . . .	112
	Bureaucratization and Turbulence in High- And Low- Turbulence Settings	
Table 22	Partial Correlation Coefficients Between Turbulence . . .	113
	Measures and Work Alienation in High- And Low- Turbulence Settings (Controlling for Other Turbulence Measures)	
Table 23	Zero-Order Correlations Between Control and Bureau- . . .	117
	cratization and Turbulence in High- And Low- Turbulence Settings	
Table 24	Partial Correlation Coefficients Between Bureau-	120
	cratization Measures and Work Alienation in High- And Low-Turbulence Settings (Controlling for Other Bureaucratization Measures)	
Table 25	Mean Scores on Work Alienation, Bureaucratization, . . .	130
	Turbulence, and Organizational Control Measures By Agency Level	
Table 26	Mean Scores on Work Alienation, Bureaucratization, . . .	133
	Turbulence, and Organizational Control Measures By Agency Type	

Table 27	Mean Scores on Work Alienation, Bureaucratization, Turbulence, and Organizational Control Measures By Agency Career Plans	. . . 140
Table 28	Mean Scores on Work Alienation, Bureaucratization, Turbulence, and Organizational Control Measures By Public Sector Career Plans of Respondents Planning To Leave Current Agency	. . . 142
Table 29	Mean Scores on Work Alienation, Bureaucratization, Turbulence, and Organizational Control Measures By Ethnic Background	. . . 143
Table 30	Mean Scores on Work Alienation, Bureaucratization, Turbulence, and Organizational Control Measures By Sex	. . . 145

CHAPTER I

BUREAUCRACY AND WORK ALIENATION IN TURBULENT TIMES

Among the prevalent themes in the study of twentieth century politics has been the relationship between alienation and bureaucracy. The bureaucratic revolution which has transpired this century has set Robert Merton's "bureaucratic personality"¹ in a broader bureaucratic, or administrative state, itself existing in an administrative age; we have, in the words of Henry Jacoby, witnessed the "bureaucratization of the world."² And although the image of an earlier, less bureaucratic era is appealing, projections into the future yield little indication of a significantly less bureaucratic order. Whether the envisioned social order is termed technetronic,³ post-mass consumption,⁴ post-maturity,⁵ post-capitalist,⁶ post-industrial,⁷ post-collectivist,⁸ service,⁹ programmed,¹⁰ post-modern,¹¹ or, most graphically, post-civilized,¹² bureaucratic structure is an inescapable part of the projected future.

These broad visions of the future have been substantiated by our own recent experience with growing governmental bureaus. On the eve of World War II, for example, there were seven federal employees for every 1,000 inhabitants of the United States; by 1975 the ratio had climbed to 14.8 per 1,000 inhabitants. An even more remarkable growth has been experienced by state and local governments. State and local governments employed 2.6 million people in 1933, and by the early 1970's the number

had risen to 10.5 million. By the early 1970's, one out of every six gainfully employed Americans worked for federal, state, or local agencies.¹³

Concomitantly, those attitudes and behaviors associated with bureaucratic structure have taken on a greater importance, particularly those attitudes and behaviors which are alienative. Victor Thompson, for example, in discussing bureaucracy writes of bureaupathology, bureaupaths, and bureaus, ¹⁴ while Michel Crozier describes the bureaucratic phenomenon in terms of vicious circles which would generate alienation.¹⁵ Bertram Gross links bureaucracy and alienation in his discussion of "friendly fascism," developing a picture of a managed society ruled by "a faceless and widely dispersed complex of warfare-welfare-industrial-communications-police bureaucracies" existing in a "culture of alienation."¹⁶ As Hans Freyer has observed, "Man is overwhelmed by the machine . . . [A]n entire preconceived . . . system of alienation is connected with it."¹⁷ The machine he cites is bureaucracy.

The comprehensiveness of the alienation is evident; it extends to the keeper as well as the kept. Certainly the client dependent upon the public organization is vulnerable before the machine. As one disenchanting client observed, "Being on the client side . . . makes one weary, angry, and disillusioned with the federal bureaucracy":¹⁸ the client sees himself as a victim. Additionally, workers within the bureaucracy often perceive themselves as victims. A frustrated agency representative, speaking of her own experiences, complained that

... the bureaucratic process placed a great gap between the social worker and the client There were too many regulations and forms that got in the way of what I considered to be a good relationship based on needs and feelings.¹⁹

The labor of this human services worker had been so limited by bureaucratic structure that its intrinsic meaning was lost for her, and in that lies a paradox.

By design the bureaucratic properties of centralization, formalization, and specialization are employed to increase the efficiency of the organization; they serve to rationalize its collective activity. Yet those same properties repeatedly have been associated with the level of alienation experienced by the worker as well as behaviors inhibiting the operation of the organization. So frequently is this bureaucracy-work alienation theme encountered that it appears to have become an incontestable tenet in the theory of organizational behavior: the greater the degree of bureaucratization, the greater the degree of work alienation. Bureaucracy strips the worker of control over work processes, an action which leads to a loss of intrinsic meaning or pride in work.

To redress the situation of low worker control and high alienation, according to the end-of-bureaucracy and contingency theorists, the organization must be willing to restructure the organization formally. Increasing rates of social change, they argue, make bureaucratic (mechanistic) structures obsolete and will give rise to flat, flexible, and adaptable (organic) organizations.²⁰ Resorting to organic rather than mechanistic structures would seemingly provide a solution to the work alienation problem by increasing the worker's control over his labor.

Inherent in this argument is the recognition that the turbulence which the worker encounters also contributes to the development of organizational alienation. The simple bivariate relationship between bureaucratization and alienation which dominates the relevant research

is inadequate in its explanation of worker alienation because the impact of environmental variables, particularly environmental turbulence, upon the bureaucratization-work alienation relationship is neglected.

Although bureaucracy cannot be discounted as a factor contributing to the presence of work alienation, neither can turbulence itself, for as the turbulence increases and results in a loss of control over work, it becomes an increasingly significant factor contributing to the development of work alienation. Phillip Hunsaker, William Mudgett, and Bayard Wynne, in discussing the need for developing managers skilled in negotiating environmental turbulence, observe that,

With the increase in societal turbulence and change, it is clear that the psychological and physical health of individuals and organizations will become increasingly important if productivity and satisfaction are to remain at reasonable levels.²¹

There is even evidence that, in highly turbulent situations, the worker may resort to increased bureaucratization to negotiate the uncertainty associated with the change inherent in turbulence. Alvin Gouldner in Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy, for example, chronicles the use of increased bureaucratization to reassert control over the uncertainties of administrative change.²²

The question, then, is one of the interrelationships existing among work alienation, bureaucratization, and environmental turbulence. Does environmental turbulence affect the work alienation-bureaucracy relationship, and, if so, how? By going beyond the existing bivariate analyses and considering the role which environmental factors have in the development of work alienation, the relationship between bureaucracy and work alienation can be better understood. In exploring the relationships which exist among bureaucratization, work alienation, and environmental turbulence, three sets of hypotheses are tested.

In the first set, the relationships between work alienation and four dimensions of environmental turbulence are considered. The four dimensions of environmental turbulence are turbulence in the extra-organizational administrative environment, turbulence in the intra-organizational administrative environment, turbulence in the policy environment (substantive policy content), and the comparative rate of turbulence which the worker perceives when contrasting his work environment to that of workers in other agencies.

The second set of hypotheses tests the "control" premise upon which the work alienation-bureaucratization relationship is based. As well as hypothesizing that control is related to work alienation, three dimensions of bureaucracy (centralization, formalization, and specialization) and the four dimensions of environmental turbulence are hypothesized to be significantly related to control.

The third set of hypotheses tests projected "conditional" relationships between bureaucratization and work alienation. When accounting for the variance in work alienation, the bureaucratization measures are expected to explain a greater percentage of the variance than will the turbulence measures when conditions of low-level turbulence exist. In conditions of high-level turbulence, the turbulence measures are expected to account for more of the variance in the alienation measure than will the bureaucratization measures. Also, using the bureaucracy-as-a-defense justification, in conditions of high-level turbulence, the degree of bureaucratization is expected to be inversely related to work alienation.

In testing the hypotheses, data collected from 607 human services workers throughout Texas are used. The sample includes human services

professionals in the Texas Department of Human Resources, the Texas Employment Commission, the Texas Rehabilitation Commission, regional mental health programs, regional legal services agencies, alcoholism and drug abuse councils, and community action agencies.

Management in both the private and public sectors has faced increasingly turbulent environments during the 1980's, and if, as Peter Drucker forecasts, we are facing a future of continued turbulence, an increased understanding of turbulence's impact upon organizational structures, attitudes, and behaviors is relevant.²³ In testing the three sets of hypotheses, an increased understanding of the consequences of turbulence upon bureaucratic organizations should result, an understanding beneficial to academic and practitioner alike. The end-of-bureaucracy thesis notwithstanding, in the public sector bureaucracy endures as the organizational form utilized in administering government services, and increased insight into its functioning provides the basis for improved management.

J. D. Williams has observed that "structure makes a difference in administration, just as the way a house is planned affects the quality of life of its occupants."²⁴ The quality of life frequently experienced by the occupants of bureaucratic organizations is one of alienation from those activities which comprise their labor. In order to understand the behavior of the inhabitants of bureaucratic organization, one needs to know not only the structure of the domicile but also the structure of the environment which assails that bureaucratic house as well. Those structures are defined next.

Notes

¹Robert K. Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," in Reader in Bureaucracy, eds. Robert K. Merton, Alisa P. Gray, Barbara Hockey, Hanan C. Selvin (New York: The Free Press, 1952), pp. 361-372.

²Henry Jacoby, The Bureaucratization of the World, trans. Eveline Kanes (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1976).

³Zbigniew K. Brzezinski, Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era (New York: Viking Press, 1970).

⁴Herman Kahn and Anthony J. Weiner, Beyond The Year Two Thousand (New York: Macmillan, 1976).

⁵W. W. Rostow, Stages of Economic Growth (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1971).

⁶Ralf Dahrendorf, Class Conflict in Industrial Society (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1959).

⁷Daniel Bell, The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture In Social Forecasting (New York: Basic Books, 1973), p. x.

⁸Samuel Beer, British Politics In The Collectivist Age (New York: Random House, 1969).

⁹Bertram Gross, "Planning In An Era of Social Revolution," Public Administration Review, 31, no. 3 (May/June, 1971), pp. 259-294.

¹⁰Alain Touraine, Post Industrial Society, trans. Leonard Mayhew (New York: Random House, 1969).

¹¹Amitai Etzioni, The Active Society (New York: The Free Press, 1968).

¹²Gross, p. 271.

¹³Carl E. Lutrin and Allen K. Settle, American Public Administration: Concepts and Cases (Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1980), p. 3.

¹⁴Victor Thompson, Modern Organization (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961).

- ✓ 15 Michel Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964).
- 16 Bertram Gross, "Friendly Fascism: A Model For America," Social Policy (November/December, 1970), p. 46.
- 17 Jacoby, p. 179.
- 18 Susan Duyer, "The Bureaucratic Beast," Newsweek (Letters) 42, no. 13 (September, 1978), p. 8.
- 19 Ralph P. Hummel, The Bureaucratic Experience (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977), p. 24.
- 20 Warren Bennis, "Organizations of the Future," Personnel Administration 30, no. 5 (September-October, 1967, pp. 6-19 and Tom Burns and G. M. Stalker The Management of Innovation (London: Tavistock Publications, 1961).
- 21 Phillip Hunsaker, William Mudgett, and Bayard Wynne, "Assessing and Developing Administration for Turbulent Environments," Administration and Society 7, no. 3 (November, 1975). p. 318.
- 22 Alvin W. Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954).
- 23 Peter F. Drucker, Managing in Turbulent Times (New York: Harper and Row, 1980).
- 24 J. D. Williams, Public Administration: The People's Business (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1980), p. 62.

CHAPTER II

ALIENATION IN THE BUREAUCRATIC SETTING

Although the bureaucratization of the twentieth century world has resulted in an abundance of scholarship inquiring into the relationship between bureaucracy and alienation, a standardization of concepts has not emerged from those efforts. One requirement in studying "alienation" and "bureaucratization," therefore, must be the selection of definitions appropriate to the research task.

Work Alienation Conceptualized

Alienation, like the term "bureaucracy," has suffered in definitional precision not because it has no meaning, but because of the diversity of its meanings. For example, work alienation is not the conceptual equivalent of job dissatisfaction nor the conceptual reverse of job satisfaction. Work is but one aspect of a job. The concept of "job" also includes wages, social relationships with co-workers, specific employers, and life styles associated with the job. Ada W. Finifter observes that

The concept of alienation from work... focuses on the individual's relation to the work process and on the satisfactions and dissatisfactions provided by the work itself

. . . [T]he concept 'alienation from work' is used primarily in reference to the intrinsic rewards of work, while the concept of 'job satisfaction' is frequently used to refer to both the intrinsic rewards and also the extrinsic benefits that are not integral parts of a man's relationship to his work.¹

As to what alienation is, Melvin Seeman, in his frequently cited study on the meaning of alienation, identifies five "variants" of alienation: senses of powerlessness, meaninglessness, isolation, normlessness, and self-estrangement.² For Seeman, work alienation falls under the rubric of self-estrangement.

To be self alienated... means to be something less than what one might ideally be if circumstances in society were otherwise...[w]hat has been called self-estrangement refers essentially to the inability of the individual to find self rewarding ...activities that engage him.³

Accordingly, to be alienated from work, in the sense of self-estrangement, is to be unable to find self-reward in one's work; it is to experience a loss of intrinsic meaning or pride in work.⁴

Robert Blauner, in his study of alienation and freedom among blue collar workers, also views work alienation in terms of self-estrangement. Blauner writes that

...when the worker lacks freedom and control (powerless), when his role is so specialized that he becomes a 'cog' in the organization [meaninglessness], and when he is isolated from a community or network of personal relations at work [isolation], the result is that the worker's activity becomes only a means rather than a self-fulfilling end [self-estrangement].⁵

Central to both Seeman's and Blauner's views of work alienation is the concept of "control." The intrinsic meaning of work, as well as pride in work, is dependent upon the worker's ability to exact from the work role what the worker has determined to be rightfully his in the work situation.⁶

Control, that is, "the ability to promote one's own desired objectives, or alternately, the power to resist undesirable ones,"⁷ is inextricably a part of exacting from the work role what the worker feels he has a right to have. John Clark, for example, observes that an isolable feature of all expressions of alienation is one's feeling of a

lack of means to realize the situation which one feels should exist; that is to say, alienation is born in one's lack of control over a situation.

The concept of control is apparent in Clark's writings as he notes that

Those who feel they do not belong would cause themselves to belong if they could, those who feel manipulated would cease to be so, those socially or self-isolated would not be so if they were in a position to change circumstances -- provided that they have decided that their roles rightfully should be different.

To the extent that organizational structure results in a loss of control over work for the worker, it contributes to the development of work alienation.

Bureaucratization Conceptualized

The organizational structure considered here is bureaucracy. The concept of "bureaucratization" is definitionally complex because it is dependent upon the concept on bureaucracy, a term which, like alienation, has been used to describe more than one organizational arrangement. Illustrative of this point is the introductory discussion on bureaucracy in Michel Crozier's Bureaucratic Phenomenon in which he identifies three usages of the concept: (1) bureaucracy as government by bureaus; (2) bureaucracy as the rationalization of collective activity (Max Weber's Ideal Type); and (3) bureaucracy as dysfunctional organization.⁹

Bureaucratization in the first definition would suggest the proliferation of government by bureaus as is evident in Henry Jacoby's Bureaucratization of the World.¹⁰ In the second usage, bureaucratization would suggest the increased adherence of an agency to the

organizational properties associated with Max Weber's Ideal Type of Bureaucracy. Bureaucratization in the third usage suggests the processes endemic in the transformation from a healthy organization, an organization effectively meeting its goals, to a maladapted organization, one which has experienced goal displacement, as is described in the work of Alaine Touraine¹¹, Antoinette Catrice-Lorey,¹² and Victor Thompson.¹³

It is the second usage of bureaucracy/bureaucratization which is employed in this research. Still, additional clarification is required. As Richard Hall comments, "There has been an unfortunate lack of sophistication in the use of the bureaucratic concept."¹⁴ This lack of sophistication is evident when bureaucracy is used to describe a single bureaucratic type as if an organization were either bureaucratic or not.

Max Weber, the father of the Ideal Type of Bureaucracy, defined the concept through the discussion of the various dimensions of an organization. Those dimensions include division of labor, hierarchy of authority, the use of an extensive network of rules, as well as recruitment and promotion on a merit basis and career tenure. Rather than questioning whether an organization is bureaucratic or not, Weber's dimensional approach encourages questioning the degree to which these properties exist in the agency. For example, in the Aston studies, which concentrated on the structure of fifty-two work organizations in the English Midlands, D. S. Pugh and his associates concluded that "the concept of a single bureaucratic type is no longer useful, since bureaucracy takes different forms in different settings."¹⁵ Alvin Gouldner uses the following analogy to develop the imagery of bureaucracy as a variable type of organization:

Not every formal association will possess all of the characteristics incorporated into the ideal type bureaucracy. The ideal type may be used as a yardstick enabling us to determine in which particular respect an organization is bureaucratized. The ideal type of bureaucracy may be used as a twelve inch ruler is employed. We would not expect, for example, that all objects measured by the ruler would be exactly twelve inches--some would be more and some would be less.¹⁶

And Richard Hall, in concluding from his research that bureaucracy is a matter of degree rather than kind, observed that

the configurational nature of the degree to which the dimensions (of bureaucracy) are present suggests that organizations are indeed composed of the commonly ascribed dimensions, but these dimensions are not necessarily present to the same degree in actual organizations . . . [T]he bureaucratic dimensions existed independently in the form of continua.¹⁷

Bureaucracy, therefore, may be conceptualized as a variable type of organizational structure characterized by division of labor, a hierarchy of authority, impersonal rules, and selection and promotion for employment based upon technical competence with each property existing independently in the form of continua. The degree of bureaucratization may then be understood as the degree to which an organization has developed one or more of the dimensions of bureaucracy. Accordingly, "a highly bureaucratized organization would be characterized by an intricate division of labor; a multi-level, closely followed hierarchical structure; [and/or] extensive rules governing on-the-job behavior"¹⁸

This dimensional approach is particularly useful because the dimensions can be fairly well specified and thus, operationalized. In exploring bureaucracy (and its association with alienation), scholars regularly focus on three major dimensions: the degree of centralization evident in the hierarchy, the degree of formalization, and the degree of specialization.

The degree of centralization in an organization is a reflection of the distribution of the decision-making privileges throughout the hierarchy. Therefore, the degree of centralization characteristic of the hierarchy, explain Michael Aiken and Jerald Hage, is "the degree to which members participate in decision-making."¹⁹ Richard Hall, whose work Aiken and Hage employed, has explained this dimension of bureaucracy as "the extent which the locus of decision-making is prestructured by the organization."²⁰

Formalization refers to the degree to which behavior is predetermined by rules. By formalization, Aiken and Hage mean "The degree of work standardization and the amount of deviation that is allowed from standards."²¹ In formulating this definition, Aiken and Hage focused upon the degree to which job incumbents must consult rules in fulfilling professional responsibilities and the degree to which employees are observed for rule violations.²² The Aiken and Hage study is consistent with the research of Pugh, et al.,²³ as well as with Hall²⁴ in the conceptualization of this dimension of bureaucracy.

The third dimension, the degree of specialization, refers to structuring the scope of the work task. "Specialization," writes Pugh, "is concerned with the division of labor within the organization, the distribution of official duties among a number of positions."²⁵ Similarly Hall defines the division of labor as "the extent to which work tasks are subdivided by functional specialization decided by the organization,"²⁶ a subdivision which, Victor Thompson comments, moves in the "direction of the ever more specific, the narrowing of activities to simple repetitive routines."²⁷ Specialization, or division of

labor, in this sense would be analogous to Aiken and Hage's concept of routinization of technology."²⁸

Bureaucracy as a Control Structure

The preponderance of research relating each of these bureaucratic properties to work alienation is consistent with viewing control as an intermediate factor. This is unsurprising in part because of the nature of organization. Arnold Tannenbaum observes that control is "an essential and universal aspect of organizations; . . . organization implies control."²⁹ In reality, Tannenbaum continues, organizations are composed of inter-relationships structured into "unit cycles of control." These control cycles, which begin with an interest or objective on the part of a person or group and lead to an influence-attempt addressed to another person or group, who respond either by fulfilling to a greater or lesser extent the intention of the original party, or causing the original intention to be modified by a refusal to modify behavior, are the basic units of organizational life.³⁰

Centralization, formalization, and specialization, the three dimensions of bureaucracy which formally pattern human interaction within an organization, are each associated with setting the parameters of legitimate behavior for the organizational member--the consequence of each dimension ostensibly being the limitation of the assertion of self into the work processes. Thompson captures this logic well as he notes that, "Being a cog in such machinery [bureaucracy], the individual has lost much of the control over his own destiny. Many people have a feeling of powerlessness, of alienation, and they respond with various kinds of behavior."³¹ Since a lack of control produces alienation, the bureaucratization-work alienation connection is evident.

Bureaucratization and Work Alienation:
Empirical Findings

Empirically Thompson's observation is well-documented. There exists in the literature an abundance of evidence confirming the positive relationship between the three previously cited dimensions of bureaucracy and work alienation. In each study, the dimensions of bureaucracy served as an impediment to the worker's control over his work, and, in each case, the degree of bureaucratization was concluded to be significantly related to the presence of work alienation.

Centralization and Work Alienation

The importance of this concept to work alienation is that centralization reflects the extent to which the worker may be instrumental in making work-related decisions. When the worker is denied the prerogatives of decision-making, which are needed for effective participation in the organization, the resultant lack of control fosters alienation from work.

Empirically, the above premise is sound. Aiken and Hage have identified two important dimensions of centralization:

... First, organizations vary in the extent to which members are assigned tasks and then provided the freedom to implement them without interruption from superiors; we call this the degree of hierarchy of authority. A second, and equally important aspect of the distribution of power is the degree to which staff members participate in setting the goals and policies of the entire organization; we call this the degree of participation in decision-making.³²

Both dimensions of centralization identified by Aiken and Hage refer to decision-making. Hierarchy of authority, as used by Aiken and Hage, focuses on decision-making in task implementation, while the degree of

participation in decision-making focuses upon the organization as a whole.

Both aspects of centralization have been found to be significantly related to the presence of work alienation. The degree of hierarchy and worker alienation were significantly related with a correlation coefficient of 0.49.³³ The lack of participation in agency decision-making was "strongly related to alienation from work ($r = -0.59$)."³⁴ From their findings Aiken and Hage concluded that "organizations that rely heavily on hierarchical arrangement are likely to be characterized by . . . work alienation,"³⁵ and that "alienation [from work] is higher in those organizations in which staff members have a small voice in agency-wide decision."³⁶

Other studies which use the individual worker as the unit of analysis confirm the conclusions of the Aiken and Hage study. In a study of management trainees, Bruce Allen and William La Follette also found alienation from work to be directly related to hierarchy of authority. Excessive control by supervisors over the manner in which workers accomplished assigned tasks contributed to job disappointment.³⁷ In both the Aiken and Hage and Allen and La Follette studies, the degree of centralization was conducive to the development of work alienation.

Leonard Pearlin and George Miller in their respective studies observed the same alienative consequences following denial of decision-making participation. Pearlin discovered that alienation from work was greatest among nurses who were simply told what to do and was least among nurses to whom the required activity was explained. Without the explanation, the directive was an instrument of control: a unilateral

limitation of the nurse's administration of her duties. Pearlin states that ". . . when it is explained why something is required, the subordinate tends to become more of a partner to the action."³⁸

Miller also takes note of the alienating potential in unilateral relationships characteristic of some leadership styles. By using leadership style, Miller tapped another measure of centralization. In his study of an aerospace company, Miller observes the variation in leadership styles which can characterize an organization. Industrial engineers working for "Directive" supervisors were characterized by higher levels of alienation than those serving under more participation-oriented superiors. "Directive" supervisors were, by definition, those superordinates who preferred only infrequent interaction with the engineers and who preferred to make decisions unilaterally.³⁹ In both Pearlin and Miller's work, insulation from decision-making and, therefore, the lack of participation, were associated with the presence of alienation.

Leonard Pearlin and George Miller's works exemplify Jon Miller's view of alienation as an "interactional" variable, one which reflects the extent to which individuals are isolated from certain critical networks of influence.⁴⁰ Unlike the previous studies J. Miller's work explores the nonsubjective meaning of alienation by studying sociometric relationships rather than subjective feelings. Miller identified certain groups (those with low formal education, low formal status, low professional rank, and females) as particularly isolated from those with formal decision-making authority.

Although Miller does not discuss work alienation, he does address alienation from authority, itself a measure of centralization. Miller sees alienation as existing when the member of an organization is sociometrically isolated from a number of categories, two of which are related to centralization: (1) isolation from persons in positions of official authority and (2) isolation from those seen by respondents as influential in the actual structure of decision-making in the organization. In each of these situations the worker's control would be minimized not only by his lacking sufficient decision-making authority but also by his not having easy access to those who do.

Summary

Researchers have consistently found centralization to be significantly related to work alienation. Aiken and Hage, as well as Allen and LaFollette, found that those workers who were denied participation in agency-wide policy-making also expressed higher levels of alienation. The level of task-oriented discretionary decision-making authority was also significantly related to the level of work alienation; clearly, those workers who were denied the prerogatives of making their own decisions concerning task implementation expressed higher levels of alienation than did their fellow workers who exercised discretionary authority.

In both Pearlin and G. Miller's research, the association between low levels of decision-making and high levels of work alienation was evident. Unilateral decision-making by superordinates and "directive" leadership styles were both conducive to the development of work alienation. In all of the studies cited, those workers who are most highly alienated conform to J. Miller's view of alienation as isolation

from decision makers. The more highly centralized the organization, the higher the levels of alienation which may be expected.

Formalization and Work Alienation

When a high degree of centralization in an agency is accompanied by a high degree of formalization, the likelihood of alienation from work seems even more probable. The degree of formalization in an agency promotes alienation by limiting the worker's discretion in the execution of work. Whereas centralization denies the worker control over decisions yet to be made, formalization denies control by pre-establishing decisions. The degree of formalization, therefore, promotes alienation from work by limiting the worker's options in the execution of his work.

In the Aiken and Hage study of welfare workers, the relationship between formalization and work alienation becomes more evident. Aiken and Hage hypothesized that "the degree of alienation from work . . . will vary concomitantly with the degree of formalization of an organization."⁴¹ After exploring the interrelationship between formalization and alienation from work in various welfare organizations, these authors concluded that ". . . there is great dissatisfaction with work in those organizations in which jobs are rigidly structured" and that "organizations in which rules are strictly enforced have high degrees of work alienation."⁴²

Allen and La Follette confirmed Aiken and Hage's conclusions. In their study of management trainees, they concluded that job codification was directly related to alienation from work. A situation in which a preponderance of rules governed work activities was ostensibly an

additional factor which engendered a greater level of alienation from work among management trainees.⁴³

Barbara Kirsch and Joseph Lengermann, in their powerlessness scale, measured a dimension (lack of ability to choose techniques and make work decisions) which closely resembles the Aiken and Hage concept of formalization. Kirsch and Lengermann found that white-collar workers who felt that they must follow rules and regulations in work decisions were more highly alienated than those workers who felt less necessity to follow rules and regulations. Also, workers who felt that they must refer decisions to supervisors, must follow procedures they would not otherwise choose, and must refer problems to superiors were more likely as well to be alienated from their work.⁴⁴

Michel Crozier presents the ultimate scenario in the development of formalization. In The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, Crozier shows that the degree of the "development of impersonal rules" (formalization) may disempower superordinate as well as subordinate.

The daily behavior of everyone, as well as his chances of having to perform a different routine later, can be predicted exactly. In such a system, as we have established, hierarchical dependence relationships tend to disappear or at least to decline considerably. If no difference can be introduced in the treatment given to subordinates, either in the present definition of the job or in the fulfilment of their career expectations, hierarchical superiors cannot keep power over them. Superiors' roles will be limited to controlling the application of rules. As a counterpart, subordinates also have at their disposal no possibility of pressure, no bargaining power over supervisors, inasmuch as their own behavior is entirely set by rules.⁴⁵

Continuing, Crozier relates this advanced degree of formalization to the displacement of goals which would promote feelings of meaninglessness by isolating the worker from the organization.

Peter Blau observed a more unusual manner in which alienation and the degree of formalization may be related. Welfare workers, Blau observed, were expected to work within the bounds of so many regulations that

. . . it was impossible in a few days or weeks to learn to understand, let alone administer, the many rules and regulations that governed operators. . . . Newcomers who were unable or unwilling to master the pertinent regulations and perform their duties in accordance with them either found their jobs so unsatisfactory that they soon left or, more rarely, performed their tasks so poorly that they did not survive the probationary period.⁴⁶

The proliferation of rules in Blau's study served to reduce the worker's effectiveness as a welfare worker by diverting the worker from the provision of the service to the mastery of rules, a subtle confirmation of Crozier's warning of goal displacement.

Conversely, the salutary effect of low-level formalization is evident in the study by Eric Poole, et al., of cynicism, work alienation, and professionalization in police departments. They found that autonomy reduced the cynicism and work alienation in large departments. In large departments, organizational effectiveness requires greater coordination. Consequently, employees must work within a more formalized operation where rights and duties are spelled out in detail.⁴⁷

Summary

In each of the studies cited in this section, formalization operated as a barrier to self-expression in work. Aiken and Hage, as well as Allen and LaFollette, found work alienation to be significantly related to formalization. Kirsch and Lengermann observed a similar development of work alienation among white collar employees who felt that they must follow rules and regulations in work decisions.

Crozier's, Blau's, and Poole's works are consistent with the other scholars cited. Each supports the hypothesis that as the level of formalization increases, the level of work alienation will increase.

Specialization and Work Alienation

Whereas the degree of centralization and the degree of formalization are clearly related to the worker's exercise of control over his work, the relationships between specialization and control can be less evident. The centralization and formalization discussions primarily focused on the loss of control through feelings of powerlessness. The degree of specialization in one's work, on the other hand, is frequently associated with the theme of meaninglessness--a loss of control through a loss of meaning.

Blauner's research of blue collar industrial workers in Alienation and Freedom and the replication of Blauner's work in a white-collar setting by Kirsch and Lengermann confirm the significant relationship between work alienation and specialization. In both analyses specialization promoted meaninglessness, which was associated with the development of alienation from work.

Meaninglessness was also particularly important in Alan Brill's study of systems analysts. Brill observed that the systems analyst, because of his isolation in the organization, was particularly alienated as a result of the division of labor. Brill's solution was to broaden the systems analyst's exposure to other personnel. He also suggests that "We could reduce the present alienation by permitting a flow of personnel into and out of the systems department."⁴⁸ The strategy Brill developed increases the meaningfulness of the systems analyst's

job by presenting him with a fuller understanding of other positions in the organization and the analyst's interface with them.

Although control and meaninglessness are not the major focus in the research just cited, it is possible to infer from the work of Blauner, Kirsch and Lengermann, and Brill that meaninglessness contributes to the worker's loss of control over his work. If the specialization is meaningless, the worker is less likely to understand the functioning of the organization at large. Consequently, he will be less effective in asserting his interests in organization decisions which may have particularly important consequences for his work.

The alienating consequences of a high degree of task specialization are also evident in Jon Shepard's study of automation and alienation. Shepard concluded that alienation in jobs that were not highly specialized (craftsmen and monitors) was lower than in highly-specialized jobs performed by automobile workers. Similarly, office-workers (computer operators and software personnel) were generally less alienated than office machine operators and nonmechanized clerks. Shepard clearly associated the micro-division of labor with the presence of work alienation and concluded that the reduction of alienation was to be found in the enlargement of the task. As he states, "The reduction of job specialization . . . appears to exercise salutary effects on work attitudes."⁴⁹

Like Shepard, J. Frank Jones prescribes a remedy for work alienation that also requires decreasing the degree of specialization in the organization. Jones, in his development of a calculus expressing the relationships between division of labor, worker alienation, and productivity, states that

The impact of the results of this model on the production process is clear. Managers who are trying to maximize only productivity may find it self-serving to reduce specialization, hence reducing alienation.⁵⁰

Jones advises managers to reduce specialization to an even greater degree when attempting to reach objectives which may be alienative in nature, e.g., collective bargaining.⁵¹ Shepard agrees when he contends that automation reverses the historical trend toward increased alienation from work among factory workers because automation results in job enlargement. That enlargement requires less task uniformity.

According to Shepard,

Continuous process technology may provide factory workers with jobs characterized by more freedom, control, meaning, and self-involvement than some, extrapolating from the experience of mass-production mechanization, have predicted.⁵²

Management therefore has an opportunity to decrease work alienation by decreasing specialization.

The professions are particularly vulnerable to the alienative consequences of specialization. Peter Blau, et al., has noted that the professional encounters different management problems because, for the professional, ". . . tasks are not as fragmented (as in routinized differentiation), and because professionals are qualified to assume wider responsibilities. . . ." ⁵³ If the professional is in a position where the division of labor is not conducive to the fulfillment of his professionally-related expectations, it is reasonable to expect that he may be particularly vulnerable to feelings of powerlessness or meaninglessness.

Richard Hall's findings are consistent with this expectation. Hall examined the dimension of professionalism designated "professional organizational reference," i.e., the use of the professional (versus

bureaucratic) organization as a major reference. He found a stronger negative relationship existing between professionalism and division of labor than between professionalism and the hierarchy of authority.

According to Hall,

If a division of labor is very intense, it may force a professional person away from his broader professional ties. This interpretation recognizes specialization within the professions, but the question here is the level of organizationally based division of labor. At the same time, strong professional identification may impede intensive specialization on the part of organizations.⁵⁴

Hall also observed a strong negative relationship between professionalism (feeling of autonomy) and division of labor. Accordingly, Hall continues, "this suggests that increased bureaucratization threatens professional autonomy. It is in these relationships that a potential source of conflict between the professional and the organization can be found."⁵⁵ The division of labor may promote the interests of the professional, or it may frustrate him by limiting acceptable professional behavior which the organization does not accept as appropriate to the organizationally defined specialization.

Summary

Both the professional and non-professional want sufficient latitude in their work to assure the fulfillment of their occupational goals and objectives. If the worker hasn't sufficient latitude to reach his work objectives, he is more likely to become alienated from his work. Blauner, Kirsch and Lengeremann, Blau, and Hall all support this position in their research. Accordingly, Shepard and Jones argue that job enlargement works to reduce work alienation. The findings cited here all indicate that the greater the degree of task specialization, the greater the degree of work alienation which can be expected.

Control As A Common Denominator

Although these bureaucratization-work alienation studies vary in their methodologies and research emphases, the concept of control is common to each. In centralization, the worker is granted or denied access to organizational decision-making processes and to decision makers. In each study, the highly centralized organization was associated with more intensely alienated personnel than were the less centralized agencies; a denial of control for the worker was apparent in the development of alienation from work.

As with centralization, formalization served as a barrier to the worker's control over his labor. As Hall noted, formalization--the proliferation and enforcement of agency rules or regulations--reflects the degree to which the behavior of the organization's members are subject to organizational control.⁵⁶ In highly formalized organizations, the lack of control over work appeared to foster alienation from work by limiting the options which a worker might employ in his tasks.

In specialization, the worker encounters the structuring of the scope of his work activity. Control can be viewed throughout the discussion of specialization and work alienation. Both the professional and non-professional workers are concerned with securing sufficient latitude in the scope of their labor to assure the fulfillment of work goals and objectives. If the worker hasn't sufficient latitude to accomplish his work, he is likely to feel powerless to reach his work objective, and/or he may feel that his work has no meaning. Both feelings will work against his sense of control. Job enlargement, in contrast, is found to increase both a sense of meaning and power and, consequently, of control.

Bureaucratization and Work Alienation:
A Second Look

The bureaucratization-work alienation hypotheses have become an integral part of organizational theory. It is generally conceded that the degree of centralization, the degree of formalization, and the degree of specialization "...are necessary for the effective organization of services," but they "simultaneously generate contradictions and conflicts for organizational actors."⁵⁷ The argument is that in highly bureaucratized organizations the worker's control over his work will be limited to such an extent that it will have little, if any, intrinsic meaning, or he will experience no pride in his work.

Control has been the central concept in explaining the relationship between work alienation and bureaucratization. However, a challenge to the generally accepted interpretation of the work alienation-bureaucratization relationship is also found in the emphasis upon control. There is reason to suspect that in some circumstances the worker may look to bureaucratic structure for a source of control. Particularly, workers may resort to bureaucratic structure as they try to deal with environmental turbulence in carrying out their tasks.

Environmental Turbulence
Conceptualized

In surveying the research which discusses environmental turbulence, one characteristic is salient--the rate of change. Turbulence is more than just change; it is also the rate at which the change is occurring. The result of the rapid change is frequently projected to be disorder. Pradip Khandwalla observes that the "rapid change" in a worker's environment can lead the worker to perceive the environment as

turbulent.⁵⁸ According to Khandwalla, for example, a worker encounters environmental turbulence when he encounters an environment which is dynamic, expanding, and fluctuating.⁵⁹

The rate of change focus is also evident in Phillip Hunsaker's view that turbulent situations are those which are "constantly changing," change resulting in increased uncertainty and ambiguity for the worker.⁶⁰ The importance of change is evident elsewhere. F. E. Emery and E. L. Trist, in their work on the causal texture of environment, write of the significance of "radical environmental changes" in developing the "relevant uncertainty" of an organization,⁶¹ and Louis Gawthrop notes that "[a]s the environment changes fundamentally, decision-making strategy for public and private organizations becomes engulfed in increasing uncertainty."⁶² And Peter Drucker simply states that turbulence, by definition, is irregular, non-linear, and erratic: all descriptive of change occurring in the environment.⁶³

The degree of environmental turbulence in the task environment, therefore, may be conceptualized as the rate of change characterizing the task environment; it is a variable which ranges all the way from complete stability to total instability.⁶⁴

Environmental Turbulence and Work Alienation

The climate of instability associated with high levels of environmental turbulence fosters conditions conducive to the development of work alienation. It does so by increasing the uncertainty, and, therefore, reducing the worker's control over his labor. Howard Aldrich, in discussing environmental turbulence, writes:

Increasing interconnection leads to externally induced changes in the nature of environmental selection criteria produced by forces that are obscure to administrators and therefore difficult to predict or plan for.⁶⁵

Emotionally the turbulence can be demanding upon the worker.

Louis Gawthrop observed that turbulent environments are emotionally-charged, high-intensity environments built upon resentment, frustration, and anger, and are generally not conducive to the formation of compromise proposals for conflict resolution.⁶⁶ Phillip Hunsaker associates high levels of turbulence in the worker's task environment with stress reactions and then links this stress-produced anxiety to lower productivity as well as the presence of job dissatisfaction.⁶⁷ Similarly Stanley E. Weed and Terence R. Mitchell note that "some of the most important factors that have been suggested to influence an individual's job satisfaction and job performance are the uncertainties about the surrounding environment and the uncertainties about the consequences of his behavior."⁶⁸

Because uncertainty in the environment and, concomitantly, lower levels of control over the environment have been significantly related to job dissatisfaction, the relationship between bureaucratic structure and work alienation is problematic. In ignoring the relationship between work alienation and environmental variables, the student of work alienation may be overlooking a primary source of lack of control for the worker.

Bureaucracy as a Control Structure over Environmental Turbulence

Bureaucratic structure may not invariably be the source of the lack of control. Dwight Waldo, for example, notes that in the presence of turbulence neither centralization nor decentralization is either right or wrong; "The arduous task, the urgent necessity, is to find the particular combination that will 'work' for our time."⁶⁹ The implication in Waldo's statement is that there may be times when bureaucratic structure is appropriate to the management of turbulence. Bureaucratic structure would therefore be useful in establishing control over the work processes.

Although the worker's responses to the increased turbulence in his task environment may vary, one response is strict adherence to the structural characteristics of bureaucracy. There is evidence that various dimensions of bureaucracy may be employed by the worker to establish control over aspects of his work environment which are threatening or stress-inducing to him. As Whittington states:

One characteristic found in mechanistic organizations which may help to limit stress is the setting of boundaries of responsibilities. It can be very consoling to be able to pass a problem on to someone with 'the responsibility' for dealing with it. Even where boundaries exist for reasons quite independent of a member's possible psychological needs, their removal, if they have been effective in reducing stress, may not be welcomed by him. Indeed, Burns and Stalker found that while the absence of clarity, definition and boundaries significantly increased the effectiveness of the management in conditions of unpredictability and change, this happened 'at the cost of personal satisfaction and adjustment.'⁷⁰

Rivka Bar-Yosef and W. O. Schild also note the supportive role bureaucratic structure may play in assisting the worker in a turbulent environment. They observe that

[t]he client is expected to accept the authority of the organization as legitimate and to conform in his dealings with officials to certain norms of interaction. In particular, he is supposed to acknowledge that the line-bureaucrat is restricted by the organization in his freedom to concede requests and demands. If so the pressures which the client will exert on the bureaucrat will be restrained.⁷¹

In apparent agreement, Thomas C. Schelling, in The Strategy of Conflict, advises that if one party in a bargaining situation is committed to a stand which is recognized by the second party, the second party will not engage in threats.⁷² "The bureaucratic regulations serve as such 'commitment' for the line bureaucrat."⁷³

Alvin Gouldner reported such use of rules in his study of managerial succession in an industrial bureaucracy. "By a strange paradox," Gouldner states, "formal rules gave supervisors something with which they could 'bargain' in order to secure informal cooperation from workers. The rules were the 'chips' with which the company staked the supervisors and which they could use to play the game; they carved out a 'right' which, should supervisors wish to, they could stand upon."⁷⁴ Through stricter enforcement of the rules, the new manager in Gouldner's study was able to reduce tensions of the organization as a whole, but particularly for himself. Although stricter adherence to the rules did not remove the tensions which led the worker to challenge management's legitimacy, it did reduce the challenge.

While Gouldner's study focused on processes within the organization, his observations may be extended to parts of the task environment, particularly clients. Orion White, for example, in his presentation of the dialectical organization as an alternative to bureaucracy, contends that

The whole tenor of the interaction [with the organization] is set, in the first place, by the fact that the client is viewed as a subordinate to the bureaucrat. The hierarchical pattern of authority in which the bureaucrat functions simply extended to the client relation.⁷⁵

Just as Gouldner's new manager employed the bureaucratic structure to manage the turbulence in his new work situation, the worker who encounters turbulence in the task environment may resort to "increased bureaucratization" through stricter adherence to formal dimensions of the organizations. Organizational structure may effectively be used to avoid the consequences of turbulence from both extra- and intraorganizational forces.

Blau's study of welfare workers gives evidence of the welfare worker's foregoing the exercise of discretion and resorting to the rules when relations with the client are uncertain. Blau states: "[a]nother finding indicates a similar decrease in rigid compliance with official procedures with increasing experience."⁷⁶ This is similar to Gouldner's report of managerial succession, in which the new manager fell back on rules to manage the uncertainty in his environment. Consistent with Gouldner and Blau, James Thompson argues that "individuals exercise discretion whenever they believe it is to their advantage to do so and seek to evade discretion on other occasions."⁷⁷ Thompson goes on to state that "when the individual believes that his cause/effect resources are inadequate to the uncertainty, he will seek to evade discretion."⁷⁸

Aldrich, in discussing centralization versus decentralization, presents his readers with an empirical generalization that summarizes much of what the literature reflects:

Administrators seek to maintain an orderly reliable pattern of resource flow as free from uncertainty as is organizationally and technologically possible. The drive toward reducing uncertainty often takes the form of standardizing transactions to make them more predictable and manageable.

Centralization, specialization, and formalization, as the literature has shown, provide the opportunity to standardize transactions with groups in the environment. Clearly, workers in highly turbulent environments—environments characterized by a high degree of change for the worker as well as a resulting loss of control—may seek to maintain their positions or expand their control over the environment by resorting to increased bureaucratization. As Walter Nord observes,

. . . Moreover, bureaucratic structure and routine jobs have not been rendered obsolete by turbulent environments, as many thought they would be. Consumer demands . . . force organizations to establish routine operations and to buffer them from sources of uncertainty

In fact, rather than discourage routinization many current environmental pressures actually foster it.⁸⁰

Chapter Summary

Alienation and bureaucracy are two concepts which have received considerable attention in lay and academic writings. As a result there exists considerable diversity in the use of the concepts. Bureaucracy is used in this research to refer to a variable type of organizational structure characterized by hierarchy (centralization), division of labor (specialization), and impersonal rules (formalization), each dimension existing independently in the form of continua. Work alienation refers to the loss of intrinsic meaning or pride in work. The preponderance of research indicates that as organizations become increasingly centralized, formulized, or specialized, the organizational members are more likely to become alienated from their work. The rationale for the

development of alienation lies in the loss of control over work which is experienced.

On the other hand, the concept of environmental turbulence, i.e., rapid change in the environment, calls the bureaucratization-work alienation relationship into question. Research also suggests that environmental turbulence and its resultant demands upon the worker reduce the worker's control over his labor. In those situations of increasing turbulence, the worker, in fact, may turn to the bureaucratic structure to manage the consequences of the turbulence.

Notes

¹Ada M. Finifter, Alienation and the Social System, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972), p. 108.

²Melvin Seeman, "On The Meaning Of Alienation," American Sociological Review 24 (December 1959), p. 790.

³Seeman, p. 790.

⁴Seeman, p. 790.

⁵Robert Blauner, Alienation And Freedom, (Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 33.

⁶John P. Clark, "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System," American Sociological Review 24 (December 1959), p. 849.

⁷Robin Smith, "The Maximazation Of Control In Industrial Relations Systems," in The Control Of Work, eds. John Purcell and Robin Smith (London: The Macmillan Press, 1979), p. 5.

⁸Clark, p. 849.

⁹Michel Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 3-4.

¹⁰Henry Jacoby, The Bureaucratization Of The World, trans. Eveline Kaner (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1976).

¹¹Alain Touraine, The Post Industrial Society (New York: Random House, 1971).

¹²Antoinette Catrice-Lorey, "Social Security And Its Relations With Beneficiaries: The Problem of Bureaucracy In Social Administration," in Bureaucracy And The Public, eds. Elihu Katz and Brenda Danet (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973), pp. 245-256.

¹³Victor Thompson, Modern Organization (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961).

¹⁴Richard H. Hall, "The Concept Of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment," American Journal Of Sociology 69, no. 1 (July 1963), p. 32.

- ¹⁵D. S. Pugh et. al., "An Empirical Taxonomy of Structures of Work Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly 14 (1969), p. 115.
- ¹⁶Hall, p. 33.
- ¹⁷Hall, pp. 38-39.
- ¹⁸Hall, pp. 33-34.
- ¹⁹Michael Aiken and Jerald Hage, "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis," The American Sociological Review 31 (August 1966), p. 497.
- ²⁰Richard H. Hall, "Professionalization and Bureaucratization," American Sociological Review 31 (February 1968), p. 95.
- ²¹Aiken and Hage, p. 499.
- ²²Aiken and Hage, p. 502.
- ²³D. S. Pugh, et. al., "Dimensions Of Organizational Structure," Administrative Science Quarterly 13 (1968), pp. 72-73.
- ²⁴Hall, "Professionalization and Bureaucratization," p. 95.
- ²⁵Pugh, "Dimensions Of Organizational Structure," pp. 72-73.
- ²⁶Hall, "Professionalization and Bureaucratization," p. 95.
- ²⁷V. Thompson, p. 26.
- ²⁸Jerald Hage and Michael Aiken, "Routine Technology, Structure, and Organizational Goals," in Human Service Organizations, eds., Yeheskel Hasenfeld and Richard A. English (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1974), pp. 301-302.
- ²⁹Arnold S. Tannenbaum, Control In Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), p. 3.
- ³⁰Tannenbaum, p. 5.
- ³¹V. Thompson, p. 4.
- ³²Aiken and Hage, p. 503.
- ³³Aiken and Hage, p. 503.
- ³⁴Aiken and Hage, p. 503.
- ³⁵Aiken and Hage, p. 503.
- ³⁶Aiken and Hage, p. 503.

³⁷ Bruce H. Allen and William R. La Follette, "Perceived Organizational Structures And Alienation Among Management Trainees," Academy Of Management Journal 20, no. 2 (June 1977), p. 337.

³⁸ Leonard I. Pearlin, "Alienation From Work; A Study Of Nursing Personnel," In Alienation and The Social System, ed., Ada W. Finifter (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972), p. 143.

³⁹ George A. Miller, "Professionals in Bureaucracy: Alienation Among Industrial Scientists and Engineers," American Sociological Review 32, (October 1967), p. 763.

⁴⁰ Jon Miller, "Isolation In Organizations: Alienation From Authority, Control, and Expressive Relations," Administrative Science Quarterly 20 (June 1975), p. 261.

⁴¹ Aiken and Hage, p. 503.

⁴² Aiken and Hage, p. 503.

⁴³ Allen and LaFollette, p. 337.

⁴⁴ Barbara A. Kirsch and Joseph J. Lengermann, "An Empirical Test Of Robert Blauner's Ideas On Alienation In Work As Applied To Different Type Jobs In A White Collar Setting," Sociology And Social Research: An International Journal 56, no. 2 (January 1972), pp. 180-193.

⁴⁵ Crozier, pp. 188-189.

⁴⁶ Peter M. Blau, "Orientation Towards Clients in a Public Welfare Agency," Administrative Science Quarterly, 5 (1960), pp. 345-346.

⁴⁷ Eric D. Poole, et al. "Linkages Between Professionalism, Work Alienation and Cynicism in Large and Small Police Departments," Social Science Quarterly no. 3 (December 1978), p. 532.

⁴⁸ Alan E. Brill, "The Alienation Of The Systems Analyst," Journal Of Systems Management 25, no. 1 (January 1974), pp. 29-30.

⁴⁹ Jon M. Shepard, Automation And Alienation (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1971), p. 116.

⁵⁰ J. Frank Jones, "The Division Of American Labor Is Limited By The Extent Of Worker Alienation," The American Economist 19, no. 1 (Spring 1975), p. 19.

⁵¹ Jones, p. 19.

⁵² Shepard, p. 117.

⁵³ Peter M. Blau, Wolf B. Heydebrand, and Robert E. Stauffer, "The Structure Of Small Bureaucracies," American Sociological Review 31, no. 2 (April 1966), p. 187.

- ⁵⁴Hall, "Professionalization and Bureaucratization," p. 102.
- ⁵⁵Hall, "Professionalization and Bureaucratization," p. 102.
- ⁵⁶Hall, "Professionalization and Bureaucratization," p. 95.
- ⁵⁷George Brager and Stephen Holloway, Changing Human Service Organizations (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1978), p. 11.
- ⁵⁸Pradip N. Khandwalla, The Design Of Organizations (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1977), p. 334.
- ⁵⁹Khandwalla, p. 333.
- ⁶⁰Phillip Hunsaker, "Effects of Differences in Incongruity Adaptation Levels and Environmental Turbulence on Successful Completion and Leadership Effectiveness in Officer Candidate School," Proceedings, 81st Annual Convention of The American Psychological Association, 1973; p. 739.
- ⁶¹F. E. Emery and E. L. Trist, "The Causal Texture Of Organizational Environment," Human Relations 18, no. 1 (February, 1965), pp. 21-31.
- ⁶²Louis C. Gawthrop, Administrative Politics And Social Change (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1971), pp. 87-88.
- ⁶³Peter F. Drucker, Managing In Turbulent Times (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1980), p. 2.
- ⁶⁴Khandwalla, p. 333.
- ⁶⁵Howard Aldrich, Organizations And Environments (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979), p. 69.
- ⁶⁶Gawthrop, p. 54.
- ⁶⁷Phillip L. Hunsaker, William C. Mudgett, and Bayard E. Wynne, "Assessing and Developing Administrators For Turbulent Environments," Administration and Society 7, No. 3 (November 1975), pp. 312-325.
- ⁶⁸Stanley E. Weed and Terence R. Mitchell, "The Role Of Uncertainty As A Mediator of Situation-Performance Relationships," Academy of Management Journal 23, no. 1 (1980), pp. 38-60.
- ⁶⁹Dwight Waldo, "Some Thoughts on Alternatives, Dilemmas, and Paradoxes in a Time of Turbulence" in Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, ed., Dwight Waldo (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971), p. 260.

⁷⁰Colin Whittington, "Organizational Research and Social Work: Issues In Application Illustrated From the Case of Organic and Mechanistic Systems of Management," in Social Administration, ed., Simon Slavin (New York: Haworth Press, 1978), p. 86.

⁷¹Riva Bar-Yosef and E. O. Schild, "Pressures and Defences in Bureaucratic Roles, " American Journal of Sociology 75 (1966), p. 665.

⁷²Thomas C. Schelling, The Strategy of Conflict (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 35-43.

⁷³Bar-Yosef and Schild, p. 665.

⁷⁴Alvin W. Gouldner, Patterns Of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954), p. 241.

⁷⁵Orion F. White, "The Dialectical Organization: An Alternative to Bureaucracy," Public Administration Review 29, no. 1 (January/February 1969), p. 36.

⁷⁶Peter M. Blau, "Orientation Toward Clients In A Public Welfare Agency," p. 346.

⁷⁷James Thompson, Organizations In Action (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1978), p. 118.

⁷⁸J. Thompson, p. 119.

⁷⁹Howard Aldrich, "Centralization Versus Decentralization in the Design of Human Service Delivery Systems; A Response to Gouldner's Lament," in The Management of Human Services, eds., Rosemary C. Sarri and Yeheskel Hasenfeld (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), p. 61.

⁸⁰Walter R. Nord, "Job Satisfaction Reconsidered," American Psychologist 32, no. 12 (December 1977), p. 1029.

CHAPTER III

STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES AND METHODOLOGY

Previous research has established a clear connection between levels of bureaucratization and levels of work alienation. We will not challenge this connection here but accept it as a given. What we are concerned with are the suggestions in the literature that environmental turbulence enters into the bureaucratization work-alienation connection.

Stating the Hypotheses

In analyzing the relationship among work alienation, bureaucratization, and environmental turbulence, three sets of hypotheses are tested. The first set hypothesizes that the level of turbulence in the worker's environment is positively related to the level of work alienation experienced by the worker. A factor analysis yielded four dimensions of environmental turbulence which were used in developing the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis #1. The greater the worker's perceived level of turbulence in the extraorganizational environment, the greater the level of work alienation experienced by the worker.

Hypothesis #2. The greater the worker's perceived level of turbulence in the intraorganizational environment, the greater the level of work alienation experienced by the worker.

Hypothesis #3. The greater the worker's perceived level of turbulence in the policy environments, the greater the level of work alienation experienced by the worker.

Hypothesis #4. The greater the worker's perception of the comparative rate of environmental turbulence, the greater the level of work alienation experienced by the worker.

The second set of hypotheses test the role of "control" in explaining work alienation. One hypothesis in this set relates control directly to work alienation.

Hypothesis #5. The greater the worker's perceived level of control over his work, the lower the level of work alienation experienced by the worker.

The remaining hypotheses in this set state an inverse relationship between control and the various dimensions of bureaucratization and environmental turbulence. Although we are accepting the work alienation-bureaucratization hypotheses as a given, we are not accepting the bureaucratization control hypotheses without empirical verification because the link was inferentially concluded from the empirical research on work alienation. In testing the relationship between centralization and control, two dimensions of centralization are used: hierarchy of authority and participation in decision-making.

Hypothesis #6. The greater the worker's perception of his/her exclusion from participation in the hierarchy of authority, the lower the level of control over work process experienced by the worker.

Hypothesis #7. The greater the worker's perception of his/her exclusion from participation in decision-making, the lower the level of control over work processes experienced by the worker.

Also, two dimensions are used in testing the relationship between control and formalization: rule observation and job codification.

Hypothesis #8. The greater the worker's perceived level of rule observation, the lower the level of control experienced by the worker.

Hypothesis #9. The greater the worker's perceived level of job codification, the lower the level of control experienced by the worker.

The relationship between control and specialization used only one variable.

Hypothesis #10. The greater the worker's perceived level of task specialization, the lower the level of control experienced by the worker.

The four dimensions of environmental turbulence are expected to be similarly related to control.

Hypothesis #11. The greater the worker's perception of turbulence in the extraorganizational administrative environment, the lower the level of control experienced by the worker.

Hypothesis #12. The greater the worker's perception of turbulence in the intraorganizational administrative environment, the lower the level of control experienced by the worker.

Hypothesis #13. The greater the worker's perception of turbulence in the policy environment, the lower the level of control experienced by the worker.

Hypothesis #14. The greater the worker's perception of the comparative rate of environmental turbulence, the lower the level of control experienced by the worker.

The third set of hypotheses proposes that the relationship between work alienation and bureaucratization is conditional, influenced by the level of turbulence experienced by the worker. Also, using the bureaucracy-as-a-defense-mechanism argument, the level of bureaucratization is hypothesized to be inversely related to work alienation under highly turbulent conditions.

Hypothesis #15. Under conditions of low levels of environmental turbulence, bureaucratization rather than environmental turbulence will account for the greater percentage of variance in work alienation.

Hypothesis #16. Under conditions of high-level turbulence, environmental turbulence rather than bureaucratization will account for the greater percentage of variance in work alienation.

Hypothesis #17. Under conditions of high-level turbulence, the level of hierarchy of authority will be inversely related to work alienation.

Hypothesis #18. Under conditions of high-level turbulence, the more restricted the level of participation in decision making, the lower the level of work alienation.

Hypothesis #19. Under conditions of high-level turbulence, the level of rule observation will be inversely related to work alienation.

Hypothesis #20. Under conditions of high-level turbulence, the level of job codification will be inversely related to work alienation.

Hypothesis #21. Under conditions of high-level turbulence, the level of task specialization will be inversely related to work alienation.

Collecting Data

To test the hypotheses, a sample population with considerable variation in the levels of bureaucratization, levels of work alienation, and levels of environmental turbulence within it was needed. The primary concern in drawing the sample was to achieve adequate variation for statistical analysis, not to perfectly mirror the universe of government agencies.

To meet the above sample needs, public human services agencies--governmental agencies or private non-profit or public corporations created pursuant to legislation and designated to provide human services--were used. Four factors make such agencies particularly attractive for this study.

1. Human services have become the single largest function of government. By the late 1970's, half of all governmental output was devoted to human services. Human services, therefore, are a major part of the public administration network in the United States.
2. Human services programs are in a particularly turbulent period because of the rapid amount of change and resulting uncertainty which has occurred in these programs since the beginning of the Reagan administration.

3. Human services workers, because of the reciprocal nature of their involvement with clients, are in frequent contact with a major portion of their task environment.
4. The client is an inextricable part of the social service worker's labor. The client is in a sense the product of the worker's labor.

Human services agencies, according to Yeheskel Hasenfeld and Richard A. English, are those organizations "whose primary function is to define or alter the person's behavior, attributes, and social status in order to maintain or enhance his well being."² These human services organizations differ from other organizations in the public sector in two fundamental characteristics: (1) their input of raw materials are human beings with specific attributes, and their production output are persons processed or changed in a predetermined manner, and (2) their general mandate is that of a "service," that is, to maintain and improve the general well-being and functioning of people.³ Human services organizations also have the advantage of providing research sites which have a similar mission of people processing and/or changing, yet are characterized by various degrees of bureaucratization. As Peter Blau observes, the impact of bureaucratic organization cannot be directly determined without comparing different agencies that are more or less bureaucratized.⁴ This approach has also been used by D. S. Pugh, et al., in their Aston studies.⁵ The use of different agencies also allows for variation in the degree of environmental turbulence.

Selecting the Survey Participants

Data in this study were obtained from eight different agencies: five which are local or regional agencies and three which are state agencies. The local regional agencies included councils on alcohol and

drug abuse, community action agencies, councils of governments, mental health/mental retardation centers, and legal services agencies (see Table 1). The three state agencies from which data were collected were the Texas Rehabilitation Commission, the Texas Employment Commission, and the Texas Department of Human Resources. Texas agencies were selected for convenience, economy, and high return.

In order to obtain a sampling frame of names, a variety of strategies was necessarily employed. Because the local/regional agencies had their own boards of trustees or governing bodies, each agency was contacted separately and a personnel roster requested. Every council on alcohol and drug abuse, community action agency, council of government, and regional mental health/mental retardation center in Texas was contacted and asked to participate in the study. The Texas Legal Services Center in Austin, upon request, provided the Directory of Legal Services Personnel in Texas which listed personnel by each legal aid center, thereby insuring a roster from which legal aid workers could be drawn, yet precluding the need to contact each center. In addition the local/regional agencies cited in Table 1 agreed to participate in the study.

Securing names of human services personnel from the three state agencies required an additional flexibility resulting in three different cooperative arrangements. As with the legal services workers, a complete directory of social services personnel in Texas was obtained from the Texas Rehabilitation Commission. In order to obtain personnel listings from the Texas Department of Human Resources, personnel rosters were requested from the regional directors for financial services/income assistance as well as the directors for family services in each of the

TABLE 1

REGIONAL AND LOCAL AGENCIES
PARTICIPATING IN SURVEY

Mental Health Mental Retardation Centers

Bexar County MHMR Center, San Antonio
 Central Plains MHMR Center, Plainview
 Concho Valley Center for Human Advancement, San Angelo
 Dallas County MH and MR Center, Dallas
 Deep East Texas Mental Health Mental Retardation Services, Lufkin
 El Paso Center for Mental Health Mental Retardation
 Mental Health Mental Retardation Authority of Brazos Valley, Bryan
 MHMR of Southeast Texas, Beaumont
 Nueces County MHMR Community Center, Corpus Christi
 Northeast Texas MHMR Center, Texarkana
 Sabine Valley Regional MHMR Center, Longview
 Wichita Falls Community Mental Health Mental Retardation Center

Councils of Governments

Capital Area Planning Council, Austin
 Coastal Bend Council of Governments, Corpus Christi
 Deep East Texas Council of Governments, Jasper
 Golden Crescent Regional Planning Commission, Victoria
 Heart of Texas Council of Government, Waco
 Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council, McAllen
 Nortex Regional Planning Commission, Wichita Falls.
 Panhandle Regional Planning Commission, Amarillo
 Permian Basin Regional Planning Commission, Midland
 South East Texas Regional Planning Commission, Nederland
 South Plains Association of Governments, Lubbock
 South Texas Development Council, Laredo
 Texoma Regional Planning Commission, Denison
 West Central Texas Council of Government, Abilene

Regional Councils on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse

Abilene Council on Alcoholism, Inc.
 Amarillo Council on Alcoholism
 Bay Area Council on Drugs and Alcohol, Inc., Houston
 Central Texas Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, Temple
 Denton Area Council on Alcoholism
 East Texas Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, Longview
 Fort Bend Regional Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, Inc.,
 Rosenberg
 Houston Regional Council on Alcoholism, Inc.
 Lamar County Alcohol/Drug Center, Paris
 Midland Council on Alcoholism, Midland
 Orange County Council on Alcoholism
 Red River Regional Council on Alcoholism, Texarkana

TABLE 1--Continued

Tarrant Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, Ft. Worth
 Valley Regional Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, Harlingen,
 Brownsville
 Williamson County Council on Alcoholism, Georgetown.

Community Action Programs

CAUSE, Inc., Hillsboro
 Community Action Corporation of South Texas, Alice.
 Community Action Corporation of Wichita Falls and North Texas Area
 Community Action Nacogdoches, Inc.
 Community Action Division, City of San Antonio.
 Community Action Program, Inc., Henderson.
 Community Council of Reeves County, Pecos
 Community Council of South Central Texas, Inc., New Braunfels
 Community Services, Inc., Corsicana
 East Texas Human Development Corporation, Marshall
 Economic Action Committee of the Gulf Coast, Bay City
 Gulf Coast Community Services Assoc., Houston
 Nueces County Community Action Agency, Corpus Christi
 Palo Pinto Community Services Corporation, Mineral Wells
 Programs for Human Services, Orange
 Project BRAVO, El Paso
 South Plains Community Action Association, Inc. Levelland
 Texas Panhandle Community Action Corporation, Amarillo
 Tri-County Community Action, Inc., Center

DHR regions. Regional directors in Amarillo, Lubbock, El Paso, Abilene, Dallas-Fort Worth, Austin, Edinburg, San Antonio, Beaumont, Houston, and Odessa-Midland agreed to provide the requested information.

With the Texas Employment Commission, each district director was contacted, and a personnel roster was requested. The district directors in San Angelo, Austin, Beaumont, and Amarillo agreed to cooperate with a sampling system relying upon the district offices to administer the surveys. Accordingly, a random selection of positions rather than individuals throughout the districts was performed, and then the appropriate number of surveys was forwarded to the district offices for distribution to randomly selected individuals in designated positions and locations.

The major interest of this research is the "street-level bureaucrat," as Michael Lipsky terms those in direct contact with the client. The street-level bureaucrat, Lipsky theorizes, works in conditions that produce a high level of psychological stress.⁶ Because direct service providers are in frequent contact with the clients as well as other groups in the task environment, they are particularly useful in observing the impact of turbulence and bureaucratization upon work alienation. The names of administrative staff, however, were included in the sample. While street-level bureaucrats are of greatest interest, the inclusion of administrators enables us to probe the organizational depth of bureaucratization.

The lists from which the random sample was eventually drawn included 1,389 social service workers from local or regional agencies and 2,810 social service workers from the state agencies. A stratified random sample was used with five hundred names drawn from each group. The sample was stratified according to agency size to ensure that social

workers in the smaller agencies would be adequately represented in the sample, thereby assuring sufficient variation in the bureaucratization measures. Using random numbers tables, each individual in the listings was given a number from zero to the highest number of the listing, and five hundred individuals were then selected for survey. Nachmias, in discussing the process, advises that

the table of random digits is entered at some random starting point. Each digit that appears in the table is read in order (up, down, or sideways; the direction does not matter as long as it is consistent). Whenever a digit that appears in the table of random digits corresponds to the number of a sampling unit in the list, that sampling unit is selected for the sample. This process is continued until the desired sample size is reached.

This technique ensured that every person in our list had an equal probability of being chosen for the sample, one requirement for good sampling. This technique also insures that the second requirement of sampling, independence, is also met: the selection of one subject of the sample is not dependent on the selection of another subject.⁸

Developing and Managing the Survey

The human services workers participated through answering a mail survey. Pre-existing scales measuring bureaucratization and work alienation as well as the battery of statements designed to measure environmental turbulence and control were included in the development of a survey instrument for pre-testing among human services workers in Brewster County, Texas. After reworking portions of the survey, the pre-existing scales and the battery of "improved" items were included with background variables in the final instrument.

The survey which finally developed was designed to be consistent with the advice of Douglas R. Berdie and John F. Anderson on

constructing "the sensuous questionnaire."⁹ Berdie and Anderson advise that, "Common sense dictates certain practices about the design of the mail questionnaire. The mail questionnaire should be attractive, easy to fill out, have adequate space for response, be legible."¹⁰ The survey's appearance, as well as its content, was designed to increase the return rate. Following Berdie and Anderson's advice, the survey was professionally printed rather than mimeographed. Also, color was used to increase the likelihood of the survey being returned. Study sponsorship through the auspices of Sul Ross State University was noted on the survey. The cover letters addressed the human services worker by name. One month after the initial mailing, a reminder card was sent to those workers who had not yet returned their surveys. Each survey which was returned in usable condition was coded and key-punched onto computer cards. After verification of the data cards, the data was stored on a disk.

Of the thousand surveys sent to human services workers in Texas, 60.7% were returned in usable form. The response rate of 60.7% falls within an acceptable level for analysis and lessens the chance of a significant response bias. Earl Babbie advises that a response rate of 50 percent is adequate for analysis, while 60% is good.¹¹

Profiling the Population

The sample was drawn to maximize variation on the factors of interest to us, not to perfectly mirror the universe. Nonetheless, when dealing with most surveys, it is worthwhile profiling the respondents to guard against any possible biases that might affect the results: the sample being dominated by state agencies, agencies from large metropolitan areas, etc. Below is the profile of our respondents.

Of those participating in the study 45.5% (276) were employed by local or regional agencies while 54.5% (330) were from the three state agencies. Table 2 gives a breakdown of participants by agency type. The respondents represent over 214 human service work sites throughout Texas (see Appendix A). Their geographic locations are identified in Table 3.

Of the 607 respondents, approximately one-third lived in cities below 50,000; one-third lived in cities of 50,000 to 250,000; and one-third lived in cities of more than 250,000 (see Appendix F). Almost two-thirds (61.7%) of the respondents were women, and 38.3% were men, not an unusual distribution for social service agencies.

Ethnically, two thirds of the survey respondents identified themselves as Anglo, slightly more than ten percent as Black, slightly less than one quarter as Hispanic, and less than one percent as Oriental (see Appendix G). Educationally, the respondents were highly educated. Although only 6.1% held doctorates (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., J.D.), another 6.1% possessed the Master of Social Work degree which is considered the terminal social work professional degree. An additional 22.9% possessed a Masters degree other than the M.S.W., bringing the total percentage of those with graduate degrees to more than one third of the population. Those with the bachelor degree as the highest degree accounted for 44.3% of the respondents. Fewer than twenty percent had a high school diploma or less as their highest level of formal education (see appendix C). Finally, those identifying themselves as having administrative or planning responsibilities solely or in addition to the direct delivery of services to clients totalled 25.4% of the respondents.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS
BY AGENCY TYPE

Agency Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Abuse Council	16	2.6
Community Action Agency	51	8.4
Council of Governments	26	4.3
Mental Health / Mental Retardation Centers	153	25.2
Legal Aid Agencies	32	5.3
Department of Human Resources	224	37.0
Texas Employment Commission	48	7.9
Texas Rehabilitation Commission	56	9.2
Total	606*	100.0

*the agency of one respondent was unidentifiable

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS
BY GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS IN TEXAS

Geographical Region (Planning Regions)	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Central Texas (3, 4, 7, 11, 12, 22, 23)	189	31.1
East Texas (5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16)	172	28.4
West Texas (1, 2, 8, 9, 10)	139	22.9
South Texas (17, 18,, 19, 20, 21, 24)	106	17.6
Total	606*	100.0

*the region of one respondent was unidentifiable

Sample Bias and Variation

Despite our primary concern with maximizing variation in the sample, it is clearly of interest to know to what extent our sample results can be generalized to a broader population. With the sample being drawn totally from Texas, generalizations should not be drawn far beyond the South or Southwest regions of the U.S. without due concern for governmental and cultural differences. Additionally the sample focused on human service agencies only.

Even within the human services field and the State of Texas, the sample is not perfectly representative of the universe. One evident bias existed because of the inability to survey all human services programs in Texas. The sample did not include programs other than the eight agencies mentioned: there was not total cooperation among all offices of the eight agencies mentioned, and there was not total cooperation among all offices of the eight agency types chosen. For example, not all regions of the Department of Human Resources and the Texas Employment Commission are included in the survey nor are all of the community action agencies, councils on alcoholism and drug abuse, councils of government, or regional mental health and mental retardation centers.

Stratifying the sample also biased the study although it was necessary to assure sufficient variation in the sample for analysis. The result was a sample in which local and regional human service workers are represented in disproportionately large numbers. Within the agencies surveyed, the Department of Human Resources and the mental health-mental retardation centers accounted for 67.2% of the entire

sample. The stratification did result in a statistically diverse population.

The sample was also biased due to the regional response pattern. Assuming that the general population of Texas and the social services workers of the state are distributed equally, West Texas and South Texas are overly represented in the sample while East and Central Texas are underrepresented. That, in turn, is reflected in a sample population which is more frequently found in small towns and cities than the population as a whole. Whereas more than eighty percent of the state's population is located in urban areas with a population of 50,000 or more, only slightly more than sixty four-percent of the survey respondents worked in those areas.

The population, which was heavily female (61.7%), had a mean age of 36.28 years and a median age of 34.12. Neither of these figures suggests a severe bias, given the opportunities which have existed in the human services for women and given the growth in human services employment since the 1960s.¹²

While the sample may not be a perfectly representative sample of human services workers in Texas, it is a sample sufficiently diverse in the bureaucratization, turbulence, and work alienation variables to provide the variation needed for statistical analysis. Tables 4 and 5 present information about the variation existing among the research measures. Although interpretation of the suitability for analysis of the distribution is subjective and, therefore, largely intuitive, in no instance does the data suggest a population with insufficient variation in the research variables.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION MEASURES FOR RESEARCH VARIABLES

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Kurtosis
BUREAUCRATIZATION:				
<u>Centralization</u>				
Hierarchy of Authority	9.864	2.954	15	0.959
Participation in Decision-Making	13.384	3.385	12	0.717
<u>Formalization</u>				
Rule Observation	4.017	1.514	6	0.168
Job Codification	13.697	2.365	15	0.315
<u>Specialization</u>				
	10.214	3.162	15	0.427
WORK ALIENATION:	10.373	3.365	20	0.807
TURBULENCE:				
Extraorganization	23.797	5.128	31	0.027
Intraorganization	14.172	3.531	20	0.115
Policy	13.162	3.173	16	-0.399
Relative	13.266	2.948	15	-0.243
Overall Measure	249.179	42.453	263.5	0.068
CONTROL:	23.185	2.881	18	1.900

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION MEASURES FOR BUREAUCRATIZATION AND ALIENATION MEASURES
IN HIGH- AND LOW-TURBULENCE GROUPS

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range	Kurtosis
HIGH TURBULENCE				
BUREAUCRATIZATION:				
<u>Centralization</u>				
Hierarchy of Authority	9.691	2.846	15	1.855
Participation in Decision-Making	14.377	2.450	10	2.926
<u>Formalization</u>				
Rule Observation	4.485	1.671	6	-0.314
Job Codification	14.185	2.449	12	0.134
<u>Specialization</u>				
	11.121	3.305	15	-0.385
WORK ALIENATION:	11.614	3.329	14	-0.244
LOW TURBULENCE				
BUREAUCRATIZATION:				
<u>Centralization</u>				
Hierarchy of Authority	9.858	3.003	15	0.613
Participation in Decision-Making	13.500	3.378	12	1.306
<u>Formalization</u>				
Rule Observation	3.930	1.584	6	0.219
Job Codification	13.598	2.472	14	-0.046
<u>Specialization</u>				
	10.363	3.200	15	0.505
WORK ALIENATION:	10.370	3.519	20	1.594

In evaluating the distribution of the variables, kurtosis was also employed because it measures the peakness or flatness of the curve. Although evaluating a high score would be subjective, a score of zero would indicate a normal distribution. Only one of the variables, control, had a kurtosis score valued more than 1.0. Similarly, when the population was divided into high- and low-turbulence categories, only the centralization and work alienation measures reflected scores more than 1.0, and those scores, when viewed in light of the range and standard deviations, did not appear inappropriate for analysis.

The sample population met the needs of this study. Those participating in the survey provided a group of human services workers sufficiently diverse in their levels of work alienation, environmental turbulence, and bureaucratization for statistical analysis. The biases evident within the population are only potential sources of error; the sample is still a reasonable picture of human services agencies in Texas and the Southwest.

Variable Definitions

The variables were operationalized by using indices measuring the workers' perceptions of the bureaucratic, work alienation, and turbulence concepts rather than using non-perceptual institutional properties such as the number of documents or employees. Foremost among the reasons for resorting to the attitudinal measures was the prominence of the Aiken and Hage and G. Miller measures of organizational structure and work alienation in organizational theory. Delbert Miller, for example, offers the Aiken and Hage inventories as established indicators.¹³ Attitudinal scales also give insight into the functioning of the structure, for it is possible to distinguish the existence of a

structural property from its implementation. An organization may appear on paper to be heavily burdened with regulations, for example, but if the regulations are not enforced, the level of bureaucratization is actually low. The attitudinal scales give some insight into the actual operation of those organizational properties being studied. The diversity structures which existed among those agencies used as survey sites was also more easily handled by using the attitudinal scales.

Existing Scales

In studying the relationship between bureaucratization and alienation from work, five scales constructed by Michael Aiken and Jerald Hage were used to measure the degrees of centralization, formalization, and specialization characterizing the employee's work.¹⁴ By employing a principal-components-solution-factor-analysis of twenty-one items in factoring a "hierarchy of authority" battery and a "rules" battery of statements developed by Richard Hall, Aiken and Hage identified two dimensions relating to centralization and two dimensions relating to formalization. Aiken and Hage also used factor analysis in developing a Routinization of Technology Index through which specialization was measured.

Having defined centralization as the degree to which members of the organization participate in decision-making, Aiken and Hage used factor analysis to produce two dimensions which were appropriate to this concept; the two dimensions were termed "hierarchy of authority" and "participation in decision-making." By "hierarchy of authority" Aiken and Hage mean the extent to which members are assigned tasks and then provided with the freedom to implement them without interruption from superiors. The following statements comprised this index:

- (1) There can be little action taken here until a supervisor approves a decision.
- (2) A person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly discouraged here.
- (3) Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.
- (4) I have to ask my boss before I do almost anything.
- (5) Any decision here has to have my boss' approval.

To these statements the respondents were asked to answer either strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree or inappropriate.

Aiken and Hage's participation in Decision-making Index, which measures the relative degree of participation in decisions affecting the entire organization, was constructed by using the following:

- (1) How frequently do you usually participate in the decision to hire new staff?
- (2) How frequently do you usually participate in decisions on the promotion of any of the professional staff?
- (3) How frequently do you participate in the decisions on the adoption of new programs?
- (4) How frequently do you participate in the decisions on the adoption of new policies?

The responses available were always, often, frequently, never or inappropriate.

The second property of bureaucracy, formalization, was conceptually defined by Aiken and Hage as the degree of work standardization and the amount of deviation that is allowed from standards. As before, Aiken and Hage's factor analysis produced two relevant factors. The factor which resulted in the Job Codification Index allowed for observing the degree to which job incumbents must consult rules in fulfilling professional responsibilities. The five items used in the Job Codification Index are:

- (1) I feel that I am my own boss in most matters.
- (2) A person can make his own decisions without checking with anybody else.
- (3) How things are done here is left up to the person doing the work.

- (4) People here are allowed to do almost as they please.
- (5) Most people here make their own rules on the job.

Again, the response categories were the Likert strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree items; a category for "inappropriate" was also provided.

The factor from which the Rule Observation Index was constructed measured the degree to which employees were observed for rule violations. Only two items comprised the scale: (1) the employees are constantly being checked on for rule violations and (2) people here feel as though they are constantly being watched, to see that they obey all the rules. The responses were the same as for the Job Codification Index.

Although Aiken and Hage did not employ specialization in their study of organizational alienation, they did employ this organizational property, as well as the measures for centralization and formalization, in an article studying organizational interdependence and intraorganizational structure;¹⁵ the previously defined measures for centralization and formalization were also used in that research. The degree of specialization, which is conceptualized here as the degree of task diversification characterizing the employee's work, is operationally defined in Aiken and Hage's factor-analytically-constructed Routinization of Technology Index, which includes the following items:

- (1) I do the same job in the same way every day.
- (2) One thing I like around here is the variety of work.
- (3) In my job I have something new happening every day.
- (4) There is something different to do every day.
- (5) Would you describe your job as being (1) highly routine
(2) somewhat routine (3) somewhat non-routine or (4) highly non-routine.

The response items to the first four statements were strongly agree, agree, strongly disagree, and inappropriate. The responses to each of

the bureaucratic measures were coded so that the higher the score, the more bureaucratic the situation.

The work alienation scale was taken from George A. Miller's study of industrial scientists. Miller conceptually defines work alienation as the loss of intrinsic pride or meaning in work, and he employs the scale below to measure alienation.¹⁶ The responses again ran from strongly disagree to strongly agree, with inappropriate as an option.

Index of Work Alienation

- (1) I really don't feel a sense of pride or accomplishment as a result of the type of work that I do.
- (2) My work gives me a feeling of pride in having done the job well.
- (3) I very much like the type of work that I am doing.
- (4) My job gives me a chance to do the things I do best.
- (5) My work is my most rewarding experience.

Each of these six scales, Aiken and Hage's five and Miller's one, has the advantage of having been employed in previous research and is thus well established in the literature on organizational theory. By using these existing indices, concerns about construct validity and reliability were minimized. While factor analysis was used in the Aiken and Hage studies for purposes of construct validity, Guttman scaling was used by Miller. Using the sample population of this study, each of the indices was tested for reliability. Using the SPSS program Reliability, tests for reliability yielded the following Cronbach's alphas for the pre-existing scales: Hierarchy of Authority, 0.81011; Participation in Decision-making, 0.88527; Rule Observation, 0.78770; Job Codification, 0.67316; Specialization, 0.87136; and Work Alienation, 0.88013.

Ideally, the alpha values would be .90 or above. However in interpreting the size of reliability coefficients, Downie and Heath observe that,

There is no hard and fast rule that says that any reliability has to be a certain size before any test or measuring instrument can be useful. Today we look upon reliability as a relative thing, and there are certain areas and techniques where reliability coefficients fall well below this .90, and the techniques are still used and found to be very useful. Rating scales are examples of this.¹⁷

The alpha values above, particularly when compared to the alpha values of other indices widely used in published research, are good; the reliability of these measures for study is acceptable.

Constructing New Scales

In addition to the previously developed scales, measures for two additional concepts were developed: environmental turbulence and control. In the discussion of environmental turbulence, the rate of change characteristic of the environment was the major definitional trait, and it is because of its salience that environmental turbulence is conceptually defined in this research as the rate of change characterizing the task environment. Because the individual, not the organization, is the unit of analysis, the task environment would include intraorganizational as well as extraorganizational factors. Control is here defined as the ability to promote one's own desired objectives, or, alternately, the power to resist undesirable ones.¹⁸

In creating the turbulence and control scales it was important to first identify parts of work environment which would be particularly relevant to the worker. James Thompson's discussion of task environments was selected to use in conceptualizing the environment. Thompson identifies four parts of the environment which are relevant or potentially

relevant to goal setting and goal attainment: (1) customers (clientele); (2) suppliers of material, labor, capital equipment, and work space; (3) competitors for markets and resources; and (4) regulatory groups.¹⁹

Because the human services worker and not the organization is the unit of analysis in this study, the intraorganizational setting was included in the environment. In the initial effort to construct the survey, there were statements designed to measure turbulence in government policies, support agencies, client groups, and the worker's own organization.

The initial survey was then pre-tested on a group of twelve human services workers in Brewster County, Texas. The human services workers then suggested changes in the content of the survey which would make the instrument less threatening to the workers. In the initial instrument there was an obvious effort to measure the degree of turbulence through observing the resulting frustration and uncertainty which could be anticipated. Therefore, the survey included statements such as:

Policy changes in the agencies we work with make it more difficult to do my job.

In the revised survey, the statements were designed to measure turbulence and control by using statements which would not be interpreted by the worker as admission of inadequate work performance or unhealthy attitude towards work. The panel of human services workers then reevaluated the survey. The final document included thirty-six items which were used to measure the rate of change in the worker's task environment during the past two years and the worker's ability to secure resources relevant to task completion. The survey was then sent to 1,000 human services workers throughout Texas.

In constructing the indices for turbulence and control, factor analysis was used. Procedurally, the scales were constructed by first

performing an initial factor analysis from which the number of significant factors could be determined. Rather than determining the number of significant factors by using an "eigenvalue-one" criterion, the number of significant factors was determined by using the scree test. R. J. Rummel explains the principle of the scree test accordingly:

The scree test . . . results from the practical observation that the factor variance levels off when the factors are largely measuring random error The number of the factor is plotted against the proportion of the variance it extracts. The curve fitted to the plot of these factors will have a decreasing negative slope (the difference in variance between successive factors will decrease) until the random error factors--or trivial factors--are reached. Then the curve will level off and the incremental difference between successive factors will be about the same.

After the number of significant factors was determined to be five, a second factor analysis was performed. From the results of the varimax rotation used in the second factoring, the items used in the scales were extracted.

Of the thirty-six items, six items did not load sufficiently high ($\pm .4000$) on any of the five factors to be included in the indices. Those items designed to measure turbulence and not loading on a factor were:

During the past three to five years, to what extent has there been a change in:

1. the technology you use on your job? For example, data system, computers.
2. employee skills and abilities?
3. the appropriations received from your funding sources?
4. coverage of your agency by the media?

The two items designed to measure control which were not included in the control scale were:

I am able:

1. to get other agencies I work with to go along with what I want.
2. to get around agency rules and regulations which hinder my work.

The battery of statements designed to indicate turbulence encountered by the worker in his/her work yielded four dimensions defining turbulence. Two of the four dimensions relating to turbulence suggested turbulence in what is here referred to as the administrative environment, i.e., those entities, persons or agencies, which are encountered by the worker in performing his/her work. The variables constructed from these two factors were designated turbulence in the extraorganizational administrative environment and turbulence in the intraorganizational administrative environment. Turbulence in the extraorganizational administrative environment refers to the rate of change in those groups outside of the agency which the worker encounters in the performance of his work, thereby creating changing work structures. Turbulence in the intraorganizational administrative environment refers to the rate of change occurring among groups and structures within the agency which result in changing work structures encountered in the performance of work. Both environments would include groups, individuals, or generalized organizational structures which the worker would negotiate in carrying out his/her specific tasks. The indexes derived from this analysis are tested below.

Each item is in response to the question, "during the past three to five years, to what extent has there been change in":

Index of Turbulence in the Extraorganizational Administrative Environment:

- (1) the demand for your agency's services?
- (2) the number of agencies you deal with on your job?
- (3) the number of clients you work with?
- (4) the length of time you work with a client?
- (5) pressure exerted on your agency by outside interest groups?
- (6) the ability of outside agencies to assist you in your work?

- (7) comments from the non-client members of the public?
- (8) involvement in your agency by community officials?

The Index of Turbulence in the Intraorganizational Administrative Environment:

- (1) the makeup of your agency's labor force? For example, agency size, types of occupations employed.
- (2) Your agency's goals and objectives?
- (3) the leadership of your agency?
- (4) the people in your agency (personnel turnover)?
- (5) the structure of your agency?

The response items were no, little, occasional, frequent, or constant change, with constant change being coded the higher value; inappropriate was also a response item.

The third factor, which cuts across the intra- and extra-organizational environments, taps what is here designated as the policy environment of the worker. Whereas the first two dimensions of environmental turbulence focused upon the settings in which the work is performed, this third dimension focuses upon the directives which define the labor itself. Whereas the first two dimensions are instrumental in that they address the structures through which the work is accomplished, this policy dimension is substantive in that it defines appropriate work processes and content. These processes and work content are determined not only by the policies of the worker's own agency, but also by the policies of the organizations external to his/her own which are encountered in the execution of work. Therefore, turbulence in the policy environment can be conceptualized as the rate of change in the policies of organizations upon which the worker is dependent for task execution. The Index of Turbulence in the Policy Environment incorporated the following items in response to the question, "During the past three to five years, to what extent has there been change in":

- (1) your duties and responsibilities?
- (2) agency rules and regulations?
- (3) the laws/rules and regulations which relate to your agency?
- (4) the policies of the agencies you deal with on your job?

The response items were the same as for the previous turbulence indexes. The last factor which defined environmental turbulence was one measuring the worker's perception of the rate of change in his/her agency compared to the perceived rate of change in other agencies. This dimension of environmental turbulence, which is termed the Comparative Rate of Environmental Turbulence, was measured by using the following index:

- (1) Our clients are more demanding than those in other agencies.
- (2) We have more new clients than other agencies.
- (3) Our programs change faster than the programs of other agencies.
- (4) We experience more personnel turnover than do other agencies.
- (5) Our procedures have changed more rapidly than have procedures in other agencies.

For this index the responses were strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, or inappropriate.

The concept of environmental turbulence as developed in this research is multi-dimensional. In order to better appraise the relationship between environmental turbulence and work alienation and control, the four dimensions of environmental turbulence which have been identified will be used together as independent variables.

The concept of control was operationally defined through the factor analysis of a battery of statements designed to indicate the worker's ability to promote his own desired objectives or, alternately, the power to resist undesirable ones. The items included in the Index of Organizational Control were:

I am able:

- (1) to get my supervisor to go along with what I want.
- (2) to get my peers to go along with what I want.
- (3) to get those I supervise to go along with what I want.
- (4) to get the materials I need to do my job.

- (5) to get the information I need to do my job.
- (6) to meet my work deadlines.
- (7) to accomplish my work objectives.
- (8) to get my clients to go along with what I want.

The responses ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree with inappropriate also being an option.

In creating all of the scales, only those items with a factor loading of $\pm .4000$ or above were employed. The $\pm .4000$ value was used because, after the rotation of the original axis, there was no variable with a $\pm .4000$ loading on more than one factor. The $\pm .4000$ value suggested a correlation sufficiently strong to justify inclusion in the appropriate scale. The $\pm .4000$ value, though admittedly arbitrary, seemed reasonably strong, particularly given the absence of concrete guidelines in the literature. As Nie, et al., observe, "Ultimately, the user must personally decide which method is to be used."²¹

As in the Aiken and Hage studies, factor analysis was used to establish construct validity, a technique supported by Rummel.²² Fred Kerlinger notes that "factor analysis is perhaps the most powerful method of construct validation."²³ The reliability of the measures was assessed by using Cronbach's alpha as a measure of reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha scores for each of newly created scales were .80314 for turbulence in the extraorganizational environment, .74734 for turbulence in the intraorganizational environment, .75113 for turbulence in the policy environment, .76579 for the comparative rate of turbulence, and .74974 for the organizational control scale. As before, the alpha scores were as well within the range used in behavioral science research.

In studying work alienation, therefore, ten explanatory variables will be used: five variables measuring various dimensions of bureaucracy, four measuring various dimensions of environmental turbulence, and one measuring the worker's ability to accomplish his/her work goals and objectives. The advantage of this approach is that it will allow the identification of specific properties of bureaucracy and environmental turbulence which are most significantly associated with work alienation.

Techniques of Analysis

In testing the hypotheses, SPSS programs partial correlation and regression analysis were used. The partial correlation program was used for two reasons: it provides a correlation coefficient for a bivariate relationship, and it allows the researcher to clarify the relationship by controlling for the impact of additional variables. As Norman Nie, et al., observe, "Partial correlation provides the researcher with a single measure of association describing the relationship between two variables while adjusting for the effects of one or more additional variables."²⁴ The partial correlation program was used to test the hypotheses relating turbulence to work alienation, work alienation to control, and bureaucratization and turbulence to control.

Criteria for two types of significance, substantive and statistical, had to be satisfied before the null hypothesis was rejected. Statistical significance was determined by using a significance level of .05 or less in rejecting the null hypothesis. Establishing the criteria for substantive significance was a much more subjective task since very little guidance exists in the literature. The question of substantive significance does deserve consideration, however. Substantive significance is

concerned with the strength of the correlation coefficient, i.e., is the coefficient strong enough to be a viable factor in contributing to the explanation of the dependent variable? Even though two variables may correlate statistically at a .05 level or less and, therefore, may be considered to be significantly related statistically, the correlation coefficient may be so weak as to render its explanatory utility questionable. For purposes of this study $\pm .2236$ was used to evaluate substantive significance. A value of $\pm .2236$ was used because 5% of the variance in the relation is accounted for with a coefficient of that intensity. Admittedly, the $\pm .2236$ value is arbitrary and was chosen because of the weak value generally assigned to a relationship below $\pm .2000$ in social science writing. The five percent variance was used to strengthen the criteria for substantive significance.

The "conditional" hypotheses were tested by using the SPSS multiple regression program. By using the stepwise regression option, the relative contribution of bureaucratization and turbulence measures to the variance in the work alienation measure can be determined. The SPSS manual describes the program accordingly:

...[T]he computer would enter variables in single steps from best to worst provided that they meet the statistical criteria established in the parameters section of the statement. The variable that explains the greatest amount of variance in the dependent variable will be entered first; the variable that explains the greatest amount of variance in conjunction with the first will enter second, and so on. In other words, the variable that explains the greatest amount of variance unexplained by the variables already in the equation enters the equation at each step.²⁵

In order to test the conditional hypotheses the survey population was divided into high- and low-turbulence groups. The high-turbulence group was comprised of those human services workers whose overall turbulence score was equal to or above one standard deviation beyond the mean

turbulence score. Those workers in the low-turbulence category had scores equal to or below one standard deviation under the mean score. The overall turbulence measure is a composite of the four turbulence indices. If the bureaucratization measures accounted for more of the variance in work alienation than the turbulence measures did, under conditions of low-level turbulence, the null hypothesis would be rejected; if the turbulence measures accounted for more of the variance in work alienation in the high-turbulence group than did the bureaucratization measures, then this null hypothesis would be rejected at least conditionally. Furthermore, if the signs of the bureaucratization measured change in the high-turbulence groups, this would be evidence of employees seeing bureaucratization as a defense against turbulence-induced alienation.

In addition to the partial correlation and regression programs which were used interesting the hypotheses, two other tests were used to discuss the findings. By using the SPSS procedures T-TEST and ONEWAY, significant differences within the sample population on the work alienation, control, bureaucratization, and turbulence measures could be determined.

In using the T-TEST program, significant difference on the mean score between two groupings was determined by using a two-tailed test in the separate variance technique. The two-tailed test was utilized because the t-tests were employed in exploring the nature of data rather than in testing specific directional hypotheses. According to Cornett and Beckner, when there is no positing of direction in the testing, therefore allowing for the possibility of either a positive or negative outcome, then a two-tailed test should be used.²⁶ The separate variance technique was used because it yields more conservative results than does the pooled variance technique.

The ONEWAY subprogram allowed for testing significant differences among groups of three or more. The ONEWAY subprogram permits a posteriori testing among groups along a variable. According to the SPSS manual, "An a posteriori contrast test is a systematic procedure for comparing all possible pairs of group means. The groups are divided into homogeneous subsets, where the difference in the means of any two groups in a subset is not significant at some prescribed level."²⁷ From the various a posteriori test options provided, the Scheffe test was chosen for use because it is the most conservative of the available options.²⁸ Roger Kirk in his work on experimental design also recommends the use of the Scheffe procedure in comparisons involving more than two means.²⁹ An additional advantage of the Scheffe test is that it is exact for unequal group sizes. For both the T-TEST and ONEWAY program, .05 was used as the level of significance in determining whether statistically significant differences existed among groups.

Chapter Summary

Three sets of hypotheses are presented for study. The first set hypothesizes that the dimension of environmental turbulence (extraorganizational turbulence, intraorganizational turbulence, policy turbulence, and the comparative rate of turbulence) is positively related to the degree of work alienation experienced by the worker. The second set of hypotheses projects an inverse relation between control and the work alienation, bureaucratization, and turbulence measures. The third set of hypotheses states the conditional relationship between work alienation and the bureaucratization measures, using the level of turbulence as the control variable. When accounting for the variance in work alienation, bureaucratization rather than environmental turbulence is

expected to account for the greater percentage of variance in low-turbulence environments; the turbulence measures are expected to account for a greater percentage of the variance in highly turbulent environments. Also, the level of bureaucratization is hypothesized to be inversely related to work alienation under conditions of high-level turbulence.

To test the hypothesis, a random sample of 1,000 human services workers in Texas was drawn from various state and regional/local human services agencies across the state. The return rate of 60.7% provided a number of usable cases suitable for statistical analysis.

Those participating in the study were asked to complete a mailout survey which employed existing indexes for the bureaucratization and work alienation concepts. The questionnaire also included statements from which the environmental turbulence and control measures were constructed. Factor analysis was used to establish construct validity, while Cronback's alpha was used to establish reliability scores. Product moment correlations and regression analysis were selected as the primary testing techniques.

Notes

¹Robert Agranoff, "Human Resource Administration," Southern Review of Public Administration 2, no. 2 (September 1978), p. 153.

²Yehekel Hasenfeld and Richard A. English, Human Service Organizations (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1974), p. 1

³Hasenfeld and English, p. 1

⁴Blau, "Orientation Toward Clients in a Public Welfare Agency," Administrative Science Quarterly 5 (1960), p. 344.

⁵D. S. Pugh, et al., "Dimensions of Organizational Structure," Administrative Science Quarterly 13 (1968), pp. 91-114.

⁶Michael Lipsky, "Toward a Theory of Street-Level Bureaucracy," in Bureaucratic Power in National Politics, ed., Francis E. Rourke (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1978), pp. 135-157.

⁷David Nachmias and Chava Nachmias, Research Methods in the Social Sciences (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), p. 262.

⁸Joe D. Cornett and Weldon Beckner, Introductory Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1975), pp. 45-46.

⁹Earl R. Babbie, The Practice of Social Research (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1979), p. 335

¹⁰Douglas R. Berdie and John F. Anderson, Questionnaires: Design and Use (Methuchen, N. J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974).

¹¹Berdie and Anderson, p. 36.

¹²N. Joseph Cayer and Lee Sigelman, "Minorities and Women in State and Local Government: 1973-1975," Public Administration Review 40, no. 5 (September/October 1980), pp. 443-450.

¹³Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1977), p. 281.

¹⁴Michael Aiken and Jerald Hage, "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis," The American Sociological Review 31 (August 1966), pp. 497-507 and Jerald Hage and Michael Aiken, "Routine Technology, Social Structure, and Organization Goals," Administrative Science Quarterly 14 (1969), pp. 366-375.

¹⁵Hage and Aiken, pp. 366-375.

¹⁶George A. Miller, "Professionals in Bureaucracy: Alienation Among Industrial Scientists and Engineers," American Sociological Review (October 1967), p. 759.

¹⁷N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970), p. 247.

¹⁸Robin Smith, "The Maximization of Control in Industrial Relations Systems," in The Control of Work, eds. John Purcell and Robin Smith (London: The Macmillan Press, 1979), p. 5.

¹⁹James Thompson, Organizations in Action, pp. 27-28.

²⁰R. J. Rummel, Applied Factor Analysis (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970), p. 361.

²¹Norman H. Nie et al., Statistical Package For the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), p. 427.

²²Rummel, pp. 19-20.

²³Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 468.

²⁴Nie, et al., p. 302.

²⁵Nie, et al., p. 345.

²⁶Cornett and Beckner, p. 62.

²⁷Nie, et al., p. 427.

²⁸Nie, et al., p. 428.

²⁹Roger E. Kirk, Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences (Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1968), p. 90.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In order to gain more insight into the bureaucratization-work alienation relationship, three sets of hypotheses were tested; each set focused upon a different way in which turbulence might relate to the bureaucratization-work alienation connection. Before the findings of the hypotheses are discussed, however, we first need to re-examine the work alienation-bureaucratization connection in light of this study. Then we will review, in turn, the connections between environmental turbulence and work alienation; bureaucracy, turbulence, alienation and control; and the amount of variance in work alienation explained by the turbulence and bureaucratization variables in high and low turbulence settings. In the last set of hypotheses, we will look at the possible use of bureaucracy as a defense against environmental turbulence.

Bureaucratization and Work Alienation

The relationship between work alienation and bureaucratization has been sufficiently well established in the literature and is here accepted as a given rather than as a hypothesis to be tested. Nevertheless, we must re-examine the connection as a prelude to our later examination of how turbulence effects this connection. In using the Aiken and Hage measures, we relate two measures of centralization (hierarchy of authority and participation in decision-making), two measures of

measures of formalization (job codification and rule observation) and the single measure of specialization (routinization of task) to the presence of work alienation. If this study is typical of previous research, each of the bureaucratic measures will be positively related to the level of work alienation: as each of the measures of bureaucratization intensifies, so will the level of work alienation experienced by the worker.

As in earlier research, each of the bureaucratization measures were significantly related to work alienation (see Table 6). However, unlike the earlier studies, the correlation coefficients between the work alienation measure and the centralization and formalization measures were much more modest than previously observed. Aiken and Hage, for example, reported correlation coefficients of .49 or above (see Table 7). In our study, when the criterion for substantive significance was considered, neither the job-codification ($r = .09$) nor the hierarchy-of-authority measure ($r = .18$) could be accepted as significantly related substantively to work alienation.

The differences in the intensities of the correlation coefficients cannot easily be attributed to any one factor. In part, the differences may be related to the small sample used by Aiken and Hage. In their study, the organization was the unit of analysis, and although they surveyed 314 staff members, there was data from only sixteen organizations. Also, the homogeneity of the Aiken and Hage sample may have resulted in the higher coefficient values. Whereas Aiken and Hage surveyed only mental health agencies, our survey included eight different agency types. The homogeneity in the Aiken and Hage survey may have

TABLE 6

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS: WORK ALIENATION
WITH MEASURES OF BUREAUCRATIZATION (ZERO-ORDER PARTIALS)

BUREAUCRATIZATION	WORK ALIENATION
<u>Centralization</u>	
Hierarchy of Authority	0.18*
Participation in Decision-Making	0.29*
<u>Formalization</u>	
Job Codification	0.09*
Rule Observation	0.24*
<u>Specialization</u>	
Routinization of Technology	0.49*

*Significant at .05 level or less

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
BETWEEN AIKEN AND HAGE STUDY AND TEXAS HUMAN SERVICES STUDY

MEASURES OF CENTRALIZATION AND FORMALIZATION	MEASURES OF WORK ALIENATION	
	Aiken and Hage Study	Texas Human Services Study
<u>A. Centralization</u>		
Hierarchy of Authority	.49	.18
Participation in Decisions	-.59	.29*
<u>B. Formalization</u>		
Job Codification	.51	.09
Rule Observation	.55	.24

*The sign on the participation in decision measure is reversed because in the Texas study the response items were rearranged so that the higher score measured the higher degree of bureaucratization.

obscured the relationship bureaucratization and alienation might have when it is considered in a greater variety of organizational settings.

Certainly, our use of a different work alienation measure contributed to a difference in correlation to coefficients. The Aiken and Hage measures defined work alienation in terms of job satisfaction, rather than in terms of a loss of pride in work (see Appendix 0, questions 63 through 68).

Regardless of the reason, only specialization appeared to be strongly related to alienation. Those human services workers whose work had been reduced to invariable routines experienced a greater loss of pride or meaning in their labor than those workers with less routinized work. The other two bureaucratization measures, participation in decision-making and rule observation were more modestly related to work alienation. However, we can expect those human services workers who feel isolated from agency-wide decision-making processes to experience higher levels of work alienation, just as we can expect workers who feel that they are frequently observed for rule violations to be more highly alienated than their co-workers.

Another way we can better understand the relationship between the work alienation and the bureaucratization measures is by looking at the "independent" relationships which exist when controlling for the effects of the bureaucratization measures upon one another. In Table 8 we see generally moderate zero-order relationships existing among the bureaucratization variables. The exceptions are the correlations among the job codification, rule observation, and hierarchy of authority measures; the coefficients among those variables are reasonably strong (the lowest is the 0.42 coefficient between rule observation and job codification).

TABLE 8

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AMONG BUREAUCRATIZATION MEASURES

	HA	PDM	JC	RO	S
HA	1.0				
PDM	0.23*	1.0			
JC	0.52*	.26*	1.0		
RO	0.55*	.28*	.42*	1.0	
S	0.31*	.29*	.21*	.30*	1.0

*Significant at .05 level or less

KEY: HA = Hierarchy of Authority, PDM = Participation in Decision-Making, JC = Job Codification, RO = Rule Observation, and S = Specialization

We, therefore, expect that these measures are operating in concert in their relationship to work alienation.

When controlling for the impact of the bureaucratization measures upon one another in their relationships to work alienation, we find that, once again, the specialization measure is the most useful variable in accounting for alienation (see Table 9). The coefficients for each of the other measures fall well below the level which has been established for substantive significance ($\pm .2236$).

Summary

In testing our hypotheses, we will be observing how the turbulence measures compare to these bureaucratization measures in accounting for the level of work alienation, and how the turbulence measures affect the bureaucratization-turbulence relationship. Although the correlation coefficients for these bureaucratization-work alienation relationships are modest, they do provide a basis for observing changes in their intensity which we can explain in light of the other conditions and variables which are introduced in this study.

The Turbulence-Alienation Connection

As stated earlier, a significant amount of the literature suggests that turbulence creates organizational conditions conducive to the development of work alienation, an argument sufficiently sound that we have hypothesized that the level of environmental turbulence is positively related to the level of work alienation experienced by the worker. In testing this hypothesis, the four dimensions of environmental turbulence which were discussed earlier were used. We, therefore, expect the intensity of work alienation to increase as the levels of

TABLE 9

COEFFICIENTS OF PARTIAL CORRELATIONS INDICATING RELATIVE IMPORTANCE
OF BUREAUCRATIZATION MEASURES IN ACCOUNTING FOR ALIENATION

BUREAUCRATIZATION	WORK ALIENATION
<u>Centralization</u>	
Hierarchy of Authority	0.01
Participation in Decision-Making	0.15*
<u>Formalization</u>	
Job Codification	-0.04*
Rule Observation	-0.10*
<u>Specialization</u>	
Routinization of Technology	0.42*

*Significant at .05 level or less

turbulence in the extraorganizational, intraorganizational, and policy environments increase; we also expect the intensity of work alienation to increase as the worker's perception of the comparative rate of turbulence increases.

When zero-order correlations between the work-alienation and turbulence measures are calculated, we obtain mixed results (see Table 10). Of the four measures only the comparative-turbulence measure and the measure for turbulence in the policy environment are significantly related to work alienation. Of those two measures only the correlation coefficient for the comparative rate of turbulence is sufficiently high to be considered substantively significant: there appears to be a modest relationship between the level of alienation a worker experiences and the worker's feeling that his/her organization is experiencing more change than other agencies. There was a weak correlation between the rate of change a worker is experiencing in the policies with which he works and the level of alienation he is experiencing, although it does not reach the substantive significance requirement. Without any controls, the levels of turbulence in the extraorganizational and intraorganizational environments are not significantly (statistically or substantively) related to work alienation.

The intercorrelations among the turbulence measures do suggest that they are fairly strongly related to one another and are working in concert (see Table 11); each of the turbulence measures is significantly related to one another. As before, we can get a clearer understanding of the "independent" contribution of each measure to the variance in work alienation by controlling for the influence of the remaining

TABLE 10

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS: WORK ALIENATION
WITH MEASURES OF ENVIRONMENTAL TURBULENCE

TURBULENCE MEASURES	WORK ALIENATION
Turbulence in the Extraorganizational Administrative Environment	-0.05
Turbulence in the Intraorganizational Administrative Environment	-0.08
Turbulence in the Policy Environment	0.15*
Comparative Turbulence	0.26*

*Significant at the .05 level or less

TABLE 11

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AMONG TURBULENCE MEASURES

	ET	IT	PT	CT
Turbulence in Extraorganizational Administrative Environment	1.0			
Turbulence in Intraorganizational Administrative Environment	0.35*	1.0		
Turbulence in Policy Environment	0.40*	0.49*	1.0	
Comparative Turbulence	0.28*	0.40*	0.41*	1.0

*Significant at .05 level or less

KEY: ET = Turbulence in Extraorganizational Administrative Environment, IT = Turbulence in Intraorganizational Administrative Environment, P = Turbulence in Policy Environment, and CT = Comparative Rate of Turbulence

turbulence measures (see Table 12). When we do so, an unexpected pattern emerges.

When controls for the other turbulence measures are introduced, we find that the level of turbulence in the extraorganizational environment surfaces as significantly related to work alienation. Although the correlation is weak, the more unexpected finding is the inverse relationship between the two. Evidently, some change in those groups outside of the organization can reduce the level of alienation experienced by the worker. One explanation may be that a low level of change can be associated with task enlargement. In order to manage increased demands from those groups outside of the organization, the worker may resort to new behavior which makes his work less routine.

When controlling for the other turbulence measures, we do find that there is a slight change in the coefficient for the comparative rate of turbulence. The comparative turbulence measure continued to be the most useful turbulence measure in accounting for the level of work alienation. With the control measures introduced, the level of turbulence in the policy environment was no longer statistically significant in accounting for work alienation.

Summary

In the bivariate relationships between work alienation and the four turbulence measures, only two of the turbulence measures, the comparative-rate-of-turbulence and the policy-turbulence measures, were found to be significantly related statistically to work alienation. The value of the correlation coefficient for the policy-turbulence measure was not high enough to meet the criterion for substantive significance.

TABLE 12

COEFFICIENTS OF PARTIAL CORRELATIONS INDICATING RELATIVE IMPORTANCE
OF TURBULENCE MEASURES IN ACCOUNTING FOR ALIENATION

TURBULENCE MEASURES	WORK ALIENATION
Turbulence in the Extraorganizational Administrative Environment	-0.15*
Turbulence in the Intraorganizational Administrative Environment	-0.02
Turbulence in the Policy Environment	0.10
Comparative Turbulence	0.24*

*Significant at the .05 level or less

When control measures were introduced, only the comparative-turbulence measure met the criteria for both statistical and substantive significance. Also, under the control measures, the level of turbulence in the extraorganizational environment was significantly related (statistically) to work alienation; the relationship was inverse, however, suggesting that some turbulence in this group, that is, those groups outside of the organization who work with the human services professionals, may reduce the level of work alienation.

When contrasted to the bureaucratization measures it appears that bureaucratization rather than turbulence is more useful in explaining the presence of work alienation. Next, we look at a possible explanation for why the bureaucratization measure and the comparative-turbulence and policy-turbulence measures are related to work alienation.

Control and Work Alienation

Our argument has been that turbulence and bureaucratization, by reducing the worker's control over his labor, create conditions ripe for alienating the worker from his labor. In order to evaluate the role control plays in the development of alienation, we hypothesized that the worker's sense of control over his labor is inversely related to the levels of work alienation, turbulence, and bureaucratization experienced by the worker.

Our data supported the control-worker alienation relationship (see Table 13). From the data, we can conclude that there is a significant and reasonably strong inverse relationship between work alienation and control. A sense of control is associated with the level of alienation experienced by the worker: the data suggest that workers who experience

TABLE 13

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN CONTROL AND WORK ALIENATION,
BUREAUCRATIZATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL TURBULENCE (ZERO-ORDER)

	CONTROL
WORK ALIENATION	-0.39*
BUREAUCRATIZATION	
<u>Centralization</u>	
Hierarchy of Authority	-0.34*
Participation in Decision-Making	-0.27*
<u>Formalization</u>	
Job Codification	-0.27*
Rule Observation	-0.33*
<u>Specialization</u>	
Routinization of Task	-0.22*
TURBULENCE	
Extraorganizational	-0.04
Intraorganizational	-0.01
Policy	-0.13*
Comparative Rate of Turbulence	-0.24*

*Significant at .05 level or less

lower levels of control over their work environment will also experience higher levels of alienation from their work. Bivariate analysis also confirms the relationship between each of the bureaucratization measures and control. The turbulence measures as a set, however, were less useful in explaining the worker's sense of control: only the comparative rate of turbulence measure was significantly related both substantively and statistically to control, although the level of turbulence in the policy environment was statistically significant.

Partial correlations were used once again to determine which of the variables, when they were viewed independently from their set, were most useful in explaining control (see Tables 14 and 15). After controlling for the effects of the other bureaucratization variables, the coefficient for each bureaucratization measure was weakened substantially. The reduced correlation coefficients suggest that the bureaucratization measures are working together to reduce or increase the workers control over his labor. When controlling the turbulence measures for the impact on their interrelationships, we discovered that the coefficient for the comparative rate of turbulence measure was the least changed of any of our bureaucratization or turbulence measures, indicating that comparative turbulence is more strongly related to control, in terms of its unique contribution, than are any of our other measures, although even it fell below the level of substantive significance. As a set of measures, the bureaucratization measures are more useful than the turbulence measures in explaining the worker's sense of control; yet our findings also suggest that turbulence cannot be dismissed as a factor in contributing to a change in the worker's perception that he can "control" those processes necessary to his work, particularly when those changes

TABLE 14

COEFFICIENTS OF PARTIAL CORRELATIONS INDICATING IMPORTANCE
OF BUREAUCRATIZATION MEASURES IN ACCOUNTING FOR CONTROL

	CONTROL
BUREAUCRATIZATION MEASURES	
<u>Centralization</u>	
Hierarchy of Authority	-0.15*
Participation in Decision-Making	-0.17*
<u>Formalization</u>	
Job Codification	-0.04
Rule Observation	-0.08*
<u>Specialization</u>	
Routinization of Task	-0.09*

*Significant at .05 level or less

TABLE 15

COEFFICIENTS OF PARTIAL CORRELATIONS INDICATING IMPORTANCE
OF TURBULENCE MEASURES IN ACCOUNTING FOR CONTROL

TURBULENCE MEASURES	CONTROL
Turbulence in the Extraorganizational Administrative Environment	0.01
Turbulence in the Intraorganizational Administrative Environment	0.09*
Turbulence in the Policy Environment	-0.07
Comparative Turbulence	-0.20*
*Significant at the .05 level or less	

leave the worker feeling that his agency is experiencing more turbulence than other agencies of his kind. Both bureaucratization and turbulence have a role in the development of control.

If certain dimensions of bureaucratization and turbulence are related to the worker's sense of control, can we then accept the logic that turbulence and bureaucratization are related to work alienation through the level of control? When the bureaucratization and turbulence measures are correlated with the work alienation measure, we can observe the extent to which they relate to work alienation through the worker's sense of control by controlling for control (see Table 16). A reduction in the value of the correlation coefficients would indicate that the variable is, in part, relating through the worker's sense of control. The extent of the reduction would suggest the extent to which bureaucratization and turbulence contribute to the variance in work alienation through the control variable.

In each bureaucratization and turbulence measure there was a decrease in the intensity of the correlation coefficient. There were substantial drops in each of the correlation coefficients for the centralization and formalization measures, and each of those measures appears to affect the level of work alienation through the lack of control associated with increased bureaucratization.

The specialization measure, however, experienced a rather low drop in the strength of its correlation coefficient with work alienation. Although work alienation correlates more highly with the specialization measure than it does with either centralization or formalization measure, it does not appear to relate substantially by affecting the worker's sense of control.

TABLE 16

ZERO-ORDER AND PARTIAL CORRELATIONS CONTROLLING FOR CONTROL
BETWEEN WORK ALIENATION AND BUREAUCRATIZATION
AND ENVIRONMENTAL TURBULENCE

	WORK ALIENATION		
	Zero Order Correlation	Partial Correlation	Change in Coefficient
BUREAUCRATIZATION			
<u>Centralization</u>			
Hierarchy of Authority	0.18*	.07	-.11
Participation in Decision-Making	0.29*	.20*	-.09
<u>Formalization</u>			
Job Codification	0.09*	.01*	-.08
Rule Observation	0.24*	.20*	-.04
<u>Specialization</u>			
Routinization of Task	0.49*	.46*	-.03
ENVIRONMENTAL TURBULENCE			
Extraorganizational	-0.05	-0.03	-.02
Intraorganizational	-0.08	-0.09	+.01
Turbulence in Policy Environment	0.15*	0.13*	-.02
Comparative Rate of Turbulence	0.26*	0.19*	-.07

*Significant at .05 level or less

Of the two measures of turbulence which were significantly related to work alienation statistically, only the comparative rate of turbulence seemed to work through the control measure. The coefficient for the zero order correlation between work alienation and the level of turbulence in the policy environment was not substantially altered when controlling for the control measure.

Our findings do support the position that bureaucratization and turbulence relate to work alienation by affecting the worker's sense of control. We can establish a control structure; however, we also must recognize that the imperfect variance among our measures suggests that the bureaucratization and turbulence measures contribute to the development of alienation through other causes as well.

Summary

The hypotheses relating control to work alienation and bureaucratization proved to be accurate. Work alienation and the five bureaucratization measures were all significantly related, both substantively and significantly, to the worker's sense of control. As the level of control increases, the level of work alienation decreases. Also, as the level of bureaucratization increases, the level of control decreases.

When partial correlations were run on the bureaucratization measures controlling for the impact of the remaining bureaucratization measures, the correlation coefficients for each of the measures decreased substantially, indicating that the bureaucratization measures highly intercorrelate with one another and, therefore, are acting in concert upon the sense of control. The role of turbulence was less convincing. Of the four turbulence measures only turbulence in the policy

environment and the comparative rate of turbulence were significantly related to control, and only the comparative measure had a correlation coefficient sufficiently strong to be considered substantively significant. When, however, partial correlations were run between the turbulence measures and the control measure while controlling for the remaining turbulence measures, we found that the comparative rate of turbulence measure was more strongly related to the control measure than any other variable considered--bureaucratization or turbulence--even though it did not meet the criteria for substantive significance.

Next, by partialling out the effects of control in the work alienation-bureaucratization and work alienation-turbulence relationships, we were able to determine if the turbulence and bureaucratization variables were relating to work alienation through the worker's sense of control. The data indicates that the centralization and formalization measures do relate to work alienation substantially through control; the correlation coefficient for specialization changed only marginally when the control condition was introduced.

Among the turbulence variables, only the comparative rate of turbulence related to work alienation through control. Although turbulence in the policy environment was significantly related to work alienation, there was only a marginal shift in its correlation under the control conditions.

From the data it is possible to conclude that, except for the specialization measure, those measures of environmental turbulence and bureaucratization which relate most strongly to work alienation do so in

part, though not entirely, through affecting the workers sense of control.

Alienation in Conditions of High Turbulence

In the literature review, we found evidence that as the level of turbulence increased conditions conducive to the development of higher levels of work alienation were amplified, which suggested that the relationship between work alienation and bureaucratization was conditional to the work environment. In these last hypotheses, we expect to find under low-turbulence conditions that bureaucratization accounts for a greater percentage of the variance in work alienation than does turbulence; under conditions of high-level turbulence we expect the turbulence measures to account for the greater percentage of the variance in work alienation. We also hypothesized that under conditions of high-level turbulence, the bureaucratization measures would be inversely related to the level of work alienation. This last hypothesis is based upon evidence that the worker can resort to bureaucratic structure in trying to manage the turbulence in his environment.

The first two hypotheses were accurately predicted (see Tables 17, 18, and 19). Under conditions of low-level turbulence the bureaucratization measures accounted for 28.3% of the variance in the work alienation measure and the turbulence measures accounted for 13.3% of the variance. Under conditions of high-level turbulence, turbulence accounted for 44.6% of the variance in work alienation, and the bureaucratization measures accounted for 14.0%. Our data suggest that the relationship between work alienation and bureaucratization is conditional to the

TABLE 17

STEPWISE REGRESSION OF WORK ALIENATION
WITH BUREAUCRATIZATION AND TURBULENCE MEASURES
IN LOW-TURBULENCE ENVIRONMENTS*

Variable Ranking	ALIENATION WITH	R^2	R^2 Change
1	Specialization	0.25301	0.25301
2	Comparative Rate of Turbulence	0.33111	0.07809
3	Intraorganizational Turbulence	0.37710	0.04599
4	Participation in Decision-Making	0.38816	0.01107
5	Job Codification	0.39604	0.00788
6	Rule Observation	0.40518	0.00915
7	Turbulence in Policy Environment	0.41029	0.00511
8	Extraorganizational Turbulence	0.41376	0.00347
9	Hierarchy of Authority	0.41521	0.00145

*Low turbulence calculated by using standard deviation

TABLE 18

STEPWISE REGRESSION OF WORK ALIENATION
WITH BUREAUCRATIZATION AND TURBULENCE MEASURES
IN HIGH-TURBULENCE ENVIRONMENTS*

Variable Ranking	ALIENATION WITH	R ²	R ² Change
1	Turbulence in Policy Environment	0.26798	0.26798
2	Comparative Rate of Turbulence	0.42494	0.15697
3	Hierarchy of Authority	0.49746	0.07252
4	Participation in Decision-Making	0.53311	0.03564
5	Job Codification	0.54794	0.01483
6	Intraorganizational Turbulence	0.56266	0.01472
7	Rule Observation	0.57259	0.00993
8	Extraorganizational Turbulence	0.57936	0.00676
9	Specialization	0.58676	0.00741

*High turbulence calculated by using standard deviation

TABLE 19

PERCENTAGES OF VARIANCE IN WORK ALIENATION ATTRIBUTED
TO BUREAUCRATIZATION AND TURBULENCE MEASURES
IN HIGH- AND LOW-TURBULENCE ENVIRONMENTS

EXPLANATORY VARIABLES	TURBULENCE LEVEL	
	High	Low
Turbulence	44.6%	13.3%
Bureaucratization	14.0%	23.3%

level of turbulence. In low-turbulence situations the primary contributor to work alienation is indeed bureaucratization; under conditions of high-level turbulence, however, the rate of change experienced by the worker replaces bureaucratization as the major factor contributing to work alienation.

There is no evidence, however, that the worker is resorting to bureaucratization in an effort to buttress the turbulence in his work environment (see Table 20). No change of direction in the relationship between the variables is noted. In both high- and low-turbulence environments, the bureaucratization variables which are significantly related to work alienation are all positively related to that measure. Only the correlation coefficient for job codification changed from a positive to a negative when the level of turbulence shifted from low to high. The job codification measure, however, was not significantly related statistically to work alienation in the high-turbulence situations. The human services worker who works in a highly bureaucratic environment and in conditions of high-level turbulence encounters alienative conditions both from within and from without the organization.

Chapter Summary

Our findings indicate that under conditions where the level of turbulence is not being controlled bureaucratization is more helpful in understanding the development of work alienation than is environmental turbulence. In the first set of hypotheses we learned that among human services workers in our sample only the comparative rate of turbulence and turbulence in the policy environment were significantly related to

TABLE 20

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN WORK ALIENATION
AND BUREAUCRATIZATION IN LOW- AND HIGH-TURBULENCE ENVIRONMENTS

	WORK ALIENATION	
	Low Turbulence	High Turbulence
BUREAUCRATIZATION		
<u>Centralization</u>		
Hierarchy of Authority	0.239*	0.334*
Participation in Decision-Making	0.343*	0.405*
<u>Formalization</u>		
Job Codification	0.066*	-0.002
Rule Observation	0.318*	0.269*
<u>Specialization</u>		
Routinization of Task	0.503*	0.442*

*Significant at .05 level or less

work alienation, and only the comparative rate of turbulence was substantively significant. By contrast, the specialization, participation-in-decision-making, and rule observation measures were significantly related, both substantively and statistically to work alienation; all of the bureaucratization measures met the criterion for statistical significance.

In the second set of hypotheses, which inquired into the relationship between the worker's sense of control over his labor and the work alienation, bureaucratization, and turbulence measures, we found that work alienation and control are significantly and inversely related to one another. We can expect the worker's intensity of alienation to increase as level of control experienced by the worker decreases.

We also found that all bureaucratization measures were significantly, statistically and substantively related (inversely) to the worker's sense of control: as each level of bureaucratization increased, we could expect a decrease in the worker's sense of control.

Of the four turbulence measures, only the comparative rate of turbulence and the level of turbulence in the policy environment were statistically significant in their relationship to control, and only the comparative measure was substantively significant. The role of turbulence in explaining the intensity of the worker's sense of control was not unimportant, however. When controls for the dimensional interrelationships within the bureaucratization and turbulence measures are introduced, we find that the comparative-turbulence measure, above all other measures of turbulence and bureaucratization, is most strongly related to control; its unique contribution to control is higher than

the contribution of any other measure, although even it did not meet the criteria for substantive significance.

When the turbulence/bureaucratization-control-alienation connection was considered, we found that the bureaucratization variables, as a set, conformed to the expected pattern more closely than did the turbulence measures. Although the specialization measure did not affect work alienation through the control measure, the centralization and formalization measures do.

Among the turbulence variables, only the comparative-turbulence measure related substantially to work alienation through the control measure. The data suggest that the level of turbulence in the policy environment effects work alienation only marginally through its relationship to the worker's sense of control. We can, however, from our findings accept the argument that turbulence and bureaucratization, through their various dimensions, affect the worker's control over his work, which, in turn, affects the intensity of the worker's alienation.

The last set of hypotheses introduces controls for the level of turbulence. As expected, in conditions of low-level turbulence, the bureaucratization measures account for more of the variance in work alienation than do the turbulence measures. The turbulence measures, however, explain more of the variance in work alienation than do the bureaucratization measures when conditions of high-level turbulence prevail. Contrary to our hypothesis, there is no evidence that bureaucratization is used as a defense mechanism against turbulence. In both high- and low-turbulence situations, the level of bureaucratization is positively related to the development of work alienation.

Our findings indicate that different patterns between alienation, control, bureaucratization, and turbulence exist in high- and low-turbulence environments. Without controlling for turbulence, the turbulence variables seem to wash out in their importance to work alienation. Whenever controls for turbulence are introduced, however, the turbulence variables take on a richness they did not previously have, a richness we will try to tap in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

A DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS: A CONDITIONAL INTERPRETATION OF THE BUREAUCRATIZATION-WORK ALIENATION RELATIONSHIP

Our findings have been mixed. In the first set of hypotheses we expected to find that the level of turbulence in a worker's task environment is significantly related to the level of work alienation which the worker experiences. Of the four dimensions of environmental turbulence (extraorganizational turbulence, intraorganizational turbulence, turbulence in the policy environment, and the comparative rate of turbulence), only the comparative rate of turbulence and the level of turbulence in the policy environment were significantly related to work alienation; only the comparative rate of turbulence was substantively related to work alienation.

In the second set of hypotheses, the worker's sense of control was the focal variable. We first hypothesized that the worker's sense of control over work processes is inversely related to work alienation. Then we hypothesized that bureaucratization and environmental turbulence are inversely related to control. The hypotheses relating work alienation and the bureaucratization measures (hierarchy of authority, participation in decision-making, job codification, rule observation, and specialization) were each confirmed--both substantively and statistically. Of

the turbulence measures, only the comparative rate of turbulence met the criteria for substantive and statistical significance; the measure for turbulence in the policy environment met only the criterion for statistical significance. The hypotheses for intraorganizational and extraorganizational turbulence were not confirmed.

In the last set of hypotheses we introduced the conditional relationships. Under conditions of low-level turbulence we expected that the bureaucratization measures would explain a greater percentage of the variance in work alienation than would the turbulence variables. Under conditions of high-level turbulence we expected to find that the turbulence variables accounted for a greater percentage of the variance in work alienation than would the bureaucratization variables. We also hypothesized that under high-turbulence conditions increased bureaucratization would be used as a defense against environmental turbulence.

The first two hypotheses were confirmed. Under conditions of high-level turbulence, the turbulence measures account for a greater percent of the variance of work alienation, while in the low-turbulence environments the bureaucratization measures accounted for the greater percent of the variance in work alienation. The last hypothesis was not confirmed: there was no statistical evidence that the worker resorted to bureaucratization in managing the turbulence which he encounters in his job.

We will try to explain work alienation by looking for patterns which emerged in our two control groups, high and low turbulence settings, and comparing these patterns to the findings in the entire sample population.

Alienation in High-Turbulence Settings

Under conditions of high-level turbulence, a general pattern of high levels of turbulence, high levels of bureaucratization, low levels of worker control and high levels of work alienation emerged. Because of the dimensional approach we used, we found that only certain measures of turbulence and bureaucratization were useful in explaining work alienation.

Alienation and Turbulence

In the highly turbulent group, two turbulence measures, the comparative rate of turbulence and the level of turbulence in the policy environment are more strongly related to work alienation than were any of the bureaucratization measures. Zero order correlations revealed that under highly turbulent conditions work alienation is most strongly related to the level of turbulence in the policy environment (see Table 21). Apparently rapid change in government policies creates conditions which result in a loss of pride or meaning in work. This seems consistent with Blau's observation about worker dissatisfaction being related to an abundance of new rules. It is probable in the highly-turbulent environment that the rapid introduction of new policies makes the work harder to define since the policies would change either the substance of the job definition or the processes used in the labor.

When the impact of the remaining turbulence measures were controlled, the relationship between policy turbulence and work alienation remained high; it fell from .54 to .53 (See Table 22). The remaining turbulence measures are effecting the relationship between the level of turbulence in policy environment and work alienation only marginally.

TABLE 21

ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN WORK ALIENATION
AND BUREAUCRATIZATION AND TURBULENCE
IN HIGH- AND LOW-TURBULENCE SETTINGS

BUREAUCRATIZATION	WORK ALIENATION	
	High Turbulence	Low Turbulence
<u>Centralization</u>		
Hierarchy of Authority	.33*	.11
Participation in Decision-Making	.41*	.23*
<u>Formalization</u>		
Job Codification	.002	.02
Rule Observation	.27*	.16*
<u>Specialization</u>		
Routinization of Task	.44*	.56*
<u>TURBULENCE</u>		
Extraorganizational	-.05	-.32*
Intraorganizational	-.17	-.06
Policy	.46*	.37*
Comparative Rate of Turbulence	.54*	-.12

*Significant at .05 level or less

TABLE 22

PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN TURBULENCE MEASURES
AND WORK ALIENATION HIGH- AND LOW-TURBULENCE SETTINGS
(CONTROLLING FOR OTHER TURBULENCE MEASURES)

TURBULENCE	WORK ALIENATION	
	High Turbulence	Low Turbulence
Extraorganizational	.14	-.21*
Intraorganizational	-.14	-.12
Policy	.48*	.25*
Comparative Rate of Turbulence	.53*	.03

*Significant at .05 level or less

In part the level of turbulence in the policy environment is accomplishing this through its association with low levels of control.

Similar observation can be made for the comparative rate of turbulence measure. The comparative rate of turbulence measure was second only to the policy turbulence measure in the strength of its relationship to work alienation. If a worker perceives the rate of change in his agency to be much more accelerated than the rate of change occurring in other agencies, he is also more likely to experience more intense feelings of alienation from his labor than those workers perceiving slower rates of change in comparable agencies. When the impact of the other turbulence measures upon the comparative rate of turbulence—work alienation relationship is controlled, the intensity of their relationship increases, changing from .46 to .48; the impact of the other turbulence measures evidently mutes the comparative measures impact upon work alienation.

One of the unexpected findings is that in the highly-turbulent environment, there was no statistically significant relationship between the comparative measure and the worker's sense of control as there had been in the uncontrolled environment. If the comparative turbulence measure is not significantly related to control, what is the nature of its relationship to work alienation? One explanation is that the comparative turbulence measure may be reflecting the worker's frustration level. It may be useful to view the measure in the same light as measures of various relative deprivation theories. If the worker feels that his work is being performed in an environment more turbulent than other agencies performing comparable tasks, the level of work alienation may result more from a sense of frustration than from a lack of control.

Neither the level of turbulence in the extraorganizational environment nor the level of turbulence in the intraorganizational environment were significantly related to work alienation in highly turbulent environments. Throughout this study these two measures have had little utility, either in controlled or uncontrolled conditions. Although the reason for the lack of relationship between those two measures and work alienation is not clear, some explanations do come to mind.

In one way these environments do effect work alienation in highly turbulent environments, but they do so through changes in policies. The operational measure for turbulence the policy environment does include changes in policies for the agency itself as well as for other agencies with which the worker works. To the degree those groups can change job content and processes affecting the rate of turbulence among intraorganizational and extraorganizational structures, they are significant to the development of work alienation. Perhaps one reason the operational measure for turbulence in the extraorganizational environment is not significantly related to work alienation is that those groups, even in periods of rapid change, typically do not make demands upon the worker which cannot be managed. Clients, for example, are a group which we would have expected to be a source of work alienation. However, high levels of client passivity, which we can assume characterizes human services in Texas given our political traditions, would not result in a loss of work control for the worker regardless of the rate of client change. There was not, in fact, a significant relationship between the control measure and the rate of change in the extraorganizational environment.

What is more quixotic is the relationship between change in the intraorganizational environment and work alienation under highly turbulent conditions. Although there is no significant relationship with work alienation, the intraorganizational environment is significantly related, both statistically and substantively, to the level of control, (see Table 23). The unexpected point here is that it is a positive, not an inverse, relationship. As the rate of change of internal structures increased, the intensity of the worker's sense of control increased. Under such circumstances it may be that the internal structure loosens its control on the worker. The worker may be able to assert more of him-or-herself into the work, thereby increasing his/her control over their work, due to less rigid authority structures.

There is evidence that this may be occurring. In zero-order partials between turbulence in the intraorganizational environment and the bureaucratization measures in conditions of high-level turbulence, there was a significant relationship between intraorganizational turbulence and job codification ($r = -.28$). Evidently in highly turbulent environments, as the rate of intraorganizational turbulence increases there is some reduction in the workers' feelings that they must consult rules and regulations in the performance of their world. A similar trend is observed with the participation in decision-making measure.

Alienation and Bureaucratization

When there are high rates of turbulence in highly bureaucratic organizations, the worker encounters yet another source of alienation, the bureaucratic structure itself. As mentioned before, we could find no evidence that the worker was using the bureaucratic structure to defend himself against the turbulence he encounters. We did notice,

TABLE 23

ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CONTROL AND BUREAUCRATIZATION
AND TURBULENCE IN HIGH- AND LOW-TURBULENCE SETTINGS

BUREAUCRATIZATION	CONTROL	
	High Turbulence	Low Turbulence
<u>Centralization</u>		
Hierarchy of Authority	-.37*	-.47*
Participation in Decision-Making	-.22*	-.16
<u>Formalization</u>		
Job Codification	.33*	-.05
Rule Observation	-.31*	-.33
<u>Specialization</u>		
Routinization of Task	-.30*	-.27*
TURBULENCE		
Extraorganizational	.16	.10
Intraorganizational	.24*	-.16
Policy	-.21	-.22*
Comparative Rate of Turbulence	-.36	-.22*

*Significant at .05 level or less

however, that in highly turbulent environments that the significance (substantive) of all the bureaucratization measures, except specialization, with alienation increased. All of the bureaucratization measures except job codification were significantly related to work alienation.

When we review the role the centralization and formalization measures have in the development of work alienation we find that under conditions of high-level turbulence the centralization measures become substantially more prominent in their explanation of work alienation, but the formalization measures do not. Under general conditions, i.e., without dividing the population into high- and low-turbulence groups, the correlation coefficients between work alienation and the centralization measures (hierarchy of authority, $r = .18$; participation in decision-making, $r = .29$) are modest. However, under conditions of high-level turbulence, the coefficient for the hierarchy of authority measure increased to $.33$, and the coefficient for the participation in decision-making measure increased to $.41$.

The formalization measures, job codification and rule observation, did not follow the pattern of the centralization measures. In the general population with no controls used, the job codification measure was very weakly related, substantively, to work alienation ($r = .09$); among those in the subset of the population which experienced high levels of turbulence, the job codification measure was neither substantively significant ($r = .002$) nor statistically significant. There was a slight increase in the rule observation-work alienation coefficient evident in the comparison of the general survey set and the high-turbulence subset: in the general survey population the coefficient was $.24$, and in the high turbulence group it was $.27$.

The increased correlation coefficients between the centralization and work alienation measures, which typifies the high turbulence environment, indicate the workers' need for increased flexibility, a flexibility needed for high worker morale. When we controlled for the impact of the various bureaucratization measures upon one another, we found that the participation in decision-making measure, in terms of its independent relationship to work alienation, was more strongly related to work alienation than any of the other bureaucratization measures, even specialization (see Table 24). In highly turbulent conditions, workers need to be able to participate in agency-wide decision-making process if levels of work alienation are to be minimized.

The increased correlation coefficient for the hierarchy of authority measure also indicated that under conditions of high level turbulence, the worker's ability to implement his tasks without interference from above is more important in the development of work alienation than it is in conditions of low level turbulence. Of all our bureaucratization measures, the hierarchy of authority correlated most strongly with the workers sense of control ($r = -.37$).

This apparent need for increased worker flexibility during times of high level turbulence, is also seen in the one measure of formalization which was significantly related to work alienation: rule observation. The rule observation measure, which indicates the extent to which a worker is being overseen for rule violations, increased slightly in the strength of its relationship to work alienation under conditions of high level turbulence, from .24 to .27. However modest, we can expect that during highly turbulent times, increased attempts by the agency to check the worker for rule violations will exacerbate the development of

TABLE 24

PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
 BETWEEN BUREAUCRATIZATION MEASURES AND WORK ALIENATION
 IN HIGH- AND LOW-TURBULENCE SETTINGS
 (CONTROLLING FOR OTHER BUREAUCRATIZATION MEASURES)

BUREAUCRATIZATION	WORK ALIENATION	
	High Turbulence	Low Turbulence
<u>Centralization</u>		
Hierarchy of Authority	.15	-.01
Participation in Decision-Making	.34*	.07
<u>Formalization</u>		
Job Codification	-.23*	-.02
Rule Observation	.19	-.0005
<u>Specialization</u>		
Routinization of Task	.23	.51

*Significant at .05 level or less

work alienation. If the worker feels that the agency is constantly reviewing his work for rule violations it is likely that the agency is inhibiting the workers' need to take new risks in performing his work in rapidly changing conditions.

Curiously, under high-turbulence conditions, the specialization measure decreased slightly in its substantive significance, from .49 in the population without turbulence controls to .44 in the high-turbulence population. The findings still indicate that the division of labor may be too narrow or too routine for the work to remain meaningful.

The data support the contention that under highly turbulent conditions, bureaucratization exacerbates conditions conducive to alienation. Although, turbulence may account for a greater percentage of the variance in work alienation than the bureaucratization variables, bureaucratization is still a factor contributing to the development of work alienation.

Although we did not find support for the one hypothesis that the level of bureaucratization may be used as a defense against turbulence in the environment, we cannot dismiss the argument completely. First of all, our methodology did not allow us to observe the behavior of workers in low turbulent environments and then observe those same workers in highly turbulent situations; we were not able to match strategies with individual workers. Longitudinal analysis would provide research possibilities which we can not in our research design. Secondly our assumption in testing the hypothesis may have been incorrect. The testing procedure assumes that the bureaucratization measures if they are being used to manage the level of turbulence in the environment will be inversely related to work alienation. It may be possible that the

worker by resorting to bureaucratization as a defense is using one set of alienating conditions (the level of bureaucratization) to combat another set of alienating conditions (turbulence).

A third point suggested by our data is that high levels of bureaucratization simply do not provide the opportunity to reverse the effects of turbulence. If the level of bureaucratization is employed to combat turbulence, it might be used to prevent or minimize further loss of control over the turbulence, but we have no evidence that it can effectively be used to increase the worker's control over the turbulence in his environment.

Summary

Under conditions of high level turbulence, workers in highly bureaucratic agencies encounter alienative conditions from both the level of turbulence and the level of bureaucratization. Increased rates of change in policies, in particular, are associated with lower levels of control for the worker over his tasks. If the worker feels that his agency is experiencing higher levels of turbulence than are comparable agencies, he also is likely to experience higher levels of work alienation.

Also an unexpected relationship between the level of turbulence in the intraorganizational environment and the worker's sense of control exists: as the level of turbulence in the intraorganizational environment increased, the level of control increased (a phenomenon we accredited to ambiguity in authority patterns which might accompany change within an agency).

We also found that high levels of bureaucratization work to aggravate work alienation. Our findings suggest that workers need

flexibility in negotiating the turbulence which they encounter in their work. The strength of the correlation coefficients for the hierarchy of authority, participation-in-decision-making, and rule observation measures were each stronger in highly turbulent environments than in the uncontrolled environment. The increased strength of the correlation coefficients suggests the increased need to be free from bureaucratic constraint in trying to manage the consequences of environmental turbulence.

Granting the limitations of our research design, we still could find no evidence in our data that the level of bureaucratization was used to counter the level of turbulence in the work environment. The level of bureaucratization was not seen as a variable useful to the worker in establishing control over turbulence in the work environment.

Alienation in Low-Turbulence Settings

The pattern which emerged in the low-turbulence settings generally was one of low-turbulence, low levels of bureaucratization, high levels of control, and low levels of work alienation. In the low-turbulence settings we countered a shift from the turbulence measures to the bureaucratization measures, particularly specialization, as the variables most useful in understanding the development of work alienation.

Alienation and Turbulence

Under conditions of low-level turbulence the bureaucratization measures accounted for more of the variance in work alienation than did the turbulence measures, yet under these conditions two turbulence measures did relate significantly to work alienation, the comparative rate of turbulence ($r = .37$) and the level of turbulence in the

extraorganizational environment ($r = -.32$). In each of the three groups we have studied--the entire sample and the two subsets of high- and low-turbulence--the comparative rate of turbulence measure has been the only measure of turbulence which was significantly related, both substantively and statistically, to work alienation. The comparative rate of turbulence measure was not significantly related to the worker's sense of control in the highly turbulent environment but was significantly related to control in the low-turbulence group as well as in the broader sample.

Only in the low-turbulence environment did the turbulence in the extraorganizational environment relate significantly to work alienation. In the low-turbulence environment, however, the rate of change in the extraorganizational environment is inversely related to work alienation; rather than exacerbating work alienation, extraorganizational turbulence was associated with lower rates of work alienation. One reason may be that moderate levels of change in the extraorganizational environment create conditions which allow the worker to exercise more discretion in their work. The level of extraorganizational turbulence, for example, is inversely related to the hierarchy of authority measure ($r = -.25$), the rule observation measure ($r = -.30$), and the specialization measure ($r = -.38$). Higher levels of extraorganizational turbulence were associated with more freedom of task implementation, lower levels of rule observation, and low levels of task routinization. Without the complicating factor of high levels of policy turbulence, the worker would be able to exercise discretion with lower levels of risk involved since the policies themselves would be more stable. A moderate level of turbulence would then provide a healthy challenge to the worker.

Alienation and Bureaucratization

In the low-turbulent environment, the specialization measure was more strongly related to work alienation ($r = .56$) than to any other variable, bureaucratization or turbulence. One explanation can be found in boredom which may be associated with highly routinized tasks. Another explanation may be found in the supervision which is associated with the performance of routine tasks. There was a fairly strong relationship between specialization and rule observation ($r = .49$) and hierarchy of authority ($r = .30$). An increase in the specialization of task is associated with both increased observance for rule violations and more interference from supervisors in task implementation.

Rule observation and participation in decision-making were the only other bureaucratization measures which were significantly related to work alienation among those working in low-turbulence environments. There was a modest relationship between the extent to which a worker participated in agency wide decisions and work alienation ($r = .23$); the bivariate relationship between rule observation and work alienation was weaker however ($r = .16$). In the low-turbulence environment the extent to which a worker was observed for rule observation did not meet the criteria for substantive significance. In fact when we controlled for the impact of the bureaucratization measures upon one another, the specialization measure was the only bureaucratization measure which was both statistically and substantively related to work alienation ($r = .51$). As we have already observed the hierarchy of authority measure and the rule observation measure appeared to relate to work alienation through interaction with the specialization measure; highly routinized labor was associated with elevated levels of both supervisor

interference in the worker's job implementation and supervision for rule violations.

In the low-turbulence environment, alienation from work seems to come more from a need for task enlargement rather than in an effort to control turbulence or even to participate in organizational decision-making. The correlation coefficients between control and work alienation support this position. In the highly turbulent setting the relationship between work alienation and control was higher ($r = -.43$) than in either the uncontrolled ($r = -.39$) or low-turbulence ($r = -.32$) settings.

Summary

In conditions of low level turbulence the bureaucratization measures accounted for a high percentage of the variance in work alienation. Yet different reasons seemed to surface. In the low-turbulence environments the centralization and formalization measures are not as substantively significant in the development of work alienation as in either the highly turbulent or uncontrolled populations. The specialization measure, however, becomes more significant in accounting for work alienation in low turbulence settings than it did under the high turbulent or uncontrolled conditions. In the low turbulence conditions, the alienation was born less in the lack of control and evidently more in the need for task enlargement. The level of specialization was also significantly related to the intensity of hierarchy of authority and rule observation. Those workers who performed highly routinized work also face more supervision than did those in less routine work.

Our data also indicated that under conditions of low-level turbulence, the level of turbulence in the extraorganizational environment is

significantly related to the level of work alienation; the relationship was inverse however. Increased turbulence was significantly related to lower levels of work alienation. Some turbulence in this group actually appears to reduce work alienation, perhaps because it creates conditions which result in job enlargement. The level of turbulence in the extra-organizational environment was also related to lower levels of task routinization and employee supervision, conditions which would allow the work to become less repetitive and narrow in focus. As in the other groups, if the workers perceive the rate of change in his agency to be more rapid than the rate of change in comparable agencies, his level of alienation can be expected to be higher than those workers who do not perceive higher rate of change.

By using the high- and low-turbulence groups we have been able to identify patterns in the bureaucratization-turbulence-work alienation relationships which were masked when we did not control for the level of turbulence. We have, for example, observed that under conditions of high-level turbulence, the level of turbulence in the policy environment is highly related to work alienation, although without the control measure and in the low-turbulence group it is not a viable explanation for the level of work alienation. We also observed that the centralization measures were much more useful in explaining work alienation in high-turbulent environments than they were in low-turbulence environments. In the high turbulence environments the alienation appeared to be related to the workers inability to control those processes related to work, a lack of control related primarily to conditions rooted in the turbulence. The level of bureaucratization amplified the alienating conditions.

When we did not control for the level of alienation, the bureaucratization measures were more useful in explaining work alienation than were the turbulence measures; only the comparative rate of turbulence measure was a significant factor in explaining work alienation. Again, the worker's sense of control is useful in explaining the presence of work alienation, but here, the bureaucratization measures seem to curb the worker's control more than do the turbulence measures.

In the low turbulence group the bureaucratization measures again account for more of the variance in work alienation than do the turbulence measures, yet under these conditions the worker's sense of control does not seem to be the primary explanation for the development of alienation. Under low turbulence conditions the routinization of task seems to be the primary explanation. Under these conditions the level of turbulence in the extraorganizational environment even lowered the level of alienation by creating conditions conducive to job enlargement.

Patterns of Work Alienation in Texas Human Services Programs

Although we did not hypothesize any relationships among the demographic characteristics of our sample and the work alienation, control, turbulence, and bureaucratization variables, we can use our demographic variables to isolate groups which are experiencing significantly higher levels of alienation than are other groups. We can then attempt to identify the alienating conditions in these agencies. When the findings are interpreted in context of the human services agencies surveyed, identifiable patterns among bureaucratization, work alienation, turbulence, and control emerge.

Alienation in State and Local Agencies

Human services workers employed in the state agencies (Texas Employment Commission, Texas Department of Human Resources, the Texas Rehabilitation Commission), for example, had a significantly higher mean score on the work alienation measure than did those working for the local/regional agencies (alcohol and drug abuse councils, community action agencies, councils of government, mental health/mental retardation centers, and legal services centers). The mean scores on the measures of bureaucratization, environmental turbulence, and organizational control were also significantly different between the two groups (see Table 25). The state agencies had significantly higher scores on all the turbulence measures and three of the bureaucratization measures (participation in decision-making, job codification, and specialization); the local/regional agencies had the higher score on the control measure.

In the eleven different measures employed in the analysis, the state agencies were not significantly different from the local/regional agencies in the mean scores of only two measures: hierarchy of authority and rule observation. There was no significant difference between these two groups in the degree to which they were assigned tasks and then provided with the freedom to implement those tasks without interruption from superiors, nor was there a significant difference between these two groups in the extent to which the human service worker was observed for rule violations. Yet workers in the state agencies did feel that they had less ability to reach their organizational objectives than did workers in the local/regional agencies.

The structure of work in the state agencies tended to limit the opportunities for the human services professional to guide the direction

Table 25

MEAN SCORES ON WORK ALIENATION, BUREAUCRATIZATION, TURBULENCE,
AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL MEASURES BY AGENCY LEVEL

	<u>State</u>	<u>Local/Regional</u>
WORK ALIENATION SCORE	11.0273*	9.5000*
BUREAUCRATIZATION SCORES		
<u>Centralization</u>		
Hierarchy of Authority	9.7516	10.0000
Participation in Decision-Making	14.6970*	11.7949*
<u>Formalization</u>		
Job Codification	14.0098*	13.3267*
Rule Observation	4.5290	4.3738
<u>Specialization</u>	10.6412	9.7109
TURBULENCE SCORES		
Administrative Environment		
Extraorganizational	24.8587*	22.4955*
Intraorganizational	14.5607*	13.7132*
Policy Environment	13.8742*	12.2980*
Comparative Rate of Turbulence	14.1250*	12.1256*
ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL SCORE	22.9630*	23.4698*

*Significant difference at .05 level or less

of the organization. Human services workers in the state agencies, for example, felt that they were isolated from decision-making processes which would affect agency goals and policies for the entire organization. Similarly when the focus was shifted from agency-wide decisions to job-specific decisions, the state agencies again, as a group, were more restrictive than the local/regional agencies. The state agency workers, in fulfilling their professional responsibilities, were required to consult rules with significantly greater regularity than their local/regional colleagues, an action which gave them less discretion in their work. Also, the content of their work was similarly more restrictive. Evidently the structuring of jobs in the state agencies tended toward a greater micro-division of labor. State workers registered significantly higher scores on the specialization measure indicating that by nature their work was less diverse and more routine than that of local/regional workers.

The human services workers in state agencies also faced consistently more turbulent environments than their more local counterparts. Consistent with the significantly higher scores the state workers had on the comparative rate of turbulence measures, indicating that they believed their agencies were experiencing more turbulence than other human services agencies, the state workers had significantly higher scores on the measures of turbulence in the extraorganizational and intraorganizational administrative environments and the policy environment. Those workers in state agencies were faced with rapidly changing work processes and work content, as well as rapidly changing internal and external environments. Our findings suggest that the rate of change in the external and internal environments would not in themselves

aggravate work alienation, rather the rate of change in the policy environment would make the work less certain about the appropriate actions to take. The high rates of turbulence in the administrative environments would only exacerbate the decreased control being experienced by the worker. The human services professionals at the local/regional level not only felt that they were experiencing less change in the policies which influenced job content, but also felt that they were encountering fewer structural changes within their agencies and within those groups outside the agencies with which they worked.

The pattern of higher levels of work alienation, bureaucratization, and turbulence and lower levels of control continues when the state and local/regional agencies are analyzed within each group for significant variations. For example, as a group, those human services professionals working in the Texas Department of Human Resources had the highest scores of any agency on the work alienation measure (see Table 26). Within TDHR there was also a significant difference between those individuals working in the family services programs, e.g., protective services, adoption, foster care, and those working in the financial aid programs, e.g., eligibility workers in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Food Stamp programs. The financial assistance workers, as an occupational category, had the highest mean scores on the work alienation index. Conversely, they had the lowest mean scores on the control measure while having scores indicating high degrees of bureaucratization on the participation in decision making and specialization indices.

As before, high levels of alienation, low levels of organizational control, and high levels of bureaucratization were observed in settings

Table 26

MEAN SCORES ON WORK ALIENATION, BUREAUCRATIZATION, TURBULENCE,
AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL MEASURES BY AGENCY TYPE

RCADA	LOCAL/REGIONAL AGENCIES				STATE AGENCIES		
	CAPS	COGS	MHMR	LA	DHA	TEC	TRC
WORK ALIENATION SCORE*							
7.7500	9.0392	9.4231	9.8954	9.2500	11.4107	10.1875	10.2857
BUREAUCRATIZATION SCORES							
<u>Centralization</u> Hierarchy of Authority*							
8.8125	10.4889	10.5417	10.1497	8.7000	9.8287	10.9565	8.4259
Participation in Decision-Making*							
10.2667	11.0400	11.2308	12.6513	10.1563	14.9241	14.0833	14.3750
<u>Formalization</u> Job Codification*							
11.8667	14.0227	12.7500	13.7234	11.5172	14.0865	14.6364	13.2308
Rule Observation							
4.333	4.211	4.353	4.542	3.846	4.598	4.350	4.431
<u>Specialization</u>							
7.6667	9.9318	8.5385	10.2431	8.7586	10.7621	11.3171	9.7115
TURBULENCE SCORES							
<u>Administrative Environment</u> Extraorganizational*							
21.0769	22.6944	24.2381	22.0388	23.8148	25.5747	25.4359	21.4681
Intraorganizational*							
12.3333	12.4894	13.2692	14.3878	13.4375	15.0324	13.3542	13.7818

TABLE 26 (continued)

RCADA	LOCAL/REGIONAL AGENCIES				DHA	STATE AGENCIES	
	CAPS	COGS	MHMR	LA		TEC	TRC
<u>Policy Environment*</u>							
11.6000	11.7083	12.7692	12.2357	13.5714	14.3750	11.3556	14.0182
<u>Comparative Rate of Turbulence*</u>							
10.8571	12.1707	11.0588	12.333	12.5385	15.1073	12.6047	11.2128
ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL SCORE*							
23.2500	23.9722	25.000	22.8960	24.3929	22.5134	23.6389	24.2609

*Significant differences exist between at least two of the agencies.

characterized by high levels of turbulence. The DHR financial assistance workers also had significantly higher scores on the measures for turbulence in the extraorganizational environment and policy environment, which were reflected in a significantly higher mean score on the measure for the comparative rate of turbulence.

The general pattern among the research variables which typifies the state and local/regional agencies is consistent with our findings. The state agencies which are more highly bureaucratic than the local/regional agencies also are characterized by high levels of turbulence, low levels of control, and high levels of work alienation. The local/regional agencies, which are less bureaucratic than the state agencies, also have lower levels of turbulence, higher levels of control, and lower levels of work alienation than do the state agencies.

There were exceptions within each agency level, however. The Texas Rehabilitation Commission, for example, was significantly less bureaucratic and turbulent in some areas than either the Texas Employment Commission or the Texas Department of Human Resources, although the Texas Rehabilitation Commission had the second highest work alienation score (only TDHR had a higher score) and the third highest mean score on the organizational control measure. In fact, the Texas Rehabilitation Commission had a statistically higher score on the control measure than did the Department of Human Resources. The differences which emerged between the Texas Rehabilitation Commission and the other two state agencies can also be observed in the hierarchy of authority measure. Although there was no significant difference between the mean scores on the state and local/regional agencies on that bureaucratic dimension, the Rehabilitation Commission, which had the lowest mean score of any

agency type did have a score significantly lower than the Texas Employment Commission, which had the highest mean score of any agency.

In the turbulence measures, the Texas Rehabilitation Commission also had significantly lower mean scores than did the Department of Human Resources and the Employment Commission. The Rehabilitation Commission, as well as the Employment Commission, for example, had a significantly lower mean score on the comparative rate of change measure than did the Department of Human Resources. Also the Rehabilitation Commission had a significantly lower mean score on the measure for turbulence in the extraorganizational administrative environment than did either the Human Resources Department or the Employment Commission, even though it did have a significantly higher mean score than did the Employment Commission on the policy turbulence measure.

The Rehabilitation Commission, then, presents a set of relationships deviating from the broader generalizations about alienation in state agencies. The Rehabilitation Commission presented a situation of high alienation, high control, variation among the bureaucratization measures, and variation among the turbulence measures.

The level of turbulence in the policy environment can provide at least partial resolution for this deviating case. We have learned earlier that high levels of turbulence in the policy environment are associated with high levels of work alienation; the worker's labor becomes more uncertain. It is possible that in the Texas Rehabilitation Commission, which experienced the second highest rate of policy turbulence among our eight agency types, that the TRC workers were working in higher conditions of task uncertainty due to changing policies.

This explanation, however, does not explain why the TRC worker's continued to express high levels of control over their work. The answer to this question may rest with the hierarchy of authority measure. Compared to workers in the other agencies, the TRC workers were given considerable freedom to implement their tasks without interference from superiors, a situation which may have resulted in high levels discretion, and, therefore control over work processes, regardless of how ambiguous those processes were. The worker would be able to take risks without which might not be possible in more highly supervised situations. The impact of the policy turbulence also may have been minimized by the low levels of turbulence in the extraorganizational environment. The worker may have experienced higher rates of change in those policies effecting his labor, but a rather placid extraorganizational environment did not present challenges to the worker's sense of control.

Within the local/regional agencies, the mental health/mental retardation agencies presented a case deviating on several points from other local/regional agencies. The mental health professionals were characterized by low levels of work alienation. Only the Department of Human Resources employees had a lower mean score on the control measure than did the mental health workers, and in fact, the mental health professionals had a significantly lower level of control than human services workers in another local/regional agency, *i.e.*, councils of governments. This in part may be explained by the lack of participation which the mental health workers have in the development of agency-wide decisions. Although mental health professionals had significantly more input into agency-wide decision-making than did those working in the Department of Human Resources, they had significantly less input than

did the Legal Aid professionals. They also worked in positions which required reference to rules much more frequently in the fulfillment of their professional responsibilities than did legal aid workers, as indicated by significant differences in job codification mean scores. Curiously then, mental health workers provide a situation of moderate alienation, at least alienation which is not significantly higher than any other agency studied, and very low levels of organizational control. Other than a high level of turbulence in the intraorganizational administrative environment, the turbulence measures were moderate. The significantly higher levels of turbulence in the intraorganizational administrative environment, significantly higher than that perceived by human services professionals in community action agencies, for example, may provide an explanation to the work alienation-control puzzle found with the mental health workers. The turbulence in the intraorganizational environment may be creating work situations which make it more difficult to obtain what is desired from the organization, but which does not sufficiently handicap the worker's service to the client, at least to such an extent that the work is no longer a source of pride for the human services professional.

Alienation and Agency Attrition

Grouping survey participants other than by agency type or agency level provides some insight into those groups found in each agency which may be particularly alienated from their work. One such grouping was identified by asking the question, "Do your long range plans include a career with this agency?" Not surprisingly those answering "no" to that question had significantly higher mean scores on the work alienation score than did those answering "yes." Those planning to leave the

agency also had significantly higher mean scores on the rule observation and specialization indices; not only did they consider their work more routine than did those planning to stay with the agency, but they also felt that they had been observed for rule violations at a mean level significantly higher than that of those planning to remain in the agency. At this point, the turbulence or control measures were not significantly different between those planning to leave the agency and those planning to continue in the agency (see Table 27).

Those workers leaving the agency can be portrayed as workers who have highly routinized work, are frequently checked for rule violations, and are highly alienated from their labor. This pattern is consistent with the pattern established in the discussion of alienation in low turbulence environments. Control, for example, did not seem to be the major factor contributing to the development of alienation, rather the repetitiveness and narrow scope of duties characteristic of their work contributed to the alienation. These workers were in control of work processes which were in themselves unsatisfying.

Alienation and Public Service Orientation

The turbulence measures did provide additional clarification when those planning to leave the agency were divided into two groups: Those who planned to leave public sector employment totally and those who planned to continue working in the public sector but in another agency. There was, once again, a significant difference in the work alienation mean scores between the two groups with those leaving public sector employment having the higher mean value.

Those planning to leave public sector employment had significantly higher mean scores on the participation in decision-making, rule

Table 27

MEAN SCORES ON WORK ALIENATION, BUREAUCRATIZATION, TURBULENCE,
AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL MEASURES BY AGENCY CAREER PLANS

Do your long range plans include a career with this agency?

	Yes	No
WORK ALIENATION*	9.5029	11.4041
BUREAUCRATIZATION SCORES		
<u>Centralization</u>		
Hierarchy of Authority	9.6333	10.0936
Participation in Decision-Making	13.2420	13.5226
<u>Formalization</u>		
Job Codification	13.6909	13.6300
Rule Observation*	4.2996	4.6667
<u>Specialization*</u>	9.8370	10.7743
TURBULENCE SCORES		
Administrative Environments		
Extraorganizational	24.1796	23.1796
Intraorganizational	14.1875	14.1949
Policy Environment	13.3091	12.9868
Comparative Rate of Turbulence	13.2114	13.3220
ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL SCORE	23.3516	22.9403

*Significant at .05 level or less

observation, and specialization scores. For those workers planning to leave public human services employment, the mean scores indicated that they felt that they had been excluded from agency-wide policy making, been inordinately observed for rule violations, and had been in jobs which were more routine and less diverse than did those planning to continue public sector work.

As in our earlier discussion of extraorganizational turbulence in low turbulence settings, the level of extraorganizational turbulence is associated with the level of work alienation. Those workers planning to remain in public sector employment had lower levels of alienation and higher levels of extraorganizational turbulence than did those workers planning to leave public sector employment (see Table 28).

Alienation and Ethnicity

When ethnic background was explored, there generally was little found in the bureaucratization or turbulence measures to explain the patterns that developed. For example, when ethnic identification was used in the analysis, it became evident that both Anglos and Blacks had significantly higher scores on the work alienation measure than did Hispanics, yet Hispanics also had significantly higher mean scores on the hierarchy of authority index than did Anglos, indicating that Hispanics felt that their work had been interrupted by superiors more frequently than did Anglos. Other than on the hierarchy measure, there were no significant differences in the variables (see Table 29).

Alienation and Sex

Focusing upon differences between males and females was more confusing than clarifying. Women, for example, felt significantly more

Table 28

MEAN SCORES ON WORK ALIENATION, BUREAUCRATIZATION, TURBULENCE,
AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL MEASURES BY PUBLIC SECTOR CAREER PLANS
OF RESPONDENTS PLANNING TO LEAVE CURRENT AGENCY

Do your long range plans include your
continuing to work in the public/governmental sector?

	Yes	No
WORK ALIENATION*	10.1116	11.9008
BUREAUCRATIZATION SCORES		
<u>Centralization</u>		
Hierarchy of Authority	10.0733	9.9840
Participation in Decision-Making	13.1632	14.1985
<u>Formalization</u>		
Job Codification	13.7523	13.7377
Rule Observation*	4.4158	4.7431
<u>Specialization*</u>	10.2335	11.1092
TURBULENCE SCORES		
Administrative Environments		
Extraorganizational	24.6070	22.5000
Intraorganizational	14.1966	14.1667
Policy Environment	13.2478	12.9675
Comparative Rate of Turbulence	13.3684	13.3426
ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL SCORE	23.0985	22.9722

*Significant at .05 level or less.

Table 29

MEANS SCORES ON WORK ALIENATION, BUREAUCRATIZATION, TURBULENCE,
AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL MEASURES BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

	Anglo	Black	Hispanic
WORK ALIENATION SCORES	10.477	10.884	9.527
BUREAUCRATIZATION SCORES			
<u>Centralization</u>			
Hierarchy of Authority*	9.624	9.774	10.645
Participation in Decision-Making	13.149	14.275	13.149
<u>Formalization</u>			
Job Codification*	13.508	14.403	13.933
Rule Observation	4.487	4.176	4.523
<u>Specialization</u>	10.019	10.552	10.641
TURBULENCE SCORES			
Administrative Environments			
Extraorganizational	23.601	23.596	24.650
Intraorganizational	14.339	13.723	13.789
Policy Environment	13.245	12.877	13.193
Comparative Rate of Turbulence	13.126	13.340	13.645
ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL	23.279	22.982	23.000

*Significant differences exist between at least two of the ethnic groups at .05 level or less.

isolated from agency-wide decision making than did men and, based upon the job codification scores, women felt that they could exercise significantly less discretion in their work than did the men. Also, on the turbulence measures, women had higher mean scores on the comparative rate of turbulence and turbulence in the extraorganizational administrative environment indices, yet these significant differences in the bureaucratization and turbulence measures notwithstanding, there was no significant difference between men and women on the control and work alienation measures (see Table 30). There was not satisfactory explanation in our data for the deviating cases suggested by the ethnic and sex variables.

Summary

By dividing the population into subgroupings we hoped to isolate areas of high alienation and observe their "fit" into the generalizations which were made in the earlier discussion. We identified five groupings which we hoped would differ significantly in their levels of alienation: state versus local/regional agencies, workers planning to leave the agency versus workers planning careers with the agency, workers planning to have public service versus those planning to stay in public service, Black versus Hispanic versus Anglo, and male versus female.

The state versus local/regional dichotomy was the most useful because of the various patterns which emerged, patterns which generally fit well with our interpretations. The overall pattern, for example, conformed to our discussion of alienation in highly turbulent environments. The state agencies, which were the more highly bureaucratic agencies, were characterized by low levels of control and high levels of

Table 30

MEAN SCORES ON WORK ALIENATION, BUREAUCRATIZATION, TURBULENCE,
AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL MEASURES BY SEX

	Female	Male
WORK ALIENATION	10.4424	10.1552
BUREAUCRATIZATION SCORES		
<u>Centralization</u>		
Hierarchy of Authority	9.9943	9.7035
Participation in Decision-Making*	14.1270	12.2371
<u>Formalization</u>		
Job Codification*	13.8757	13.4358
Rule Observation	4.4388	4.5000
<u>Specialization</u>		
	10.3064	10.0861
TURBULENCE SCORES		
Administrative Environments		
Extraorganizational*	24.1523	23.2108
Intraorganizational	14.2117	14.1145
Policy Environment	13.1681	13.1991
Comparative Rate of Turbulence*	13.5594	12.8173
ORGANIZATIONAL CONTROL	23.0447	23.3990

*Significant at .05 level or less

work alienation when high levels of turbulence prevailed. The local/regional agencies exemplified conditions of low bureaucratization low-turbulence, high levels of control, and low levels of work alienation. Even in the deviating conditions in the Texas Rehabilitation Commission the situation of high level alienation and high level turbulence in the policy environment was observable.

Patterns of alienation in some of the other groupings also fit our interpretations. Those workers planning to leave the agency generally worked in low turbulence conditions yet they experienced high levels of work alienation even though their sense of control were not significantly lower than those workers staying planning to staff with the agency. As in our discussion, the alienating conditions appeared to be rooted in the level of specialization. The alienation seemed to be founded upon work which in itself was unsatisfying, not because the work could not control his work setting.

When comparing those workers who plan to leave public service with those who plan to stay in public service (a division of those who plan to leave the agency), we found that lower levels of alienation were associated with higher levels of extraorganizational turbulence, a point made in our discussion of alienation in low turbulence environments. Our data revealed no satisfactory answer to differences in work alienation existing among Hispanics, Blacks, and Anglos or between men and women.

Chapter Summary

The major effort of this chapter was to identify and explain the various patterns of the work alienation-bureaucratization relationship which emerged in the findings. We do know from the findings that the relationship between work alienation and bureaucratization is

conditional upon the level of turbulence which is being experienced by the worker. Accordingly, in our discussion we referred to findings in three different settings. One setting included the entire sample; there was no effort to control for the level of turbulence in this group. The other two research settings, the high- and low-turbulence groups, were subsets of the survey sample.

In the high-turbulence setting, the turbulence measures accounted for a greater percentage of the variance in the work alienation measure than did the bureaucratization measures. Of special value to understanding the level of alienation in highly turbulent environments are the measures for turbulence in the policy environment and the comparative rate of turbulence measure. Increased rates of turbulence in the policy environment, according to our understanding, results in conditions of increased ambiguity which make it more difficult to retain control over work processes. High levels of bureaucratization only seem to aggravate the alienating conditions. There was no evidence in the data that the worker was resorting to bureaucratic structure as a defense against the turbulence in his work environment. Rather, increased levels of bureaucratization seem inadequate for handling the consequences of environmental turbulence. Under conditions of high level turbulence the centralization measures (hierarchy of authority and participation in decision-making) were particularly prominent among the bureaucratization measures in the their relationship to work alienation.

Under the uncontrolled conditions, the bureaucratization measures and the turbulence measures are both less useful in explaining the presence of work alienation than they were in the high turbulence settings. The correlation coefficients between the work alienation and the

turbulence and bureaucratization were generally stronger in the high-turbulence setting than in the broader survey sample. Factors other than turbulence and bureaucratization become increasingly important in accounting for alienation as the level of turbulence decreases, an observation based upon the decreasing strength of the correlation coefficients. Among the variables used here, the bureaucratization variables as a set, relate more strongly to the work alienation measure than do the turbulence measures in the uncontrolled setting. As in the high-turbulence environments, the measures seem to be working through the worker's sense of control.

In conditions of low-level turbulence the bureaucratization variables account for more of the variation in work alienation than do the turbulence measures. The connection to work alienation through control, however, does not seem to be as important here as in the other two settings. Under conditions of low-level turbulence, work alienation seems to be more of a function of dissatisfaction with narrowness of task.

Our observation about the declining importance of control and increased importance of control in low turbulence settings is based upon lower coefficients between work alienation and the control, centralization, and formalization measures as well as the increasing importance of the specialization measure.

Within the discussion of low-level and high-level turbulence, the theme of turbulence as a mitigating condition in the development of alienation surfaced twice. In the highly turbulent environment elevated levels of turbulence in the intraorganizational environment were associated with increased levels of control over work processes, and in low-turbulence environments increased levels of turbulence in the

extraorganizational environment are associated with lower levels of work alienation. In both examples, the turbulence measures created conditions which could have allowed the worker more discretion in his work. Regardless, our data suggest that turbulence, in certain circumstances, may work to lessen alienating conditions.

Our data also suggest that the comparative rate of turbulence measure is significantly related to work alienation in each research setting: one of the most predictable measures of work alienation is the worker's perception that his agency is experiencing substantially higher rates of turbulence than comparable agencies. This measure is apparently tapping a sense of frustration similar to the relative deprivation explanations of political behavior.

When the data is studied in context of demographic groupings within the survey sample, the groups generally conform to the identified patterns. The state agencies represent a pattern of high bureaucratization, high-turbulence, low control, and high alienation. The local/regional agencies represent a general pattern of low bureaucratization, low-turbulence, high control, and low alienation.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Before presenting the research conclusions, the limitations of this study need to be acknowledged once again. As discussed earlier, the use of perceptual data and the survey techniques limited the scope of the study. Not all human services agencies were willing to participate in the study, nor did nearly 40% of those receiving the survey choose to respond. Also, these conclusions, are based upon cross-sectional data, i.e., the cases are drawn from a single society at a single period of time, rather than data gathered in a time series, or longitudinal, design. The cases could not, therefore, be analyzed in terms of the increase or decrease of turbulence in each worker's environment and the resulting impact upon the level of the worker's alienation. The survey population obviously is limited to human services workers in Texas, and is overwhelmingly comprised of "street level" administrators. There was no provision in the research design to study high level administrators or planners as subsets of the survey population. In this study, the perceptions of "street level" human services workers in Texas were used in relating variations in several dimensions of environment turbulence, bureaucracy, and control to work alienation. The first set of hypotheses related environmental turbulence to work alienation.

These hypotheses, which postured a positive relationship between the four dimensions of environmental turbulence (turbulence in the extraorganizational administrative environment, turbulence in the intraorganizational administrative environment, turbulence in the policy environment, and the comparative rate of turbulence) and work alienation, yielded mixed results. When no controls for the level of turbulence were used, only the comparative rate of turbulence measure and the measure for the level of turbulence in the policy environment were significantly related statistically to work alienation, and only the relationship between the comparative rate of turbulence and work alienation was substantively significant.

The second set of hypotheses also yield mixed results. In this set of of hypotheses the level of the worker's control is expected to be inversely related to work alienation, bureaucratization, and turbulence. We found that the worker's level of control is inversely related to work alienation and each of the bureaucratization measures (specialization, centralization, formalization). Once again, under uncontrolled conditions, only the comparative rate of turbulence and the level of turbulence in the policy environment were significantly related to the level of control, and, once again, only the comparative rate of turbulence was substantively significant. We were able to establish that those measures of bureaucratization and turbulence which were significantly related to work alienation did so in part, but not entirely, through the worker's sense of control.

The third set of hypotheses introduced the level of turbulence into the work-alienation bureaucratization relationship by studying the level of alienation in high- and low-turbulence settings. We expected to

find that in conditions of low-level turbulence, the bureaucratization measures would account for more of the variance in work alienation than would the turbulence measures, and in conditions of high-level turbulence that the turbulence measures would account for more of the variance in work alienation than would the bureaucratization measures. We also expected to find that in conditions of high-level turbulence, the worker would use the level of bureaucratization to manage the consequences of turbulence.

Although there was no evidence in our data that the level of bureaucratization is used by the worker to counter the level of turbulence in the environment, the first two hypotheses were confirmed. From these two hypotheses our major conclusion was drawn, i.e., the relationship between work alienation and bureaucratization is conditional to the level of environmental turbulence. Under conditions of high turbulence, the primary contributors to the level of alienation will be the levels of turbulence rather than the levels of bureaucratization. Conversely, under conditions of low level turbulence, the bureaucratization measures will account for more of the variance in work alienation than will the turbulence measures.

By using the conditional interpretation of the work alienation-bureaucratization relationship, we were able to observe various patterns which emerged among the turbulence, bureaucratization, control, and work alienation measures in both high- and low-turbulence settings as well as in the population as a whole, the uncontrolled setting. From those observations, the following conclusions were drawn; each conclusion is a guide to understanding the dynamics involved in the development of work alienation in various settings.

Concerning turbulence, we learned that turbulence is the primary source of work alienation only in extremely turbulent settings. Furthermore, it is turbulence in the policy environment which is most conducive to the development of work alienation under high-turbulent conditions. Turbulence in the policy environment is tantamount to restructuring the work itself since high levels of turbulence in this dimension means rapid change in policies which define work processes and substance.

We also found that workers who perceive the rate of turbulence characteristic of their agencies to be much more accelerated than the rate of turbulence in comparable agencies are more likely to experience higher levels of work alienation. This holds true in each of our settings.

Our least expected conclusion concerning turbulence is that it is not invariably a factor contributing to the development work alienation. In both high- and low-turbulence settings, increasing levels of turbulence were associated with conditions which would have alleviated the level of work alienation. In high-turbulence conditions the level of turbulence in the intraorganizational environment was associated with increased control for the worker, a situation which we explained in terms of increased opportunities for control due to ambiguous authority patterns which could characterize intraorganizational turbulence.

Similarly in low-turbulence settings, the level of turbulence in the extraorganizational environment was associated with lower levels of work alienation. In the low-turbulence setting, where much of work alienation is related to task repetition and the narrow scope of work, turbulence in the extraorganizational apparently results in job

enlargement. Turbulence in the extraorganizational and intraorganizational environments was alienative if there were high levels of turbulence occurring in the policy environment as well.

Concerning the relationship between the level of bureaucratization and work alienation, we concluded that in high-turbulent settings, even though turbulence is the major source of alienation, the bureaucratization measures also contribute to the development of alienation. The increased levels of bureaucratization in highly turbulent environment do not provide the flexibility needed to manage the problems arising from the turbulence. There is no indication that the worker resorts to increased levels of bureaucratization as a defense against the level of turbulence in his work environment.

From the analysis we also concluded that as the level of turbulence decreases, the bureaucratization and turbulence variables accounted for less of the variation in work alienation. However, of the two sets of measures, the bureaucratization variables are more useful than the turbulence variables in explaining the level of alienation; in particular, the specialization measure becomes increasingly important.

When we look at the development of work alienation in low-turbulence settings, we find that the worker's level of control is decreasingly important. In the high-turbulent setting, the turbulence measure worked substantially through the workers sense of control as did the bureaucratization measures in the uncontrolled setting. Here we see that the specialization measure creates conditions ripe for alienation, not through substantially lowering the worker's sense of control but through binding the worker in highly routinized labor: labor associated with high levels of task repetition, frequent interference from

supervisors in task implementation, and frequent observance for rule violations.

The level of turbulence, therefore, presents a challenge to the public administrator. In order to more effectively reduce work alienation in the public sector, the administrator should give more attention to the level of turbulence which is occurring in the environment and should design management strategies according to the probable primary and secondary sources of work alienation.

Assuming that the public administrator can neither eliminate turbulence nor totally restructure the agency, public administrators should give more attention to the view of bureaucracy as a variable type; in high-turbulence settings the public administrator should reduce the level of bureaucratization through strategies such as reducing rule observation and supervisor interference in work. It is evident that by decreasing the degree of bureaucratization in the work environment the alienation experienced by the worker can be minimized. Because bureaucracy is variable, it can be used as a management tool.

Our research suggests that the value of using bureaucracy as a management tool lies in its potential motivational value. By creating a work environment in which the worker has more freedom to implement his tasks without inordinate interference from supervisors, management creates an environment conducive to meeting the higher level needs of the worker, needs such as self-esteem and self-actualization which have long been recognized by management as motivators of human behavior. The level of bureaucratization can therefore be viewed as an often under-employed vehicle for fusing the worker to the organization. In

highly-turbulent environments, it is even more important to recognize the motivational potential of bureaucracy.

The consequences of using the level of bureaucratization accordingly would seem beneficial to the overall operation of the agency. Based upon previous research, it is reasonable that the agency would reap the benefits of a work force characterized by less stress, alienation, and cynicism as well as the dysfunctional behaviors associated with those conditions. Our research has suggested that a more stable work force and the efficiency and effectiveness benefits characteristic of low employee turnover would be but one advantage of using the level of bureaucratization as a management tool. It is not unreasonable to expect lower levels of client and public alienation to result from such strategies.

There is, however, a need to look into work alienation further. The strengths of the correlation coefficients and the amount of variance in the work alienation measure explained by the bureaucratization and turbulence measures, even in highly turbulent environments, suggest that other explanations need to be sought in order to manage the level of work alienation in the agency.

Within the discussion, several areas of concern surfaced. One was changing job definition in the development of work alienation. Within the state agencies, for example, those working for the Texas Rehabilitation Commission had significantly higher scores on the work alienation measure than did those working for the Texas Employment Commission in spite of TRC's significantly higher scores on the control measure as well as lower scores on a few of the bureaucratization and turbulence scores. The TRC workers did, however, perceive significantly higher scores on the

turbulence in the policy environment measure. One explanation may be that the changes occurring in the policy environment so affected the labor itself as to render it meaningless or result in a loss of pride in the work. Other than automation as job enlargement, little attention has been given to changing job definition.

Our study of Texas human services workers also suggests groups which would be appropriate in the study of alienation. For example, we found that those workers who plan to leave the agency have significantly higher alienation scores than do those workers who plan to stay with the agency. A better understanding of alienation among this population would benefit the agency in a variety of ways, ranging from cost savings related to personnel recruitment and training to increased agency effectiveness attributable to a more experienced corps of workers.

If those planning to leave the agency include substantial numbers of minorities and women, the problem of work alienation can be seen as an obstacle to meeting the organization's affirmative action goals. There is need, therefore, to identify those groups of minorities and women who are highly alienated and try to isolate the causes of their alienation. Although Hispanics and women did not have significantly higher levels of alienation than did Anglos or men, efforts to curb the development of alienation in those groups is still needed. According to our findings both of these groups are working under conditions which we consider to be conducive to the development of alienation. The Hispanic population was working under conditions in which they perceived significantly higher levels of supervisor interference than did the Anglo population, and women felt significantly more isolated from agency-wide decision-making than did the men. The women also worked in situations in which

they exercised significantly less discretion in their work than did the men.

In these situations the question of personal expectations may be important in understanding low levels of alienation in the presence of conditions frequently associated with higher levels of alienation. Did both groups, i.e., women and Hispanics accept their situations as legitimate or as temporary and necessary to future advancement? If so, it is not likely that these attitudes are permanent.

Regardless, to the extent work alienation is resulting in attrition among minorities and women, it not only is a roadblock to the agency affirmative action program it is also a roadblock to the social objectives which affirmative action programs attempt to realize. Because we found deviating patterns in the work alienation-bureaucratization relationship among these groups, more research is needed.

Additional research on the sources of work alienation in public agencies is important. In order to retain an expert, experienced, and representative bureaucracy, we need to learn more about those conditions which are conducive to the development of work alienation, and then structure our organizations to minimize alienating conditions. If, as scholars predict, we are entering more turbulent times, the search to identify alienating conditions will become increasingly important, particularly since bureaucratic organizations continue to be the prevalent organization structures used in the delivery of public services. With alienating conditions emanating from the environment and from the organizational structure itself, the identification of processes and structures which could alleviate the development of work

alienation will be a major concern for the social sciences; this research has been one effort in that direction.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agranoff, Robert. "Human Resource Administration: Managing Human Services in the Sunshine." Southern Review of Public Administration. 2, no. 2 (September 1978): 152-169.
- Aiken, Michael and Hage, Jerald. "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis." The American Sociological Review. 31 (August 1966): 497-507.
- Aldrich, Howard. "Centralization Versus Decentralization in the Design of Human Service Delivery Systems: A Response to Gouldner's Lament." In The Management of Human Services, pp. 51-79. Edited by Rosemary C. Sarri and Yeheskel Hasenfeld. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
- Aldrich, Howard. Organizations and Environments. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.
- Allen, Bruce H. and LaFollette, William. "Perceived Organizational Structures and Alienation Among Trainees." Academy of Management Journal. 20, no. 2 (June 1977): 334-341.
- Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization: The Conflict Between the System and the Individual. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
- Babbie, Earl R. The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1979.
- Bacharach, Samuel B. and Aiken, Michael. "The Impact of Alienation, Meaninglessness, and Meritocracy on Supervisor and Subordinate Satisfaction." Social Forces. 57, no. 3 (March 1979): 853-870.
- Bar-Yosef, Rivka and Schild, E. O. "Pressures and Defences in Bureaucratic Roles." American Journal of Sociology. 71, no. 6 (May 1966): 665-673.
- Beckhard, Richard. Organization Development: Strategies and Models. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1966.
- Beckhard, Richard. "An Organization Improvement Program in a Decentralized Organization." Journal of Applied Behavior Science. 2 (January 1966): 3-26.

- Benson, J. Kenneth. "The Analysis of Bureaucratic-Professional Conflict: Functional Versus Dialectical Approaches." The Sociological Quarterly. 14 (Summer 1973): 376-394.
- Benveniste, Guy. Bureaucracy. San Francisco: Boyd and Fraser Publishing Company, 1977.
- Berdie, Douglas R. and Anderson, John F. Questionnaires: Design and Use. Metuchen, N. J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1974.
- Blau, Peter. "Orientation Towards Clients in a Public Welfare Agency," Administrative Science Quarterly. 5 (June 1960): 341-361.
- Blau, Peter M.; Heydebrand, Wolf V.; Stauffer, Robert E. "The Structure of Small Bureaucracies." American Sociological Review. 31, no. 2 (April 1966): 179-191.
- Blau, Peter and Scott, W. Richard. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Blauner, Robert. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Blauner, Robert. "Alienation and Modern Industry." In Alienation and the Social System, pp. 110-137. Edited by Ada W. Finifter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.
- Bonjean, Charles M. and Grimes, Michael. "Bureaucracy and Alienation: A Dimensional Approach." Social Forces. 48 (March 1970): 365-373.
- Bozeman, Barry. Public Management and Policy Analysis. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979.
- Brager, George and Holloway, Stephen. Changing Human Service Organizations. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1978.
- Brill, Alan E. "Alienation of the Systems Analyst." Journal of Systems Management. 25, no. 1 (January 1974): 26-29.
- Burns, Tom and Stalker, G. M. The Management of Innovation. London: Tavistock Publishers, 1961.
- Catrice-Lorey, Antoinette. "Social Security and its Relations with Beneficiaries: The Problem of Bureaucracy in Social Administration." In Bureaucracy and the Public, pp. 245-256. Edited by Elihu Katz and Brenda Danet. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.
- Cayer, N. Joseph and Siegelman, Lee. "Minorities and Women in State and Local Government." Public Administration Review. 40, no. 5 (September/October 1980): 443-350.

- Clark, John P. "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System," American Sociological Review. 24 (December 1959): 849-852.
- Cornett, Joe D. and Beckner, Weldon. Introductory Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1975.
- Crozier, Michel. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Danet, Brenda. "'Giving the Underdog a Break': Latent Particularism Among Customs Officials." In Bureaucracy and the Public, pp. 329-337. Edited by Elihu Katz and Brenda Danet. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.
- Dean, Dwight D. "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement." The American Sociological Review. 26 (October 1961): 753-758.
- Denhardt, Robert. "Alienation and the Challenge of Participation." Personnel Administration. 24, no. 4 (September/October 1971): 25-32.
- Denhardt, Robert. "Bureaucratic Socialization and Organizational Accommodation." Administrative Science Quarterly. 13 (December 1968): 441-450.
- Djilas, Milovan. "On Alienation: Thoughts on a Marxian Myth." Encounter. 26 (May 1971): 8-15.
- Downie, N. M. and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.
- Dunshire, Andrew. Control in A Bureaucracy. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978.
- Dvorin, Eugene P. and Simmons, Robert H. From Amoral to Human Bureaucracy. Los Angeles: Canfield Press, 1972.
- Emery, F. E. and Trist, E. L. "The Causal Texture of Organizational Environments." Human Relations. 30, no. 1 (January 1977): 77-79.
- Etzioni, Amitai. The Active Society. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Evans, William M. "Hierarchy, Alienation, and Organizational Effectiveness." Human Relations. 30, no. 1 (January 1977): 77-79.
- Finifter, Ada W. Alienation and the Social System. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

- Friedrich, Carl J. "Some Observations on Weber's Analysis of Bureaucracy." In Reader In Bureaucracy. pp. 27-33. Edited by Robert K. Merton, Ailsa P. Gray, Barbara Hockey, Hanan C. Selvin. New York: Free Press, 1952.
- Friedson, Eliot. "Dominant Professions, Bureaucracy, and Client Services." In Organizations and Clients: Essays In the Sociology of Service, pp. 71-79. Edited by Mark Lefton and William R. Rosengren. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.
- Gawthrop, Louis. Administrative Politics and Social Change. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1971.
- Giblin, Edward J. "Organization Development: Public Sector Theory and Practice." Public Personnel Management. March/April, 1976, pp. 108-119.
- Gibson, James L.; Ivancevich, John M.; and Donnelly, James H., Jr. Organizations: Structure, Process and Behavior. Dallas: Business Publications, Inc., 1973.
- Golembiewski, Robert T. "Perspectives on Public Sector OD." Southern Review of Public Administration. 1, no. 4 (March 1978): 406-415.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.
- Gross, Bertram. "Friendly Fascism: A Model for America." Social Policy. (November/December 1970): 44-52.
- Gross, Bertram. "Planning in an Era of Social Revolution." Public Administration Review. 31, no. 3 (May/June 1971): 259-294.
- Hage, Jerald and Aiken, Michael. "Routine Technology, Structure, and Organization Goals." In Human Service Organizations, pp. 298-314. Edited by Yeheskel Hasenfeld and Richard A. English. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1974.
- Hajda, Jan. "Alienation and Integration of Student Intellectuals." American Sociological Review. 26 (October 1961): 758-777.
- Hall, Richard H. "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment." American Journal of Sociology. 69, no. 1 (July 1963): 32-40.
- Hall, Richard H., ed. The Formal Organization. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972.
- Hall, Richard H. "Professionalization and Bureaucratization." American Sociological Review. 35 (February 1968): 92-104.
- Hasenfeld, Yeheskel and English, Richard A., eds. Human Service Organizations. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1974.

- Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1966.
- Hickson, D. J.; Hinings, C. R.; Lee, C. A.; Scheck, R. R.; and Pennings, J. M. "A Strategic Contingencies Theory of Intra-organizational Power." Administrative Science Quarterly. 16, no. 2 (June 1971): 216-229.
- Hill, Larry B. and Herbert, F. Ted. Essentials of Public Administration. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press, 1979.
- Holdaway, Edward A.; Newberry, John F.; Hickson, David; and Heron, R. Peter. "Dimensions of Organizations in Complex Societies: The Educational Sector." Administrative Science Quarterly. 20 (March 1975): 37-58.
- Hummel, Ralph P. The Bureaucracy Experience. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.
- Hunsaker, Phillip L.; Mudgett, William C.; Wynne, Bayard E. "Assessing and Developing Administrators for Turbulent Environments." Administration and Society. 7, no. 3 (November 1975): 312-325.
- Hunsaker, Phillip L. "Effects of Differences In Incongruity Adaptation Levels And Environmental Turbulence On Successful Completion and Leadership Effectiveness in Officer Candidate School." In Proceedings: 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1973.
- Hunsaker, Phillip L. "The Effects of Incongruity Adaptation Levels On Risk Preference In Turbulent Decision-Making Environments." In Proceedings: Academy of Management 33rd Annual Meeting, August 19-22, 1973.
- Ivancevich, John M. and Donnelly, James H., Jr. "Relation of Organizational Structure to Job Satisfaction, Anxiety-Stress, and Performance." Administrative Science Quarterly. 20 (June 1975): 272-280.
- Jacoby, Henry. The Bureaucratization of the World. Translated by Eveline Kanes. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1976.
- Jones, J. Frank. "The Division of Labor is Limited by the Extent of Worker Alienation." The American Economist. 19, no. 1 (Spring 1975): 18-20.
- Katz, Elihu and Danet, Brenda. "Introduction: Bureaucracy as a Problem for Sociology and Society." In Bureaucracy and the Public, pp. 3-27. Edited by Elihu Katz and Brenda Danet. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Khandwalla, Pradip N. The Design of Organizations. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1977.
- Kirk, Roger E. Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences. Belmont, California: Brooks-Cole Publishing Co., 1968.
- Kirsch, Barbara A. and Lengermann, Joseph J. "An Empirical Test of Robert Blauner's Ideas on Alienation in Work as Applied to Different Type Jobs in a White-Collar Setting." Sociology and Social Research: An International Journal. 56, no. 2 (January 1972): 180-193.
- Kohn, Melvin L. "Bureaucratic Man: A Portrait and an Interpretation." In Bureaucracy and the Public, pp. 136-156. Edited by Elihu Katz and Brenda Danet. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Lee, James A. "Behavioral Theory vs. Reality." Harvard Business Review. 49, no. 2 (March/April, 1971): 20-28.
- Lefton, Mark. "Client Characteristics and Structural Outcomes: Toward the Specification of Linkages." In Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service, pp. 17-36. Edited by William R. Rosengren and Mark Lefton. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.
- Levine, Sol and White, Paul E. "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Inter-organizational Relationships." In Human Service Organizations, pp. 545-561. Edited by Yeheskel Hasenfeld and Richard A. English. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1974.
- Lewis, Eugene. American Politics in a Bureaucratic Age: Citizens, Constituents, Clients, and Victims. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1977.
- Lipsky, Michael. "Toward a Theory of Street-Level Bureaucracy." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. September, 1969.
- Litwak, Eugene, "Models of Bureaucracy Which Permit Conflict." American Journal of Sociology. 67, no. 2 (September 1961): 177-184.
- Lukes, Steven. "Alienation and Anomie." In Alienation and The Social System, pp. 24-32. Edited by Ada W. Finifter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.
- Lutrin, Carl E. and Settle, Allen K. American Public Administration: Concepts and Cases. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Press, 1980.

- McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- March, James A. and Simon, Herbert. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.
- Mechanic, David. "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations." In Organizational Systems, pp. 281-293. Edited by Koya Azumi and Jerald Hage. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1972.
- Merton, Robert K. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." In Reader in Bureaucracy, pp. 361-372. Edited by Robert K. Merton, Ailsa P. Gray, Barbara Hockey, Hanan C. Selvin. New York: The Free Press, 1952.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1949.
- Michels, Robert. Political Parties. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1949.
- Miller, Delbert. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1977.
- Miller, George A. "Professionals in Bureaucracy: Alienation Among Industrial Scientists." In American Sociological Review. 32 (October 1967): 755-768.
- Nachmias, David and Nachmias, Chava. Research Methods in the Social Sciences. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976.
- Nachmias, David and Rosenbloom, David H. Bureaucratic Government U.S.A. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.
- Neal, Arthur G. and Seeman, Melvin. "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis." American Sociological Review. 29 (April 1964): 216-226.
- Nettler, Gwen. "A Measure of Alienation." American Sociological Review. 22 (November 1957): 670-677.
- Nie, Norman H.; Hull C. Hadlai; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin; Bent, Dale H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, Book Company, 1975.
- Nord, Walter R. "Job Satisfaction Reconsidered." American Psychologist. 32, no. 12 (December 1977): 1026-1035.
- Parsons, Talcott. "How Are Clients Integrated in Service Organizations?" In Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service, pp. 1-16. Edited by William R. Rosengren and Mark Lefton. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.

- Parsons, Talcott. The Structure of Social Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937.
- Pearlin, Leonard I. "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel." In Alienation and the Social System, pp. 138-152. Edited by Ada W. Finifter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.
- Poole, Eric D.; Regoli, Robert M.; and Lotz, Roy. "Linkages Between Professionalism, Work Alienation and Cynicism in Large and Small Police Departments." Social Science Quarterly. 59, no. 3 (December 1978): 525-534.
- Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978.
- Pugh, D. S.; Hickson, D. J.; Hinings, C. R. "An Empirical Taxonomy of Structures of Work Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly. 14 (1969): 115-126.
- Pugh, D. S.; Hickson, D. J.; Hinings, C. R.; and Turner, C. "Dimensions of Organization Structure." Administrative Science Quarterly. 13 (1968): 65-105.
- Pugh, D. S. "The Context of Organization Structures." Administrative Science Quarterly. 14 (1969): 91-114.
- Purcell, John and Smith, Robin. The Control of Work. London: Macmillan Press, 1979.
- Raynolds, Peter A. "Developing Managerial Capabilities for Coping With Turbulent Environments." In Proceedings: Academy of Management 31st Annual Meeting, August 15-18, 1973.
- Rubenstein, David. "Love and Work." The Sociological Review. 26, no. 1 (February 1978): 5-25.
- Rummel, R. J. Applied Factor Analysis: Evanston. Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
- Sarri, Rosemary C. and Hasenfeld, Yeheskel, eds. The Management of Human Services. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
- Schelling, Thomas C. The Strategy of Conflict. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Schuman, David. The Ideology of Form. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1978.
- Seeman, Melvin. "On the Meaning of Alienation." In American Sociological Review, 24 (December 1959): 783-790.
- Seeman, Melvin. "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work." American Sociological Review. 32 (April 1967): 273-285.

- Seeman, Melvin and Evans, John W. "Alienation and Learning in a Hospital Setting." American Sociological Review. 27 (December 1961): 772-782.
- Selltiz, Claire and Wrightsman, Lawrence S. and Cook, Stuart W. Search Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Selznick, Phillip. Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, and Company, 1957.
- Shariff, Zahed. "The Persistence of Bureaucracy." Social Science Quarterly. 60, no. 1 (June, 1979): 3-34.
- Shepard, Jon M. Automation and Alienation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1971.
- Sjoberg, Gideon; Brymer, Richard A.; and Farris, Buford. "Bureaucracy and the Lower Class." Sociology and Social Research. 50 (1966): 325-337.
- Slavin, Simon. "Concepts of Social Conflict: Use in Social Work Curriculum." In Social Administration, pp. 521-540. Edited by Simon Slavin. New York: Haworth Press, 1978.
- Smith, Clagett G. and Ari, Oguz N. "Organizational Control Structure and Member Consensus." In Organizational Systems, pp. 492-504. Edited by Koya Azumi and Jerald Hage. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1972.
- Starbuck, William H. "Organizational Growth and Development." In Hand Book of Organizations, pp. 451-533. Edited by James C. March. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.
- Stillman, Richard J., II. Public Administration: Concepts and Cases. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1980.
- Stone, Clarence N. and Feldbaum, Eleanor G. "Blame, Complacency, and Pessimism: Attitude and Problem Perceptions Among Selected Street-Level Administrators in Two Suburban Counties." Administration and Society. 8, no. 1 (May 1976): 79-106.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Control In Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Social Psychology of the Work Organization. Belmont, California: Brooks-Cole Publishing Company, 1966.
- Terreberry, Shirley. "The Evolution of Organizational Environments." Administrative Science Quarterly. 12, no. 4 (March 1968): 590-613.

- Thompson, James. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Thompson, James. "Organizations and Output Transactions." American Journal of Sociology. 68 (1962): 309-324.
- Thompson, Victor. Modern Organization. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Thompson, Victor. Without Sympathy or Enthusiasm: The Problem of Administrative Compassion. University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1977.
- Thornton, Russell. "Organizational Involvement and Commitment to Organization and Profession." Administrative Science Quarterly. 15, no. 4 (December 1970): 417-425.
- Tripi, Frank. "The Inevitability of Client Alienation: A Counter Argument." Sociological Quarterly. 15 (Summer 1974): 432-441.
- Trist, Eric L. "Urban North America: The Challenge of the Next Thirty Years." In Organizational Frontiers and Human Values, pp. 77-85. Edited by Warren H. Schmidt. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1970.
- Udy, Stanley H., Jr. "'Bureaucracy' and 'Rationality' in Weber's Organization Theory: An Empirical Study." American Sociological Review. 24 (December 1959): 791-795.
- von Bertalanffy, Ludwig. "The Theory of Open Systems in Physics and Biology." Science. 3 (1950): 23-29.
- Waldo, Dwight. Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.
- Weber, Max. "Bureaucracy." In Public Administration Concepts and Cases, pp. 43-66. Edited by Richard Stillman. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1980.
- White, Orion F. "The Dialectical Organization: An Alternative to Bureaucracy." Public Administration Review. 29, no. 1 (January-February 1969): 32-42.
- Whittington, Colin. "Organizational Research and Social Work: Issues in Application Illustrated From the Case of Organic and Mechanistic Systems of Management." In Social Administration, pp. 77-91. Edited by Simon Slavin. New York: Haworth Press, 1978.
- Williams, J. D. Public Administration: The People's Business. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1980.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

Worthy, James C. "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale."
American Sociological Review. 15 (April 1950): 169-179.

Zurcher, Louis A.; Meadow, Arnold; and Zurcher, Susan Lee. "Value
Orientation, Role Conflict, and Alienation from Work: A Cross-
Cultural Study." American Sociological Review. 30 (August
1965): 539-548.

APPENDIX A

LISTING OF CITIES FROM WHICH RESPONSES WERE RECEIVED

Abilene	Conroe	Hillsboro	Paris
Alice	Copperas Cove	Houston	Pasadena
Alpine	Corpus Christi	Huntsville	Pecos
Amarillo	Corsicana	Irving	Plainview
Anahuac	Catulla	Kerrville	Port Arthur
Anderson	Crockett	Killeen	Quannah
Angleton	Cuero	Kirbyville	Ralls
Arlington	Dallas	Knox City	Raymondville
Atlanta	Del Rio	Kountze	Richmond
Austin	Dennison	La Marque	Rockdale
Ballinger	Denton	Lamesa	San Angelo
Bay City	Donna	Laredo	San Antonio
Baytown	Dumas	Levelland	San Augustine
Beaumont	Eastland	Liberty	San Benito
Beeville	Edinburgh	Littlefield	San Marcos
Bellville	El Paso	Longview	Seguin
Belton	Floresville	Lubbock	Shamrock
Big Spring	Floydada	Lufkin	Smithville
Borger	Fort Stockton	Marfa	Snyder
Breckenridge	Fort Worth	Marlin	Stephenville
Brownsville	Fredricksburg	Marshall	Temple
Brownwood	Galveston	Mason	Texarkana
Bryan	Gatesville	McAllen	Texas City
Burnett	Gilmer	Menard	Vernon
Cameron	Grand Prairie	Midland	Victoria
Carrizo Springs	Greenville	Mineral Wells	Waco
Carthage	Harlingen	Muleshoe	Weslaco
Center	Haskell	Nacogdoches	Wichita Falls
Childress	Hearne	New Braunfels	Woodville
Clarksville	Henderson	Odessa	
Coldspring	Henrietta	Orange	
Coleman	Hereford	Pampa	

APPENDIX B

TABLE 31

SURVEY PARTICIPANTS BY PLANNING REGION

PLANNING REGIONS	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
CENTRAL TEXAS	189	31.1
NOR TEX RPC (Regions 3)	13	2.1
N CEN TX COG (4)	76	12.5
W CEN TX COG (7)	18	3.0
HEART OF TX COG (11)	15	2.5
CAPITAL AREA COG (12)	53	8.7
TEXOMA PC (22)	5	0.8
CEN TX COG (23)	9	1.5
EAST TEXAS	172	28.4
ARK-TEX COG (5)	17	2.8
EAST TX COG (6)	21	3.5
BRAZOS VALLEY COG (13)	20	3.3
DET CO (14)	27	4.5
SOUTHEAST TX RPC (15)	34	5.6
HOUSTON-GALVESTON AR (16)	53	8.7
WEST TEXAS	139	22.9
PANHANDLE RPC (1)	31	5.1
SPAG (2)	26	4.3
W TX COG (8)	48	7.9

APPENDIX B (Continued)

TABLE 31

PLANNING REGIONS	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
PERMIAN BASIN RPC (9)	21	3.5
CONCHO VALLEY COG (10)	13	2.1
SOUTH TEXAS	106	17.6
GOLDEN CRESCENT COG (17)	5	0.8
ALAMO AREA COG (18)	52	8.6
SOUTH TX DEV CNCL (19)	1	0.2
COASTAL BEND COG (20)	27	4.5
LOWER RIO GRANDE DEV (21)	18	3.0
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE DEV (24)	3	0.5
TOTALS	606	100.0

APPENDIX C

TABLE 32

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

HIGHEST DEGREE	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
No high school diploma or GED	3	0.5
GED	4	0.7
High school diploma	88	14.6
Certificate	9	1.5
Associate Degree	17	2.8
Bachelors Degree	269	44.6
Masters Degree	139	23.1
Master of Social Work	37	6.1
Doctorate	37	6.1
TOTALS	603	100.0

APPENDIX D

TABLE 33

INCOME OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

INCOME	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Under \$10,000	22	3.7
10,000 - 14,999	83	13.8
15,000 - 19,999	262	43.6
20,000 - 24,999	138	23.0
25,000 - 29,999	63	10.5
30,000 - 34,999	18	3.0
35,000 - 40,000	7	1.2
Above \$40,000	8	1.3
TOTALS	601	100.0

APPENDIX E

TABLE 34

SURVEY PARTICIPANTS BY AGENCY TYPE

AGENCY TYPE	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Alcohol & Drug Abuse Program	16	2.6
Community Action Agency	51	8.4
Councils of Government	26	4.3
Mental Health Center	153	25.2
Legal Aid Agency	32	5.3
Texas Dept. Human Resources	224	37.0
Texas Employment Commission	48	7.9
Texas Rehabilitation Commission	56	9.2
TOTALS	606	100.0

APPENDIX F

TABLE 35

SURVEY PARTICIPANTS BY POPULATION OF CITY

POPULATION	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Below 10,000	63	10.4
10,000 - 24,999	90	14.9
25,000 - 49,999	63	10.4
50,000 - 74,999	48	7.9
75,000 - 99,999	25	4.1
100,000 - 149,000	58	9.6
150,000 - 199,999	12	2.0
200,000 - 249,999	25	4.1
250,000 - 499,999	103	17.0
Above 500,000	119	19.6
TOTALS	606	100.0

APPENDIX G

TABLE 36

ETHNICITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

ETHNICITY	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Anglo	398	66.0
Black	69	11.4
Hispanic	129	21.4
Oriental	5	0.8
Other	2	0.3
TOTALS	603	100.0

APPENDIX H

TABLE 37

SURVEY PARTICIPANTS BY AGENCY LEVEL

AGENCY LEVEL	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
LOCAL/REGIONAL	276	45.5
STATE	330	54.5
TOTALS	606	100.0

APPENDIX I

TABLE 38

AGENCY CAREER ANTICIPATION AMONG SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

ANTICIPATE CAREER IN AGENCY	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
YES	344	58.4
NO	245	41.6
TOTALS	589	100.0

APPENDIX J

TABLE 39

PUBLIC/GOVERNMENTAL CAREER EXPECTATION AMONG SURVEY PARTICIPANTS
WHO DO NOT ANTICIPATE A CAREER IN THEIR RESPECTIVE AGENCIES

ANTICIPATE PUBLIC/GOVERNMENTAL CAREER	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
YES	126	53.2
NO	111	46.8
TOTALS	237	100.0

APPENDIX K

TABLE 40

JOB DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

JOB DESCRIPTION	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Administration	128	21.1
Planning	9	1.5
Administrator with caseload	17	2.8
Psychiatrist	3	0.5
Physician	3	0.5
Lawyer	17	2.8
Psychologist	22	3.6
Nurse	9	1.5
Paralegals	7	1.2
Caseworkers:		
Mental Health/Retardation	78	12.9
Alcoholism & Drug Abuse	6	1.0
Texas Rehabilitation Commission	46	7.6
Texas Employment Commission	38	6.3
Dept. Human Resources		
Family Services	128	21.1
Financial Assistance	79	13.0
Council of Governments	1	0.2
Community Action Program	15	2.5
TOTALS	606	100.0

APPENDIX L

TABLE 41

SEX OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

SEX	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Female	373	61.7
Male	232	38.3
TOTALS	605	100.0

APPENDIX M

COVER LETTER TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS



SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY

ALPINE, TEXAS 79830

*Division of Social Science
Political Science, Psychology, Sociology,
and Philosophy*

We all know that providing human services is an important, although inadequately understood, function of government. In an effort to increase the understanding of human services administration in our state, the enclosed survey is being sent to you and other selected social service professionals in Texas. The survey, which is brief and easily answered, asks for information on the nature of your setting.

Your participation in this project is extremely important to its success. As a social service professional, you are the only source of first-hand information for this study. Through your cooperation, we will be gaining insight into the social services system in Texas as it operates as a whole and in component parts.

To assure your anonymity, your responses will be strictly confidential and will be analyzed only in the aggregate; at no time will your responses be analyzed individually. The number on your survey is there only for assisting in the management of the return rate. Furthermore, your employer will never see your responses.

So please complete and return the enclosed survey as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please contact Jim Case at Sul Ross State University. The number is (915) 837-8161.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Jim Case, Assistant Professor
Political Science Department

APPENDIX N

REMINDER TO RETURN SURVEY



Ah! quam dulce est meminisse.

(Ah! how sweet it is to have remembered.)

Latin Proverb

Have you remembered to return your
Sul Ross Survey?
Please do!

Pax

Political Science Department
Sul Ross State University
Alpine, Texas 79832

APPENDIX O
QUESTIONNAIRE TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

Political Science Department
Sul Ross State University

SURVEY OF SOCIAL SERVICE PROFESSIONALS

Instructions:

CIRCLE the ONE alternative which best describes your opinion about the following statements. If you are uncertain about an answer or if a statement is inappropriate for your job or agency, circle response "IA".

A. This first series of statements relates to the structure of your work. Circle the one number which best reflects your feeling about your work.

	<i>strongly agree</i>	<i>agree</i>	<i>disagree</i>	<i>strongly disagree</i>	<i>inappropriate</i>
1. There can be little action taken here until a supervisor approves a decision.	1	2	3	4	IA
2. The employees here are constantly being checked on for rule violations.	1	2	3	4	IA
3. I feel that I am my own boss in most matters.	1	2	3	4	IA
4. I do the same job in the same way every day.	1	2	3	4	IA
5. People here are allowed to do almost as they please.	1	2	3	4	IA
6. People here feel as though they are constantly being watched to see that they obey all the rules.	1	2	3	4	IA
7. Most people here make their own rules on the job.	1	2	3	4	IA
8. There is something different to do on my job every day.	1	2	3	4	IA
9. Any decision I make has to have my boss's approval.	1	2	3	4	IA
10. In my job I have something new happening every day.	1	2	3	4	IA

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	inappropriate
11. How things are done here is left up to the person doing the work.	1	2	3	4	IA
12. A person who wants to make his/her own decisions would be quickly discouraged here.	1	2	3	4	IA
13. Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.	1	2	3	4	IA
14. A person here can make his/her own decisions without checking with anybody else.	1	2	3	4	IA
15. One thing I like around here is the variety of work.	1	2	3	4	IA
16. I have to ask my boss before I do almost anything.	1	2	3	4	IA
	always	often	frequently	never	inappropriate
17. How frequently do you usually participate in the decision to hire new staff?	1	2	3	4	IA
18. How often do you usually participate in decisions on the promotion of any of the professional staff?	1	2	3	4	IA
19. How frequently do you participate in decisions on the adoption of new programs?	1	2	3	4	IA
20. How frequently do you participate in decisions on the adoption of new policies?	1	2	3	4	IA
21. Would you describe your job as being:	1. highly non-routine	2. somewhat non-routine	3. routine	4. highly routine	5. IA

B. This series of statements relates to change in your work environment. Please focus on the amount of change which has occurred WITHIN your agency during the past few years. (or if you have been employed less than three years, since you began work for this agency).

During the past three to five years, to what extent has there been change in:

	<i>no change</i>	<i>little change</i>	<i>occasional change</i>	<i>frequent change</i>	<i>constant change</i>	<i>inappropriate</i>
22. your duties and responsibilities?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
23. the technology you use on your job? For example, data systems, computers.	1	2	3	4	5	IA
24. agency rules and regulations?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
25. employee skills and abilities?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
26. the makeup of your agency's labor force? For example, agency size, types of occupations employed.	1	2	3	4	5	IA
27. your agency's goals and objectives?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
28. the leadership of your agency?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
29. the people in your agency (personnel turnover)?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
30. the structure of your agency?	1	2	3	4	5	IA

Now focus on the amount of change which has occurred in the EXTERNAL environment of your agency over the past few years (or since you have been employed).

During the past three to five years, to what extent has there been change in:

31. the demand for your agency's services?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
32. the appropriations received from your funding sources?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
33. the number of agencies you deal with on your job?	1	2	3	4	5	IA

During the past three to five years, to what extent has there been change in:	no change	little change	occasional change	frequent change	constant change	inappropriate
34. the laws/rules and regulations which relate to your agency?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
35. the number of clients you work with?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
36. the policies of the agencies you deal with on your job?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
37. pressure exerted on your agency by outside interest groups?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
38. the length of time you work with a client?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
39. the ability of outside agencies to assist you in your work?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
40. coverage of your agency by the media?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
41. comments from the non-client members of the public?	1	2	3	4	5	IA
42. involvement in your agency by community public officials?	1	2	3	4	5	IA

Next, comparing your agency with other social service programs you are familiar with, how would you respond to the following statements?

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	inappropriate
43. Our clients are more demanding than those in other agencies.	1	2	3	4	IA
44. We have more new clients than other agencies.	1	2	3	4	IA
45. Our programs change faster than the programs of other agencies.	1	2	3	4	IA
46. We experience more personnel turnover than do other agencies.	1	2	3	4	IA
47. Our procedures have changed more rapidly than have procedures in other agencies.	1	2	3	4	IA

C. The following series of statements relates to constraints you experience in your work. Continuing to reflect on your work, what is your response to these statements?

I am able:	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	inappropriate
48. to get my supervisor to go along with what I want.	1	2	3	4	IA
49. to get my peers to go along with what I want.	1	2	3	4	IA
50. to get those I supervise to go along with what I want.	1	2	3	4	IA
51. to get my clients to go along with what I want.	1	2	3	4	IA
52. to get other agencies I work with to go along with what I want.	1	2	3	4	IA
53. to get around agency rules and regulations which hinder my work.	1	2	3	4	IA
54. to get the materials I need to do my job.	1	2	3	4	IA
55. to get the information I need to do my job.	1	2	3	4	IA
56. to meet my work deadlines.	1	2	3	4	IA
57. to accomplish my work objectives.	1	2	3	4	IA

D. And this series of statements relates to your satisfaction with the labor that you do. Consider how you would reply to these statements and, once again, circle the appropriate response.

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	inappropriate
58. I really don't feel a sense of pride or accomplishment as a result of the type of work I do.	1	2	3	4	IA
59. I very much like the type of work I am doing.	1	2	3	4	IA

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	inappropriate
60. My work is my most rewarding experience.	1	2	3	4	IA
61. My job gives me a chance to do the things that I do best.	1	2	3	4	IA
62. My work gives me a feeling of pride in having done the job well.	1	2	3	4	IA
	very satisfied	satisfied	dissatisfied	very dissatisfied	inappropriate
63. How satisfied are you that you have been given enough authority by your board of directors (or commission) to do your job well?	1	2	3	4	IA
64. How satisfied are you with your present job when you compare it to similar positions in the state?	1	2	3	4	IA
65. How satisfied are you with the progress you are making towards the goals which you set for yourself in your present position?	1	2	3	4	IA
66. On the whole, how satisfied are you that your superior accepts you as a professional expert to the degree to which you are entitled by reason of position, training, and experience?	1	2	3	4	IA
67. On the whole, how satisfied are you with your present job when you consider the expectations you had when you took the job?	1	2	3	4	IA
68. How satisfied are you with your present job in light of career expectations?	1	2	3	4	IA

E. And these final questions relate to your background. To help in analyzing our data, would you please give us the following information?

69. How long have you worked for this agency? _____
70. How long have you been in your current position? _____
71. Do your long-range plans include a career with this agency? 1. yes 2. no
72. If you do not plan a career with this agency, do your long-range plans include your continuing to work in the public/governmental sector? 1. yes 2. no
73. What was your age on your last birthday? _____
74. Are you male or female? 1. female 2. male
75. How many years of formal education have you completed? _____
76. What is the highest educational degree you hold? _____
77. What is your before-tax annual income in your present position?
- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| ___ 1. under \$10,000 | ___ 5. \$25,000 to \$29,999 |
| ___ 2. \$10,000 to \$14,999 | ___ 6. \$30,000 to \$34,999 |
| ___ 3. \$15,000 to \$19,999 | ___ 7. \$35,000 to \$40,000 |
| ___ 4. \$20,000 to \$24,999 | ___ 8. above \$40,000 |
78. What is your ethnic/cultural background?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| ___ 1. Anglo | ___ 2. Black | ___ 3. Hispanic | ___ 4. Oriental |
| ___ 5. Other, please specify: _____ | | | |
79. Would you briefly describe your work? For example: administrator, planner, or caseworker in a specific program or set of programs.

THANK YOU!

Please secure this survey with the enclosed seal and return as quickly as possible so that our project can continue. Simply deposit in the mail. NOTE: POSTAGE HAS ALREADY BEEN PAID.