

Social Foundation for Change

Some context is required before jumping too quickly into organizational change. The “earth is flat” was not even an issue until someone thought otherwise and asked the questions that caused the existing paradigm to be evaluated which raised other possibilities. So too it is with social change, which is effectively what is at the heart of organizational change. To understand the theories, there is the implicit need to understand the historical context within which they were developed and the level of understanding built over time.

As a frame of reference for historical positioning, Alvin and Heidi Toffler’s waves of civilization provide the backdrop. This framework was initially laid out in *Future Shock* and *Third Wave* and later expanded in *Powershift* and *Building a New Civilization* (Toffler, 1970, 1980, & 1990, and Toffler & Toffler, 1995). This model provides the ability to draw inferences to issues facing us today as well as to provide a historical frame of reference for social change. Many of the great sociologists (Marx, Weber, Durkheim, VanderZanden) did their work during the beginning of the Industrial Revolution when the impacts of the industrial Second Wave on the agrarian First Wave were becoming evident. It was a time when turmoil and uncertainty existed as civilization itself was evolving. Today, it is important not only to know how early social thought explained the social environment then, but also it is important to understand that we are at a similar position entering still another era. This is an attempt to understand our social system as early theorists sought to understand theirs.

Looking back, it can be seen how the early social theories were groundbreaking at the time and how they built on the foundation of earlier pioneers. Changes of a similar magnitude are underway today and any study of society and/or organizations must include the other because of the great interaction between the social system and the components making up society. Organizations as a sub-society operate with social processes that are common to those to the larger society, along with some social processes that are unique to the smaller sized organization. But even in these smaller areas there are implications to the larger society because of impact organizations have on society through their combined actions.

The seeds for the Second Wave – Western Civilization

Toffler described three broad waves of social change that affect all aspects of society including the interrelationships between its sub-parts. While not totally eliminating all remnants of the previous society, each sweeping change influences the existing civilization, changing it in ways that would not occur without these new forces. The first wave of change was related to the Agricultural Revolution where human society shifted from a hunter-gatherer society to one centered on controlled agriculture. The second traumatic wave of social change was the shift from the First Wave (agricultural) to the Second Wave (industrial). Today, we stand on the threshold of the Third Wave (knowledge based).

Zeitlin (1990) described 14th century Europe as a period of self-sufficiency by the majority of the population who were free peasant proprietors working their own agricultural operations. Over time the productivity of the community grew to the point where surpluses existed beyond the needs of the manorial village. And by the 15th century there had been a shift to a market economy with a corresponding shift in power from the feudal lord to the

monarchy. With the push to consolidate power the less powerful lords had their estates and public properties confiscated by other, stronger lords and the monarchy. In a short period of time many of the farmer peasants faced the loss of the protection previously provided by the local feudal lord. These free peasant proprietors who had previously owned their own land and had free access to public lands for timber and grazing found themselves forced into serfdom, becoming a convenient labor pool for an infant capitalistic economy. Effectively the feudal economy reverted back to an economy based on a labor pool that did not have access to the means of production. While not slaves, the effect was similar in their options for survival. Zeitlin (1990, p. 116) described this as

the evicted became vagabonds helplessly roaming the country-side; their descendants eventually became wage-laborers. . . . Thus what was formerly the peasant's means of production now became capital in the hands of the new commercial lords and big farmers, and what was formerly produced by peasants for their own use and consumption, now became means of subsistence that the new proletarians could acquire only selling their labor for wages. Labor had become a commodity subject to market forces [within a system of centralized production for market use].

Within England the antithesis of a welfare system existed where laws were even put in place forcing the poor, homeless, and criminal to work in the early factory system. (Zeitlin, 1990) When you put this transition into perspective as to the impact on the average individual and household, today's changes are minor in comparison.

This was the transition point as the First Wave started to give way to the Second Wave with its emphasis on division of labor and mass efficiency. It was also the backdrop for Max Weber's and Karl Marx's study of historical sociology which lead to the development of their later theories. The relationship between the individual and society was seen as one of estrangement forced upon the workers by their lack of access to production capabilities. Emile Durkheim also saw an estranged worker but more as a result of division of labor. Durkheim also stressed solidarity and consensus among workers where Marx saw only opposition and conflict between classes (Abrahamson, 1990). Durkheim saw division of labor as a natural result of society getting more complex and a group not being able to produce all of the group's needs without outside assistance. This society of specialization of trades and talents fits into Toffler's Second Wave society. In describing a society that matches Toffler's First Wave, Durkheim discusses primitive societies as "mechanical solidarity" wherein everyone in the group knew each other and worked together to produce the needs of the social group (Takata & Curran, 1993).

Marx's view of capitalism went beyond class stratification to a dislike of the basic attitude the system has toward laborers. To him the entire relationship between manager and worker was based on conflicting principles and tendencies that only push the two classes further apart in a win-lose battle (Zeitlin, 1990). Along with Frederick Engels, Marx also focused on the problem of overspecialization inherent in division of labor and recommended communism as an alternative that would allow the worker to better control his daily activity and thereby avoid the boredom so often encountered in mass production. On the subject of choice of work, Marx and Engels said, "for as soon as labor is distributed, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape" (Zeitlin, 1990, p. 95, original: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "German Ideology"). This viewpoint rests entirely on the worker being dependent on society to make decisions in

the worker's best interest. It ignores self-determination by the worker to ever change or to expand skills and knowledge necessary to work in different fields. As an alternative though, history has also shown that state control of production within a communist society to be a poor solution to the basic problem of worker self-actualization. As the world continues to become more knowledge-based there will be even greater difficulty for workers coping with centralized control.

Lacking the ability to control their work, people would avoid work as much as possible. Marx then agreed with a core part of Douglas McGregor's Theory X, not because work itself was undesirable, but because work was boring. Marx's thoughts on the humanistic side of work approached some of the thinking that Abraham Maslow incorporated in his Hierarchy of Human Needs but with a different end result. Where Maslow gave primary requirement to the animalistic issues of physiological and safety needs, Marx saw people feeling most human when eating, drinking, and procreating, differentiating these activities as being away from work. Maslow's higher level needs that are work related (ego and self-esteem and self-actualization) are thought of as animalistic by Marx because the nature of work makes people feel less human. (Abrahamson, 1990 and Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996)

The class differences of Marx were expanded by James VanderZanden to a theory of social stratification, which is "the ranking and grading of individuals and groups into hierarchical layers" (Takata & Curran, 1993, p. 211). Goodness or badness is not necessarily ascribed to stratification, just an acceptance that it is natural in both the animal kingdom and all human societies. The ranking process depends on what each particular society values, which in turn determines access to and possession of social wealth as defined by that society. While social stratification is universal there are a number of ways that societies determine rank placement. VanderZanden described three broad mechanisms: ascribed status, achieved status, and caste. In the ascribed status, birth or seniority determines the rank. In each, the process is outside the control of the individual; you are either born into the right family and gain the status of previous generations or rank is attained over time through tenure. This is in sharp contrast to achieved status that is dependent on what the individual accomplishes. In the third mechanism, the caste system allows the individual no ability to shift ranks, not even with seniority. Castes may be differentiated on race, gender, or physical attractiveness. (Takata & Curran, 1993)

Once placed in a social stratum the individual develops norms relative to the group to which the individual belongs and identifies with that group by adherence to the unarticulated rules that govern the functioning of the group. According to VanderZanden it is through these social norms that the society keeps from degenerating into disorder and unruliness, which is similar to "anomie" or normlessness that Durkheim studied (Takata & Curran, 1993). As society changes, so must the rules governing the society. Tying back to Toffler's model of societal change it is at the wave interfaces that confusion exists because the norms are being recast to fit new situations; where the present does not fit the past or the future. In VanderZanden's model of belonging, the insider maintains the group norms and the continuation of the society. However, it is the outsider who is responsible for raising awareness and promoting the necessary changes to move forward, just as Marx was looking for those to mobilize the proletariat through raising their consciousness to their plight.

VanderZanden described two types of change agents, the innovator and the revolutionary. The innovator is accepting of the basic norms of society, but lacks the means

to attain them as others do. They are therefore required to invent new ways to attain the same goals, some of which may not necessarily be legal or socially acceptable. On the other hand, revolutionaries do not accept the basic goals that underlie society and others see them as troublemakers because they are striving to overthrow the norms (Takata & Curran, 1993). However, the social core is not powerless to fight the revolutionaries, not so much with conspiracy or focused intent, but with adherence to the norms themselves. A common occurrence of this effort to maintain the status quo is the concept of “working to rule” where the norm or work rule is met literally to the letter without adaptation to the situation. This is the total reliance on the formal work structure, ignoring the informal structure where much of the activity normally takes place. The revolutionary cannot complain because the rules are being met. It is through this situation where the strength of the informal structure becomes evident because it is impossible to spell out all rules in sufficient detail for the formal structure to work. In the informal structure, mutual interdependence drives group members toward the common goal and adaptation is ongoing.

Anthony Giddens described the role of the revolutionary as one who makes others aware of the situation, makes them uncomfortable with the situation, and then helps people to question their initial beliefs in the norm itself. The difficulty arises in that people do not like to have their belief systems questioned, because recognition of one area needing change brings up the question of other areas also being in possible error. Further, revolutionaries see their role as one of consciousness raising, not one of delivering the solution (Takata & Curran, 1993). A more recent example is the Cluetrain Manifesto (1999) which lists ninety-five changes that business will have to make to survive in the long run. Examples included:

7. Hyperlinks subvert hierarchy.

15. In a few more years, the current homogenized “voice” of business – the sound of mission statements and brochures – will seem as contrived and artificial as the language of the 18th century French court.

51. Command-and-control management styles both derive from and reinforce bureaucracy, power tripping and an overall culture of paranoia.

95. We are waking up and linking to each other. We are watching. But we are not waiting.

Also reported in the Journal of the Hyperlinked Organization “the assumption is that the less management, the better . . . and no management would be the best of all. On the Web, everyone is a comrade” (Weinberger, 1999). In many ways, the voice is similar to that heard on college campus during the Vietnam War era in its tone and insistence on change, NOW! It also has overtones of Marx in its consciousness raising and empowerment of the worker masses. When this writer pointed out the gap between their manifesto and the current situation without a plan of action for closing the gap, the response was as expected of a revolutionary, “That’s not what we’re about.” Awareness and action are two different steps in social change.

Richard Michels highlights this difference in his theories of crowds and crowd psychology. He agrees with Marx that it is not oppressive conditions that cause class struggle, but the *recognition* of the oppressive conditions. Where Marx saw this recognition becoming evident to the proletariat, Michels claims it does not happen spontaneously, but being triggered by an outside force. Without such leadership, the masses are content to let others continue to run their life either through aristocratic or bureaucratic processes. Michels (1959, cited in Zeitlin, 1990, p. 246) noted “When his work is finished, the proletarian can

think only of rest and getting to bed in good time.” This raises the question about where the initial leaders will arise.

Michels finds the answer in the bourgeois where there is always a fraction that is discontent with the current social system and is looking for a mechanism for promoting change. Their ability to lead is aided both by their education and the culture of the bourgeois. As any movement for social change grows there is the need for additional leadership, most of which must come from the masses. However, as a worker is elevated to a leader of workers, the new leader is no longer one of the masses and now has the ability to promote his own self-interests. The struggle then becomes not of one between a leader and the masses, but between the leader and the new ascending leaders looking for their own power base. By proclaiming their experience and stressing the need to continue following their lead, the emerging leaders then solidify their power base. This dependence on leaders combined with the general apathy of the masses plays into the general human characteristic of greed for power. The result is that the organized movement manages to shift power from one large oligarchy to many smaller oligarchies again denying the masses the benefits that were originally sought. Michels then concluded that leadership which is necessary to bring about change also results in the creation of new oligarchies that, while new and different still oppress the masses. Even within the bourgeois there are different levels of power.

This recognition of the creation of new leader strata differs from Marx’s view of two homogeneous classes. Marx focused attention on abuse of power by the bourgeois class as the leaders, where Michels sees the oligarchic abuse of power that arises within leadership groups wherever they exist. This led Michels (1959, cited in Zeitlin, 1990, p. 254) to predict “The socialist might conquer, but not socialism, which would perish in the moment of its adherent’s triumph.” This pointed out a great weakness in Marx’s theory and was remarkably accurate. Michels saw in democracy a threat to bring about oligarchy, but less of one than that present in socialism or a return to aristocracy. He advocated the education of the masses about the risks associated with organizing and felt that it was only through such education would the masses be able to recognize and stand against such oligarchic forces (Zeitlin, 1990).

Where Michels studied power relationships in simple organizational structures Max Weber studied the more complex organizations where man at all levels have become “proletarianized.” In this view, virtually everyone is dependent on their employment for their livelihood and is a captive to the system. He therefore sought the most rational structure for organizing complex relationships, which was the bureaucracy. Today, bureaucracy is thought of as an inefficient method of organizing, but that is only within today’s need to adapt to change. In a society with little change, the bureaucratic form of organizing work becomes more efficient through the removal of personal whim by traditional or charismatic leaders. By establishing norms for all work processes and relationships the organization becomes predictable and rewards demonstrated competence and not favoritism. Where Marx saw the division of labor as the basis of class struggle and Michels saw it as the foundation for oligarchy through the formation of leadership levels, Weber saw division of labor as creating clear authority and responsibility, removing ambiguity of roles. The hierarchy of command creates clear lines of communication and rank placement is by achievement through education and training and validated by examination or actual performance. Placement by patrimonialism is not consistent with the rules of bureaucratic office management. The bureaucracy also created an administrator class that blurred the line between proletariat and

bourgeoisie. These administrators were responsible for representing the owners in all decisions, working for fixed salaries, yet were not owners. They were responsible for implementing the rules, discipline, and controls in a fair and impersonal manner. (Hodge and Anthony, 1991, 19; Takata and Curran, 1993, pp. 85, & 152; and Zeitlin, 1990, 69 & 184)

This study of complex organizations has led Weber to be referred to as the “father of organizational theory.” Weber saw the bureaucratic organization similar to that of the assembly line in its technical superiority over other structures and writes:

The decisive reason for the advance of bureaucratic organization has always been its purely *technical* superiority over any other form of organization. The fully developed bureaucratic apparatus compares with other organizations exactly as does the machine with the non-mechanical modes of production. Precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of the files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs – these are raised to the optimum point in the strictly bureaucratic administration, and especially in its monocratic form. (Gerth, H. H. & Mills, C. W. (eds.). (1958). “Max Weber: Essays in Sociology” as cited in Zeitlin, 1990, p 183).

However, in the same book Weber points out that the growth of bureaucracies is not solely because of its efficiency, but because of power politics and the enormity of managing large budgets and organizations. He foresaw the tendency toward less individual freedom as a trade-off for the efficiency. And Zeitlin (1990, p. 185) points out that “in no complex, industrial society has bureaucratization been halted, much less reversed. This is true regardless of whether the societies in question are liberal-capitalistic or socialist.” In fact what has happened over time is a movement from simple bureaucracies to more specialized forms. In Mintzberg (1983) the specialized forms differ on the mechanism for setting the rules upon which the bureaucracy functions. These bureaucratic forms are (a) standardization around work processes as studied by Weber, (b) standardization of output, and (c) standardization of skills. As these additional layers of complexity accumulate, the organizational study becomes more difficult with the interaction between various functional units. One approach to studying such complexity is within a systems framework.

Talcott Parsons was the first sociologist that emphasized society as a social system with mutually interdependent parts. Malfunctioning of one part can cause a cascade failure in other parts of society. The theory was built around the personality system, the social system, and the cultural system. Within the personality system are the individual goals and motivations of each person. These individuals interact with each other within the social system. In addition to the individual interactions the social system includes the situational norms which govern the interaction. The cultural system includes the values, beliefs, and symbols that define a society and regulate the personality and social systems. Parsons’ theory on the way norms influence social development is closely related to Durkheim’s. Parsons describes the way the cultural norms provide the foundation for the development of situational norms as institutionalization. And the way cultural norms help shape the individual’s personal goals and motivations is called internalization by Parsons. By having common cultural norms for institutionalization and internalization the society becomes more stable. The biggest criticism of Parsons’ work is the overemphasis of internalization for social stability. According to Parsons internalization directs individual actions in given situations. But does it ensure compliance or does it generate guilt for non-compliance? And if guilt is

involved, is that sufficient to control action or is it the fear of getting caught that is the ultimate control? Harold Garfinkel argues that there are too many situations to be adequately codified in situational norms and that individuals confront each situation judgmentally. Sigmund Freud weighs in with the belief that moral conscious is only one of the forces directing human actions. Further criticism comes from Alvin Gouldner who focuses on inequality in the interactions themselves that create conflict. For example, relationships that involve gender roles, proletarian-bourgeoisie, role conflict, or forced situations all produce interactions where one party has different power in the relationship and can therefore influence the outcome. (Abrahamson, 1990, pp. 37-49 and Takata and Curran, 1993, p. 84)

The work done by Weber, Parsons, Marx, and others provides the foundation for more detailed study of organizations as social systems. In Hersey et. al. (1996) organizations are shown to operate as a social system, similar to Parsons' model with subsystems. The subsystems include:

- human/social, which includes the needs, motivations, and leadership roles,
- structural, including authority, responsibility, and interpersonal relationships,
- informational/decision-making to keep the system operating, and
- economic/technical control toward organizational goals in a cost effective manner.

As one sociologist built on the work of others, so have those who have studied organization theory built on each other as well as the sociology foundation. Hodge and Anthony (1991) organizes these theorists into four groups: classical, behavioral, systems, and contingency. The classical school, which includes Max Weber, studied organizations from an efficiency point of view blending engineering and economics backgrounds on the problems they saw. The behavioral school built on the classical theories but added the human dimension of psychology, sociology, and social psychology. Current work is underway in both the systems area and the contingency school. The contingency school adds current management and leadership studies and industrial engineering to the study of organizations.

The Classical School

Study of the division of labor continued from the work done by Marx, Weber, Michels, and others, adding the impact of organizational growth and organizational structure. Structural aspects include span of control, line and staff divisions, hierarchical order of authority and responsibility, and advantages of further specialization. The approach was rational and scientific, searching for the best way to do each task and process. Yet the human element was ignored or viewed only as a barrier to be overcome.

Using "time studies" as a tool to investigate production methods Frederick Taylor sought to find the "one best way" to perform a task, establish that method as a work standard, and then to develop personnel and equipment selection procedures that match the requirements for the work. Frank Gilbreth later used "motion studies" for similar work and later added the time component after meeting Taylor. (Wren and Greenwood, 1998, p. 145) A century later this process is similar to our "best practice" activity only applied to a work task instead of a business process. The underlying assumption was that both the worker and the organization would benefit from the work efficiency and incentive pay available from increased productivity. Like Weber, Taylor promoted the standardization of work throughout the organization. Taylor's view of management was also similar to Weber's in that he saw

the ideal manager as completely rational and divorced from human emotions. Yet he did recognize the human element as an obstacle to implementing his recommendations. Taylor in “Shop Management” (Taylor, 1903, as cited in Wren, 1994, p. 129) wrote:

Proper personal relations should always be maintained between the employers and men; and even the prejudices of the workmen should be considered in dealing with them.... [The manager who] talks to his men in a condescending or patronizing way, or else not at all, has no chance whatever of ascertaining their real thoughts or feelings.

In dealing with these problems, Taylor placed the blame on management for not designing the work correctly, but the human side was limited to communication and problem recognition. His comments on change still ring true today. In “Shop Management” (as cited in Wren, 1994, p. 129-130) Taylor wrote about resistance to change:

Through generations of bitter experiences working men as a class have learned to look upon all change as antagonistic to their best interests. They do not ask the object of the change, but oppose it simply as *change*. The first changes, therefore should be such as to allay the suspicions of the men and convince them by actual contact that the reforms are after all rather harmless and are only such as will ultimately be of benefit to all concerned.

Such resistance was often displayed as “soldiering.” Natural soldiering was “the natural instinct and tendency of men to take it easy” (Taylor, 1903, as cited in Wren, 1994, p. 107). This attitude toward work is similar to Douglas McGregor’s Theory X. Taylor believed that good managers could overcome such attitudes through inspiring or forcing workers to come up to standards that were rationally set. The belief was that if workers understood the engineering point of view upon which the standards were set they would be accepted. Having learned that negative incentives and rate cutting through reducing piece rate amounts did not yield the desired improvement, Taylor developed a “differential piece rate” incentive that encouraged increased productivity. The other type of soldiering, systematic was “more intricate second thought and reasoning caused by their relations with other men.” (Taylor, 1903, as cited in Wren, 1994, p. 107) This is similar to the group norms of Durkheim and Parsons and is much more difficult to overcome because they are culturally ingrained. Again, the corrective approach was based on education of rational work practices and incentives. (Hodge and Anthony, 1991, p. 22; Mintzberg, 1983, p. 8; and Wren, 1994, 107-109)

Another early contributor to the classical school was Andrew Ure who along with Taylor pioneered management education. Ure established his principles of action as an interacting system, as did Parsons. Ure included all of Parsons’ systems within the moral category and added the technical aspects, production processes, and the commercial aspects of sales and finance. His writings influenced Charles Dupin, who in turn would influence Henry Fayol. (Wren, 1994, pp. 63-64) While Ure and Dupin were mainly concerned with the technical aspects of business and not the managerial aspects, Fayol focused his study on the administrative levels of the organization developing fourteen principles of management. He felt that these principles would apply to any organization, which was the first notion of “universality” in organization theory. While Fayol addressed the same issues as Weber he did so from an advisory point of view and not one of developing a unified theory. Topics that were included match those included by Weber, division of labor, authority and responsibility, and hierarchy of command and control. Along with Taylor and Weber, Fayol stressed the importance of scientific selection of workers and their training. Fayol’s study of record

keeping and application of information to control operations match Weber's insights into bureaucracies. ((Hodge and Anthony, 1991, p. 22; Mintzberg, 1983, p. 8; and Scott and Mitchell, 1972, p. 13)

The Behavioral School

The behaviorists recognized the major deficiency of the classical theories as the lack of understanding of human behavior as it related to organizational dynamics. They therefore built on the work that had been done to that point, going beyond process efficiency and adding studies into motivation/needs, communications, leadership, and human relations. However, as a reaction to the lack of human elements in organization theory, they may have swung the pendulum too far in that direction, neglecting the interaction between the workers and the work processes.

The work started by Elton Mayo and continued by Fritz Roethlisberger and William Dickson at the Western Electric Hawthorne plant was the turning point where classical organization theory started to include human elements in the research. The research design was similar to that of Taylor and Gilbreth centering on work conditions, in particular the impact of illumination levels on productivity. The initial results were as expected, higher productivity with increased illumination. However, the productivity continued to increase even after lighting was dimmed to the initial level and below. What was being observed is the inability to treat the worker as an independent variable in the test design. The simple act of paying attention to the workers influenced their behavior. The work done by Roethlisberger and Dickson was the first to connect the informal organization structure with a self-coordinating mechanism, in this case a group of young women developing a "team" structure by the common bond of being part of a scientific study. Also in the Mayo study was the finding of a relationship between productivity and a feeling of discontinuity of personal goals and organizational goals as often happens with very close supervision and lack of ability to control the job or work environment. (Hersey et. al., 1996, pp. 65-66; Mintzberg, 1983, pp. 8-9)

The study of informal work groups was continued by George Homan in his theory of Mutual Dependency of Activities, Interactions, and Sentiments in which the potential of the informal work relationships to control group behavior and productivity was validated. Also validated was the fear that management has of informal relationships because of their inability to control via the formal hierarchy. Both of these issues come into play today where the need for the strengths of the informal organization is becoming more important because of the inability of the formal organizational structure to adapt quick enough to environmental change. To describe the relationships in the organization Homan developed a model of an interacting social system with three parts. The first part is the activities or tasks that are performed as part of the normal work processes. This is the part of the model that would have been studied in detail by the classical theorists. The second part was termed "interactions" for the natural behaviors that occur between individuals while performing the activity. This part is similar to Parsons' personality system as it is concerned with the interpersonal interactions among individuals with their own goals and ambitions. Homan's third part is "sentiments" or the attitudes that develop within a group and between individuals and must be mutually agreeable for the work process to continue. Any deviation from the expected norm can be

met with great social pressure to conform to the expected behavior. The sentiments part then implies a similarity to Parsons' social system in that satisfaction lies with interactions being within boundaries established by situational norms, which in turn are established by the cultural system described by Parsons. Homan's model of social interaction assumes a natural balance being established by the three forces collectively acting in the informal organization. Possible imbalance with the organizational goals could originate with non-alignment of sentiments with the cultural system demanded by the organizational goals. In this event, the social system developed within the organizational sub-group is reaching equilibrium with insufficient outside influence of the cultural system. This explanation is a blending of Parsons' model with that of Homan's using the non-overlapping part of Parson's model to explain organizational non-alignment that can occur when Homan's model is extended from the small work group to the larger organization. (Hersey et. al., 1996, pp. 71-72)

Within Homan's social model, personal satisfaction is derived from the positive feedback that results from the activity with its interpersonal relationships and the attitudes that develop within the group. Frederick Herzberg pushed further into this area of study to differentiate job satisfaction from job dissatisfaction. Similar to Homan, satisfaction was associated with the work itself and the personal growth and recognition, both in social recognition and promotion. However, job dissatisfaction was more associated with the work environment or the job context, which includes such items as quality of supervision, physical environment, and rewards. These items were described as maintenance items because there were negative consequences of not having enough, such as lowered productivity. And having excess did not produce satisfaction, but a lack of dissatisfaction. Gains in the motivators of achievement and recognition were related to higher worker productivity. The prescription from Herzberg's work is to build organizations not on pay and fear, but on personal accomplishment and recognition. (Hersey et. al., 1996, pp. 77-78; Hodge and Anthony, 1991, p. 24)

Focusing more on individual motivations David McClelland theorized two basic needs, the need for achievement and the need for affiliation. Early childhood development and the socialization that is transferred from parent to child may establish high levels of self-assurance and the desire to achieve noteworthy accomplishments. Or in a different environment, may establish dependency on others and an avoidance of risk. The first outcome produces adults with a high need for achievement. The second outcome would be a low level for achievement and a higher need to fit in with others and be accepted within the group. This was described as having a higher need for affiliation. McClelland extended his work beyond the organization to include cross-cultural studies. The different ethnic, religious, and minority groups studied did have different levels of individual need for achievement, which drove the society's rate of economic development and entrepreneurial activity. Wealth, status, and respect in the society was not the direct goal being sought, but the by-product of individual personalities willing to work hard, take risks, try new ideas, and make decisions with acceptance of responsibility. McClelland's work supported that by Max Weber in validating the relationship the Protestant Reformation had on the growth in modern capitalism. Within the Protestant Reformation was found the origin of self-reliance and independence that McClelland found at the root of the socialization process required for children to grow into adults with a high need for achievement. One of McClelland's interesting findings is the existence of a fifty-year lag for a significant shift in need for achievement in a society and the corresponding increase in economic growth. This work has

direct implications for welfare reform and economic development within the old Soviet Empire. It also has some implication to today's welfare state though the rate of change may likely be shorter. In both cases, efforts to increase need achievement within society or selected groups can result in improved economic situations. It also has something to say for attacking the problems of gangs, where the sub-culture socialization process has minimized the need for achievement and the need for affiliation dominates the individual personalities. In this instance, gang membership drives satisfaction even with its negative implications on society. (Hersey et. al., 1996, pp.81-85; Takata and Curran, 1993, pp. 147 & 321; and Wren, 1994, pp. 26-27)

Another area of study is the issue of cooperation within the group that was documented by Mary Parker Follett and Chester Barnard. As have many of the previous scholars, Barnard saw organizations as social processes for accomplishing work and not as static hierarchical charts that reflect the formal command and control structure. Within this framework is the need to align the goals of the formal organization with the goals of the individuals and the informal structure that always exists. In fact much of Barnard's work was on the power and benefit of the informal organization with its more effective direct lines of communication. He was also a leader in advocating the view of organizations existing within a greater society that are impacted by many external as well as internal stakeholders. Essentially, it is only through cooperation that individuals can achieve success. (Hodge and Anthony, 1991, p. 23 & Wren and Greenwood, 1998, pp. 163-167)

Barnard's emphasis on management cultivating a work environment that fosters cooperation is similar to Follett's attention on managing conflict in relationships. Within her work was the emphasis on the group as a collective effort and not the sum of individual efforts. Follett's model for conflict resolution showed win-lose strategies benefiting only one party, and only in the short-term. Additionally in compromise, neither side really wins – suppressing conflict lacks permanence since the core issue was not resolved. Today's efforts to take joint ownership of problems to find win-win solutions without power imbalances or compromise can be traced to Follett's work. In the problem solving process creative thinking is employed to focus on areas of common interest and not by focusing on differences. The degree of cooperation is similar to what is being proposed by many of today's experiments in shared management between worker and management. This sharing of authority with subordinates has little in common with Marx's concept of class struggle, which was seen as a win-lose proposition with no other options. In lieu of order givers and order takers Follett suggested the "law of the situation" where orders are defined by the situation itself and not the person giving the order. In this work process the group works as a unit and the formal hierarchical structure is not dominant. This is the foundation from which Peter Drucker developed his concept of management by objectives where the objectives themselves drive the management process. (Hodge and Anthony, 1991, p. 23 & Wren and Greenwood, 1998, pp. 165-168)

An extension of Follett's belief in the benefit of group collaboration was the work done by Douglas McGregor who theorized that an individual's response would be in reaction to other's expectations and attitudes toward him and were therefore a self-fulfilling prophecy. This idea challenged those of Nicolo Machiavelli who believed "that all men are bad and ever ready to display their vicious nature, whenever they may find occasion for it." (Gilbert, A. H. (Trans.). (1956). "Machiavelli: the Chief Works and Others" as cited in Wren and Greenwood, 1998, p. 28). Machiavelli would be an extreme of McGregor's Theory X where

workers only worked out of fear of economic or physical punishment. Further down the continuum is Theory Y which believes that work is a natural part of expressing creativity in human life and that acceptance of responsibility is a learned behavior. While fear can be shown to produce results, the consequences hinder long-term motivation toward desirable behavior. (Wren and Greenwood, 1998, pp. 23 & 202-203) In a free and open democratic society McGregor saw people much more capable of accepting increasing levels of responsibility for meeting group goals. However, Theory Y requires effort. Peter Drucker once commented:

Theory Y is not permissive . . . it's far more demanding than Theory X, it does not allow people to do their own thing, but demands self-discipline of them. It's a hard taskmaster, so it will only work if you start out with high performance goals and performance standards and don't tolerate anything else. (as cited in Wren and Greenwood, 1998, p. 202)

And Abraham Maslow commented that Theory Y will not work in cases of "bastards & sick people & for just plain normal human foolishness, mistakes, stupidity, dopiness, cowardliness, laziness, etc." and "these principles (i.e., McGregor's and Drucker's) *hold primarily for good conditions, rather than for stormy weather.*" (as cited in Wren and Greenwood, 1998, p. 202, italics belong to Maslow)

There have been a number of writers who have extended McGregor's Theory X & Y to include a Theory "Z." Lyndall Urwick's "Theory Z" was designed to fill gaps in McGregor's Theory Y and as such was not really a true extension of the X-Y continuum, but a definition of success. To Urwick, Theory Y would not be successful without individuals knowing the organization's goals and their role and reward for assisting in meeting the goals. (Wren and Greenwood, 1998, p. 375) William Ouchi and Alfred Jaeger developed a "Type Z" management style that was later renamed "Theory Z" to conform to the current buzzwords of the time. But the "theory" was really an extraction of the Japanese culture of long-range goal setting in a society that is built on loyalty and stability than it was a theory of motivation. This is similar to Emile Durkheim's need for group norms with its common understanding of group success. (Hodge and Anthony, 1991, p. 24 and Wren and Greenwood, 1998, p. 361 & 375-376)

At the time of his death Abraham Maslow also was working on additional detail to his version of Theory Z. He saw the workplace becoming more humanistic where economic security was assured and attitudes toward work itself were changed. (Maslow, 1998) Richard Barton, head of Microsoft's Expedia summarized this as "Work is not work. It's a hobby you happen to get paid for" (as cited in Wren and Greenwood, 1998, p. 72). In addition to extending McGregor's work Maslow in his five level Hierarchy of Human Needs also added additional depth to that of Herzberg. What was being described was a work force that had surpassed Herzberg's hygiene factors (broken out by Maslow as physiological, safety, and social needs) and had moved fully into Herzberg's motivators (self-esteem and self-actualization needs).

The Systems School

The Systems School of organizational development approaches organizational study from a holistic view, quantifying functional relationships. It builds on the work of the

Classicists and incorporates both behavioral and quantitative methods in the study. But it also bridges to the Contingency School by its approach to open systems. Kenneth Boulding and Ludwig von Bertalanffy saw organizations as a system of independent resources integrated together toward accomplishing a common goal. Each part doing its function of a greater process. But the Systems School focus is not only in how organizations function internally, but how they interact with their environment and other outside organizations. Jay Forrester's organizational simulations to seek understanding of the workings of the entire organization illustrate this approach. And Norbert Weiner and Stafford Beer pioneered the field of cybernetics as the feedback control from the total environment of the system. Within the systems approach are two operational views of systems. The closed systems view sees organizations operating independently from their environment and is similar to the view taken by the Classical School. The open system view where the organization interacts with both the internal and external environment links to the work done by the contingency school. (Hodge and Anthony, 1991, pp. 24-26)

From a systems perspective, the interaction of the properties of open systems (interdependence and self-regulatory properties) establish the possibility for change and adaptability. Such adaptation allows survival in a changing environment. This concept of evolution moves beyond the biological realm when reviewing system theory literature. In this manner, organizations change when the culture itself changes to restore a new balance with the changed environmental forces. Flint (1997) mentioned three forces at play in change and adaptation. The system may move toward subsystem segregation and be less interdependent of change elsewhere in the system. Secondly, the system may systemize with increased interdependence among the sub-systems. The third possible mechanism for adaptation is centralization, which is the increased importance of a particular sub-system with lessened interdependence with other sub-systems.

Using an example of an organizational crisis, the hierarchical leader gains more power from the organization's members in an effort to provide a quick response. This would be an example of centralized adaptation with the hierarchical leadership system becoming more dominant. However, if hierarchical dictate drove the shift in organizational power with lessened input from organizational members, the adaptation would be a segregated response. If the organizational response to environmental change were to include increased communication among the organizational members and increased teamwork, the response would involve a systemized response. Note that this adaptation process may not fully extend to an equivalent Darwinian evolutionary process within social systems. In part, this is due to a lack of a physical process that enables system duplication along with a definitive organizational life cycle. Yet, there are similar analogies to evolutionary models of social change. (Knapp, 1999, p. 78) This problem of relating outcome within the social system to changed environmental conditions also is a root problem in biological systems. In biological systems it can be argued "that what evolves is not an organism, subject to a fixed and given environment, but an ecosystem" (p. 81). An adaptation by one species such as an increase in claws and teeth triggers a response in another species by developing increased defensive capabilities such as increased speed or armored body features. These two species remain in balance, and other species may be more severely impacted. In both this biological example and those within social systems there is the ability to see the adaptive change in retrospect, but great difficulty in predicting how current environmental responses will be reflected in the future state of the system.

One further criticism of social evolution is an argument “that societies are not adapted, but individual behavior is adaptive” (p. 82). From this perspective, social evolution is only a biological response reflected across a group. Further, adaptive evolution is not so much competition as it is cooperation. Winning by competition is limited to the individual involved in one relationship. Within systems, such a relationship exchange would be one of many going on at the same time and not necessarily in isolation from one another. Observation of a likely loss in a zero sum game would prevent the likely loser from even entering such a competition. Therefore, a competitive approach to evolutionary theory is limited in its application to open systems with exchange of information of likely outcomes. In these situations, the evolving ecosystem is one that establishes mutually beneficial relationships between individual subsystems.

Examining organizations as social systems requires recognition that organizations are composed of individuals, each with their own agenda and ability to affect some directional control on the organization. Moreover, the interdependence of the system demands that they also change. Sometimes such changes are problematic as in the change in a prison guard’s behavior and attitude toward prisoners after experiencing both the need for control for personal safety and the response received from prisoners when exercising their power for control (Busch & Busch, 1992, pp. 102-105). Even when the influence is not outwardly noticeable, it does have an internal impact from a change in perspective caused by interactions within the organizational system. We do not exist in isolation, but in relationships with others. (pp. 150-151)

The Contingency School

In addition to seeing organizations within the context of an open system, this approach examines the dynamic relationships that exist within the organization and its connection to its environment. The approach is also more prescriptive and adaptive in seeking to go beyond understanding to corrective action. With extensive observation James Thompson saw similarity between organizations that experienced similar histories in technology and environmental adaptation. To understand their current organizational situation required an understanding of the effect technology and the outside environment has had on past decisions and the current organizational structure. Joan Woodward seeking to explain how individuals and organizations adapt to change also addressed the importance of structural response to technology. Her research shows that successful firms are those that are able to build a structure that complements the functional requirements of the organization. Because this requires situational adaptation, the firm rules of the Classical School are not always capable of successful implementation and the actual situation is usually more complex than initially thought. The effects that core values can have on the entire organization was illustrated in the amount of control that is required to manage mass-production manufacturing and its dispersion throughout the organization into areas where such levels of control are not needed, nor even desirable. The underlying issue is the balance of the operating efficiency of the Classical School with the human element of the Behavioral School. Increased technology is yielding the possibility of replacing the interpersonal conflict between knowledgeable managers and unskilled workers with a conflict between different staff specialists, each seeking to optimize the process from their perspective. This also calls into question the entire

structure of staff specialists and how they communicate through the informal organization. (Hodge and Anthony, 1991, pp. 26-29 and Mintzberg, 1983, p. 135)

Jay Lorsch and Paul Lawrence also studied the relationship between organizational structure and response to environmental demands. Four types of organizational differences were discovered. The first was the formality of the structure and its reliance on following prescribed rules and procedures. Second was the difference in the source of goals, whether market oriented or scientific discovery. The short-term or long-term orientation for decision-making was the third factor. And last was the value the organization gave to interpersonal relationships versus task accomplishment. The challenge to management is to achieve the balance of each differentiating factor by creating the network of organizational parts necessary to meet the environmental constraints and still accomplish the organizational goals. Lawrence and Lorsch also discovered a tendency for internal grouping based on common functional relationships and interpersonal style. In the near-term the formation of sub-groups can create efficiencies to overcome obstacles. However, coordination problems and sub-optimization can develop which require realignment with the total organization. (Hodge and Anthony, 1991, pp. 27-28 and Mintzberg, 1983, p. 47)

Jay Galbraith's work involved the relationship between environmental uncertainty and organizational complexity. Basically, the more predictable things are the more that can be planned without additional information. However, the need to collect, store, and respond to information about the external environment requires an organization that is sufficiently integrated so that information needs can be identified and decisions aligned toward common goals. However, the usual response to improving performance involves changing the organizational structure itself by focusing on reporting relationships and not needs for information flow. This approach was sufficient in times of less change and the environment moved incrementally and predictably. However, this response does not challenge the paradigm upon which the organization functions, i.e., the reliance on formal organization designs that are changed more frequently into yet another formal structure. Galbraith's current efforts are on studying the impact of change on the informal organization, which can respond quicker than the formal organization. The focus is on what the customer or situation requires at the time and what needs to be done without concern for the job description that defines functional work on the organizational chart. This requires organizational self-design capabilities that are currently not recognized, let alone taught and encouraged. Galbraith summarizes:

In a flatter, more responsive, constantly changing organization, the informal organization may have to become dominant. The more formal organization certainly still needs to reflect the macro-level design decisions that the organization has made about such issues as which groups and teams are responsible for particular customers, services, products, processes, and particular geographies, but it need not reflect the day-to-day interactions and activities of the individuals and teams necessary to getting the work done and responding quickly to customers' needs and environmental changes. Overall, the new organizational chart may seem to depict aggregations of individuals with collective responsibility for particular processes, customers, and products. (Galbraith, Lawler, et. al., 1993, p. 295)

The New Civilization

Galbraith's work and predictions match those proclaimed by Alvin and Heidi Toffler in *Creating a New Civilization* (Toffler, 1995). The speed to which an organization responds is becoming more important than economies of scale. Toffler calls this "economy of speed" and it runs in direct contradiction to the industrial paradigm of the Second Wave, which is based on the capitalistic model of "time is money." Today "time is money" not in financial terms, but response time compared to competition. The change is also having a direct impact on the concept of "worker" and how society is to respond. In the industrial Second Wave workers were classified as either unskilled or easily skilled. They were basically interchangeable and management's role was to maintain a supply of workers to keep the industrial processes going. With an evolving shift to the knowledge based Third Wave there will be increasing need for a diverse work force that is continually growing its skill base. This has implications for not only the business community, but also governments. In the past, a government response to unemployment would be to spur business activity through increased spending. However, with a heterogeneous workforce the task is much more complex. What sector is to be promoted to impact what part of the work force? And with what effect in a global economy that is evolving toward a virtual environment without concern for time constraints. An even bigger question is what is government's role in society to encourage or facilitate worker continuing education?

The change to society goes well beyond the worker and extends into all aspects of society. As the Second Wave changed the basis of wealth from being land based to factory production, a shift is occurring toward new vistas opened by increased knowledge. This is not to say that the change will be complete and immediate, for the wave theory proposed by the Toffler's is similar to that of a wave hitting the beach and blending with the previous waves. Parts of the previous wave remain, but are transformed by the force of the new wave. Where this is most revealed is in the structure of the family and people's attitude toward the "right" family structure. The family structure that is thought of as "the best" is probably what has come to be called the nuclear family, two-parent household with one wage earner. But that is very different from the multi-generational family that would have been most common during the First Wave. The problems that are occurring now are more associated with lack of new family structures to meet the side effects of change than they are of breakdown of families. Going back to the shift from multi-generational families to the nuclear family. This shift would not have been possible without transportation and communication improvements to allow family ties to continue over increased distance. The invention of elder care facilities also facilitated the shift. In each case a core element of the "family structure" was retained, but in a different form. The challenge now is to continue to invent new social structures. A similar debate is occurring in elementary education, which centers around three choices: public schools, private schools, and home schooling. If you remove the financial and political issues it comes down to factory style schooling versus an agrarian style of education. While the two basic models are familiar, they limit change to the education paradigm. This is the core issue that the Toffler's are bring up. By raising the social conscious to search for other alternatives, they will be found. For example, combine two trends, entrepreneurship and Internet communication and you have cottage education that can be available in most neighborhoods. Other alternatives exist, but they must be invented as today's social institutions have been invented by previous generations. (Toffler, 1995, pp. 29-52)

Toffler's writing spans twenty-five years of theoretical evolution of social change. In *Future Shock* (Toffler, 1970) the social effect of change was addressed. *The Third Wave* (Toffler, 1980) further strengthened the argument that the changes that were occurring in society were much deeper than may first appear. *Powershift* (Toffler, 1990) examined the implications of change and *Building a new civilization* (Toffler, 1995) brought everything together and examined each aspect of society, tracing the impact of change. What is interesting is to view these changes from the perspective of Karl Marx. Toffler states in a sense knowledge is a far greater long-term threat to the power of finance than are organized labor or anticapitalist political parties. For, relatively speaking, the information revolution is reducing the need for capital per unit of output in a capitalist economy. Nothing could be more revolutionary. (Toffler, 1995, p 39)

But this shift is encouraging employees to "use not only their rational minds but to pour their emotions, intuitions and imagination into the job . . . why Marcusean critics see in this an even more sinister 'exploitation' of the employee" (Toffler, 1995, p. 57). But is this really "exploitation" or an "opportunity" to shift the balance of power from capital to the worker? This issue will continue to play itself out as organized labor comes to grip with the Third Wave.

Toffler summarizes these change impacts in three core issues that must be addressed by society to move forward into the knowledge civilization. First is the issue of majority power that is a cornerstone upon which much of our current society is built. The concept of majority rule was developed during a time when power was held in the hands of a relatively few number of industrial owners, government officials, religious leaders, etc. Any decision that favored the "majority" would likely be to the benefit of the underprivileged class and be more humane and liberating than their current situation. Effectively, the "majority" needed protection from the power held by a "minority." However, this is not necessarily the case for a large portion of the population in the industrial world. Increasingly, fragments of society are developing around issues that matter to their minority, which is not being addressed within the greater society. Within a social system based on majority rule, minority voices are drowned out by other minorities shouting for attention to their cause. The problem then is a political and decision-making process that is out of step with the new majority, which is really a diverse collection of sub-groups that form and un-form across different issues. The current voting process revolves around vote trading (creating unholy alliances) and does not fairly address the importance of an issue to a sub-group and possible trade-offs that would be acceptable without blending in other non-related issues. In the past, problems of majority rule were ignored because the minority being oppressed lacked the power to initiate change. However, increasing grid-lock on political issues and more active minority groups are bringing this issue to the forefront as a cultural issue that needs to be successfully addressed by society as a whole. (Toffler, 1995, pp. 92-95)

The second core change that Toffler addresses is semi-direct democracy. The lack of consensus addressed above calls into question the concept of representation. As the number of issues and minority groups increase the less informed a representative can be about an issue and what acceptable trade-offs exist. Single-issue groups lack the ability to break into the political process without searching for coalitions with others with whom they have no real interest. And even when given a voice in the process, the system is designed around a win-lose concept rather than win-win. Toffler suggests the creation of new mechanisms for people

to voice their concerns and to be able to put issues on the table for consideration. This requires the creation of new institutions for direct representation without the complexity of totally eliminating representative democracy. (Toffler, 1995, pp. 96-99)

The last core issue that is addressed is the process by which decisions are actually made. Organizations have long fought with the centralized control of decision-making versus the bottlenecks created when an excessive amount of the decisions are made at one point. In tracing the history of democracy, Toffler connects the rise of democracy with the inability of the feudal or monarchical elite to handle the number of decisions required. Hence, the development of democracy and bureaucracy to handle the amount of information flow required for decision-making in a complex society or organization. Today, the amount of information is once again overwhelming centralized decision-making processes. Traditionally this issue is faced as centralization versus decentralization, an either/or situation. Thus there is a shifting of decision-making power that moves back and forth within an organization over time. The alternative is to evaluate the decision-making process itself to determine where each type of decision is best made and how to integrate decisions across the organization.

. . . the extent of democracy depends less on culture, less on Marxist class, less on battlefield courage, less on rhetoric, less on political will, than on the decision load of any society. A heavy load will ultimately have to be shared through wider democratic participation. So long as the decision load of the social system expands, therefore, democracy becomes not a matter of choice but of evolutionary necessity. The system cannot run without it. (Toffler, 1995, p. 103)

Conclusion

This paper has traced the development of social theory from the earliest study of society and the organizations that operate within society to some of the current study that is underway today. The theories have been positioned within the context of Toffler's three waves of civilization because of the enlightenment that it sheds on current social changes. Many of the early social theorists worked during the era when the Second Wave was overtaking the First Wave. It was a time of great social change and much of the sociological study was in direct response to the change. Marx's study of class struggle had its foundation in early industrialization as did Durkheim's study of division of labor on society. Weber studied the early attempts to control new social institutions. VanderZanden's study of social stratification and group norms. All these and other early sociologists attempted to explain what was happening within society. Today we stand at a similar place in history, yet one step forward. The Toffler's are explaining much of the current transformation as is Galbraith and other current students of organizational development. However, much of the current activity still directs attention toward identification of trends and deficiencies. Much work is needed to develop the new social institutions that will carry society forward into the next era. And as the early sociologists used historical socialism to put change in perspective of earlier times, so too has this writer attempted to add perspective to the changes of today.

References

- Abrahamson, M. (1990). *Sociological theory: an introduction to concepts, issues, and research* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Busch, J. A., & Busch, G. M. (1992). *Sociocybernetics: A perspective for living in complexity*. Jeffersonville, IN: Social Systems Press.
- Cluetrain Manifesto (1999) Retrieved August 14, 1999, from <http://www.cluetrain.com>
- Flint, L. (1997). System theory. Retrieved 7/2/2000 from <http://www.ccim.bsu.edu/speech/flint/systems.htm>
- Galbraith, J. R., Lawler, E. E., III, & associates (1993). *Organizing for the future: The new logic for managing complex organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (1996). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hodge, B. J., & Anthony, W. P. (1991). *Organization theory: A strategic approach* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Knapp, P. (1999). Evolution, complex systems and the dialectic. *Journal of World-Systems Research* [Online], 5(1), 74-103. Retrieved 7/2/2000.
- Maslow, A. H. (with Stephens, D. C. & Heil, G) (1998). *Maslow on Management*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structure in fives: Designing effective organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Scott, W. G. & Mitchell, T. R. (1972). *Organization theory: A structural and behavioral analysis*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Takata, S. R. & Curran, J. (1993). *Using sociology to understand your life: Theories, methods, and strategies for career planning*. San Francisco: Edwin Mellen Text.
- Toffler, A. (1970). *Future shock*. New York: Random House.
- Toffler, A. (1980). *Third wave*. New York: Morrow.
- Toffler, A. (1990). *Powershift: Knowledge, wealth, and violence at the edge of the 21st century*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Toffler, A., & Toffler, H. (1995). *Creating a new civilization: The politics of the third wave*. Atlanta: Turner Publishing.
- Ross A. Wirth, Ph.D. (2004)
www.orgchangedoctor.com

Weinberger, D. (1999). *Journal of the Hyperlinked Organization [On-line serial]*. Retrieved May 20, 1999, from archive at <http://www.hyperorg.com>

Wren, D A. (1994). *The evolution of management thought* (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wren, D. A., & Greenwood, R. G. (1998). *Management Innovators: The people and ideas that have shaped modern business*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zeitlin, I. M. (1990). *Ideology and the development of sociological theory* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.