

They Knew But Did Not Care -- Then Again, Why *Should* They Care?

by Daniela Truty & John David Truty
Northeastern Illinois University
Northern Illinois University

Abstract

This article is about why organizations should take time to understand and care for employees and why they probably do not. The discussion is set against the backdrop of stories from 28 people separated from the job in August 2000 during a downsizing event at TREBCO (pseudonym), a manufacturing automotive firm based in a large midwestern U.S. city. A total of 1,100 white-collar workers were sent away at that time. The first author presents findings from a qualitative study she conducted in 2001 to explore these workers' experiences of the same downsizing event and their perceptions about whether or not TREBCO knew that its decision might adversely affect some lives. She ends her section by suggesting that because of the varied experiences that emerged from the study and because of the unique relevancy structures from which each emerged, TREBCO should have taken time to know these employees as persons and found alternative means of achieving corporate profitability ends. The second author then presents a counter-argument based on some of the organizational literature that questions why TREBCO *should* care, from an organization's perspective. He also presents a position from a labor point of view, which argues that the proposed action may actually be detrimental to those same employees. The purpose of this paper is not to resolve this perspectival dilemma; rather, it is to promote dialog toward possible transformation.

Keywords: Downsizing, Violatives, Violence, Relevancy Structure

Background of the Problem

According to the (BLS), over 43 million jobs were eliminated as a result of corporate downsizing during the late 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s (Miller, 1998). Of these, 16.4 million people lost their jobs between 1992 and 1997, averaging one of every 12 to 15 workers:

While millions of workers were losing their jobs, corporate profits were climbing, stock values were rising, and the salaries of U.S. corporate CEOs [chief executive officers] remained the highest in the world by far. . . . The logic seemed inescapable--getting rid of those high-paid U.S. workers was good for business. (Gozzi, 1999/2000, p. 2)

The BLS approximates that from January 2000 through January 2005, 93,131 mass layoff events have brought 10,236,729 initial claimants for unemployment benefits in the United States alone (United States Department of Labor, 2002, 2005). The BLS glossary (2003) defines *layoff* as "A separation of an employee from an establishment that is initiated by the employer; an involuntary separation; a period of forced unemployment." A *mass layoff* event is defined as "A situation that involves at least 50 persons at the same establishment, each of whom has filed an initial claim for unemployment insurance benefits during a consecutive 5-week period." An initial claimant is "A person who files any notice of unemployment to initiate a request either for a determination of entitlement to and eligibility for compensation, or for a subsequent period of unemployment within a benefit year or

Truty & Truty

period of eligibility” (<http://www.bls.gov/bls/glossary.htm>). In this article, we refer to downsizing as what happens during a mass layoff event, even though the BLS does not use this term from the vernacular. According to Lurie (2000), The term “downsizing” was coined to describe the action of dismissing a large portion of a firm's workforce in a very short period of time.... In a downsizing, the separation between a worker and a firm is permanent. A downsizing is also not a dismissal for individual incompetence but rather a decision on the part of management to reduce the overall workforce. (p. 1)

Research conducted by the American Management Association (AMA) revealed that many companies that downsized once tended to downsize again. The AMA also found that “in 1995, for example, fewer than 37% of companies that downsized in previous years had seen any increase in productivity and less than half experienced any increase in net” (Miller, 1998, p. 3). After an initial upward spike in the cost of company stock, downsizing appeared to lack any long-term positive effect on shareholder value two or more years after the event (Miller, 1998).

But beneath all the words and figures, lives are being deeply affected as a few become wealthier and the many become more anxious. They are anxious because they fear losing control of the forces that govern their lives and because they sense an erosion of community . . . of fairness, of balance. . . . The misery of the world of “eat or be eaten” is not to be measured in income statistics. It is a moral disaster. The United States has always been built around a work ethic. We do not go to work only to earn an income but to find meaning in our lives. What we do is a large part of who we are. To see ourselves as nothing more than a means to profits reaped by others is a blow to our self-respect. To be thrown out of work after 20 years with the same firm, as if we were of no more value than a piece of worn-out

machinery, is, indeed, to feel like a piece of junk. (Miller, 1998, pp. 1, 3)

In 2001, I (lead author) was involved in an organizational downsizing at TREBCO. I launched a qualitative study to explore white-collar workers' experiences of the same downsizing event, from the perspectives of those separated from the job. As an outcome of this study, I developed an interpretive conceptual framework that extends the ways in which the phenomenon of downsizing has been understood. I posed the following questions: 1) From the perspective of the person separated from the job, how do people in this study describe their experience of downsizing? 2) Is there a relationship between their experience of downsizing and violence? If so, what is the relationship? 3) And what are their perceptions about the acceptability of this downsizing from TREBCO and downsizing in general? Please refer to Truty, 2003, for a thorough treatment of all of these questions. For purposes of this paper, I will focus primarily on the first and discuss how it is that these experiences likely emerged.

Literature

Ultimately, five bodies of literature became important for my study: **person**, downsizing, violence, peace studies, and institutional theory. Please refer to Truty, 2003, for in-depth presentations on the literatures of downsizing, violence, and institutional theory. Most relevant for this paper are Stanage's theory of **person** and the theory of violatives as well as Galtung's typology of violence and the basic human needs.

Person

The concept of **person** was central to this study, because it pointed to the necessity for understanding perceptual differences among people. According to Stanage (1987), **person** was composed of the essential structure of persons, i.e., people. The theory of **person** holds that all persons engage in feeling, experiencing, and consciousness phenomena that they encounter

within their lifeworlds. The lifeworld is the sphere where people enact their everyday projects of living. For example, by virtue of being human, people *come into contact with, and interact with*, various elements, stimuli, and occurrences within their environments (feeling). In order to attain satisfactory resolution to what a particular element might be, to its meaning and importance for the way people perceive order in life, they engage in some kind of *experimentation or process of learning*, perhaps even through trial and error (experiencing). Through this deliberate experimentation, *people reach an understanding of the phenomenon and ultimately situate it and their new knowledge of that phenomenon* within an updated sense of who they believe they are, what they could know, what they might hope, and what they ought to do as they move forward with their lives (consciosing). People engage in a process of co-creation with their environments when they and their environment are dialectically reformed and transformed through everyday contact. The combinations of influences on peoples' perspectives and the new ways of feeling, seeing, and being that emerge appear to be limitless and result in the uniqueness of each individual. It is impossible, therefore, to predict how different people will perceive and experience a given phenomenon without conducting a thorough investigation of the ways in which they interact with the world and how it is that they interact the way they do.

Indeed, the way that various persons approach the experimentation process of a phenomenon is determined by values, motives, and drives that they perceive to be important and worthy of their attention. Elements that capture an individual's attention compose his or her "relevancy structure" (Stanage, 1987). These are elements in the lifeworld of persons that command their interest and attention because they are perceived to be important for *them*. What is important to one person may not be important to another. Each individual prioritizes and orders these elements in ways different from others because this prioritization process is

based on unique points of view. People tend to act according to these values, motives, and priorities.

Stanage (1987) explained, "A person is at least the expression of **person**" (p. 247). He claimed that investigation of how that expression came to be for any particular person requires deep understanding of each person's unique point of view. According to Stanage (1987), this can be approximated through phenomenological investigations of persons because of the method's iterative, back and forth, educative, and constitutive approach, which is the hallmark of phenomenological investigations of **person**. He points out that eductions of **person** are the language, expressions, ways of acting, perceiving, sense-making, and all other ways of being that persons manifest as they carry out their lives within their everyday worlds. Although all people, by virtue of being human, engage in these activities, it is important to investigate each one of these in order to understand unique distinctions among various people. Constitutive elements are formative elements in one's life that were influential for, or contributory to, one's current attitudes, behaviors, values, way of being, and way of ordering the world, and thus to one's perspective.

Stanage's Theory of Violatives

Stanage (1974, 1981) believed that it is important to define violence within the complexity of human experience so that occurrences might be reduced, if not eradicated, as "forms of human bondage" (Stanage, 1974, p. 207). Pivotal to my study was the theory of violatives that Stanage unveiled in 1974. "These violatives are phenomenological distinctions within occurrences of violence--distinctions that are articulated by our language when this language is carefully explored" (p. 208).

According to Stanage (1974), occurrences are considered to be violative when perceived to disorder the natural order within a given society. One learns about

Truty & Truty

violatives by situating or locating them within a specific social context. The phenomenon of violence could be explored according to its instrumentality within a social context. Gradations of violence could be situated along a continuum between civility and barbarity. To the degree that an occurrence is perceived to disorder the natural order of events toward civility, the occurrence is considered to be constructive "in the long run" (p. 215); conversely, to the degree that order within a social order is disordered, away from civility and toward barbarity, it is thought to be destructive.

Stanage (1974) explained that a third form of violence is perceived to be constructive in the long run and carried out by those who are not in power against those who are. This kind of violence is instrumental in disordering a barbaric and uncivil order with the purpose of creating or restoring order. Order and disorder are defined from the perspective of the collective that perceives it. This kind of violence is more commonly known as revolution, mutiny, or insurrection.

In 1974, Stanage unveiled the theory of violatives. I found nothing more published about it between then and 1981. Stanage (1981) developed the theory to include ways in which violative occurrences could disorder the civil order as defined by "proprietary relevancy structures" of a particular social group or even a person. Stanage (1981) called these unwelcome occurrences "thrusts," according to the ways in which they were perceived to impact the relevancy structures of individual people or social groups, and named them "distrusive," "intrusive," "obtrusive," "retrusive," and "subtrusive," i.e., DIORS. The DIORS violatives express directionalities of violent phenomena as they impact components of the person's or social group's relevancy structure. Distrusives unwelcomely frustrate the person's expectations of what could or should be to constitute, maintain, or reorder his or her life; intrusives introduce something unwelcome and unexpected in one's

constructed sense of order; obtrusives unwelcomely force adjustments prematurely, before the person is ready and prepared to encounter a phenomenon; retrusives unwelcomely cause a person to redo, revisit, or repeat something that he or she believed had been completed and put away; and subtrusives unwelcomely alter a person's perceived identity or desired patterns of thought or behavior.

Peace Studies and Four Basic Human Needs

Galtung is the founder of the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo, Norway. He (1969) claimed it was imperative that peace researchers study violence because violence is the absence of peace and peace the absence of violence. It is impossible to study one without understanding the other. For Galtung, violence refers to an avoidable gap between potential and actual satisfaction of one or more basic human needs. Peace is the opposite of violence. Through extensive international research, Galtung identified four basic human needs: survival, well being, identity, and freedom (Galtung, 1990).

As the study progressed, I found that Galtung's and Stanage's work came together conceptually to inform what people in my study perceived to be important for them and how the downsizing was ultimately experienced.

Method

I designed a qualitative study that would allow the research participants to provide rich detail about how each perceived order and disorder in their lives, how that sense of order came to be, how they perceived their experience of this downsizing, and how it might be that downsizing seemed so readily accepted in U. S. society. In so doing, I adopted tools from a variety of traditional qualitative methods. I borrowed from phenomenology, linguistic phenomenology, and grounded theory. I called this qualitative method *bricolage*.

Denzin and Lincoln (1998a) held that

“the multiple methodologies of qualitative research may be viewed as a *bricolage* [emphasis in original], and the researcher as *bricoleur* [emphasis original]” (p. 3). Dabbling and borrowing elements from different qualitative methods and integrating them into a context-specific method for her study, the end result of Turnbull's (2002) method, she claimed, was bricolage.

Phenomenology

I invoked elements of the phenomenological tradition because I was attempting to learn about how persons perceived their experience of the downsizing and made meaning of it. Merriam (1998) held that inherent in a phenomenological investigation was the ultimate discovery of the essential structure of the phenomenon. According to Stanage (1987), it was possible to attain a deep understanding of unique experiences and perspectives through educative and constitutive inquiry, attending as fully as possible to what the speaker was saying, why he or she had elected to express it, and how that person's chosen means of expression came to be. This could be accomplished through back-and-forth educative and constitutive inquiry.

The phenomenological method seemed natural to me, outlining a process through which I could explore my questions; but at times I found it necessary to prompt and direct the conversation toward some issues that the participants did not cover on their own. I preferred to say, therefore, that the investigative process I used in this study was *influenced* by phenomenology rather than claiming that it followed a pure phenomenological process.

Linguistic Phenomenology

Stanage (1969, 1987) held that the ways people carried out their activities offered important clues to their unique perspectives. So did the language they selectively used to describe and retrospectively construct their experience. It was not within the scope of this study to conduct a systematic phenomenological

investigation of the language employed; however, I *did* attend to language used by the participants in telling their stories with heightened awareness, subjecting it to constitutive and educative questioning to understand its selection and context. My method was ultimately *influenced* by linguistic phenomenology. (Please refer to Truty, 2003, for more information about this aspect of my study, as I will only touch upon it here).

Grounded Theory

The constant comparative method of analysis was a hallmark of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). It required an iterative analytical process during which smaller units of data were compared to larger units, to other units, to the whole, back again to refine understanding of the original unit, comparing it with larger units and the whole as often as necessary, as well as to the collective whole. The data were coded according to commonalities that occurred intra- and intersource. Through this process, themes and categories emerged. These were also compared with one another and expanded or collapsed as needed until the data were reduced to all identifiable themes, categories, and properties that would contribute to the development of a theory.

According to Glaser and Strauss (1967), this constant comparative method was used throughout the analytical phase and the data collection process. Doing so enhanced the success of theory building by grasping its complexity. When themes began to recur, they were said to have reached the point of saturation. Because each participant's story was unique and because I intended to allow all interested separated employees to tell their stories, I did not seek nor stop at saturation. My method was therefore *influenced by* the tenets of grounded theory.

Hermeneutical Analysis

Data analysis was influenced by a variety of interpretive approaches. Analysis began during data collection as I reflected upon and compared the various stories being

Truty & Truty

shared with me. As time went on, I developed one-page summaries per person, which were similar to the ideographic summaries described by Cotte and Ratneshwar (1999). By repeatedly returning to the texts, looking for minor differences in prior interpretations and revising them after each review, I tried to approximate as closely as possible the content and intent of the participants' stories. I drew various diagrams to experiment with emergent findings. For me, the writing was not just a demonstrative tool in this study. It was also an analytical tool. Themes emerged from multiple readings of the transcribed conversations, moving iteratively from part to whole to part again to the data as a whole and so on (Cotte & Ratneshwar, 1999; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This iterative process was also known as the "hermeneutical circle" (Schwandt, 1998, p. 227).

Some believed that the hermeneutical circle included an attempt at verification of interpretive accuracy; whereas others, with more of an ontological penchant, held that attempts at verification were fruitless (Schwandt, 1998). My own beliefs appeared to approximate this latter view. The only "verification" I sought from the participants regarded the accuracy of the transcripts. I believed I was able to obtain the necessary clarification of the participants' words and body language through educative and constitutive probing during the conversations.

Because I believed, as did Schutz, (1972) that interpretation and context changed with the passage of time, that experiences were defined as such only after the fact, and that perspectives were socially constructed, I did not think it fruitful to submit my interpretation of the data for verification at this later date. Further, we believed that some of the participants might not wish to revisit a painful time in their lives or to dwell on their past but rather wished to move on.

Data

Data were derived from multiple sources, including one-on-one, in-depth

conversations, demographic profile forms, two participant journals, my own journal and field notes, two descriptive documents prepared by two of the participants, electronic communication with some participants, the company's annual report, and corporate news and comments from the company's investor message board.

Study Participants

Twenty-eight people, including myself, participated in this study. Criteria for selection included the following characteristics: 1) separated from TREBCO during the August 2000 event; 2) separated from one of seven company locations geographically located in the midwestern U.S. metropolitan area; 3) white-collar workers; and 3) willing to tell his or her story about this downsizing event. I recruited them through a voluntary contact list I created and circulated during the transition and re-employment workshop days after the downsizing event. Participants on the contact list were encouraged to recruit their colleagues who had not attended the workshop. I sent invitation letters to colleagues whom I personally had known and who had also been separated from the job. I worked with the career center administrators to include the contact list in one mass mailing to all TREBCO former employees served by the three center locations.

Among the 28 people who participated in this study, there was, interestingly, at least one person from each of the seven metropolitan company locations. Nine were female. Two were African American, one was South American, and one was Asian. They ranged between 30 and 61 years of age. Seniority within the company spanned between 1.5 to 38 years. Participants represented organization levels three through eight, with eight being closer to CEO level 13. Formal education levels ranged between 12 and 20+ years.

Conversations

I attempted to investigate and enhance understanding of the specific phenomenon in

my more immediate world, largely through the vehicle of conversations and the spoken word. I am aware of the burgeoning body of literature that raises the researcher's awareness about issues surrounding conversations as primary tools of data collection in terms of understanding, interpreting, and reporting individual experiences. Schutz (1967) explained that experiences are constructed only after the fact, away from the "stream of consciousness" through which people traverse.

The experience was defined as a unit of meaning through a process of retrospective reflection that was filtered through the totality of one's perspective. Cunliffe (2001) alluded to the social construction of experience by describing layers of voices that came between the initial event and the reader's understanding and interpretation of the researcher's account. Hart (2001) suggested that participants selected the stories that they told to describe their experiences, depending on personal context and perspective as well as on trust and motive for sharing. She cautioned that in conducting conversational research projects of this kind, the researcher needed to be continuously aware of personal biases and perspectives; power relationships; one's agenda for engaging in these conversations; the linguistic and grammatical "translation" that occurred in producing the final document for a scholarly audience; and the selection of excerpts of the participants' accounts to illustrate, highlight, and support the researcher's reason for studying this particular phenomenon.

I preferred to use the word "conversation" instead of "interview" because it suggested a collaborative process between two people who were equals as human beings and through which meaning was negotiated by both. Conversations lasted between 1.25 and 3.0 hours each. All but three were face-to-face, and those three occurred by telephone. Participants were asked to adopt a pseudonym for purposes of

anonymity. All conversations were audio taped and transcribed verbatim in the order in which they occurred. As each tape was transcribed, the document was submitted to the participant for editing and review.

Journals

Two participants, including myself, maintained journals throughout the downsizing process. These were analyzed similarly to the transcripts. A third person said she had journaled leading up to the downsizing; however, she would not share the document because she considered it a collection of private thoughts intended to help her record and remember the events that transpired. Two others contributed written thought pieces in anticipation of the conversation.

Process Notes

I took notes by hand immediately after each conversation. These consisted of process notes or remarks that were perhaps made after the second of two tapes ran out and I did not want to begin a third. In these notes, I also described body language or nonverbal expressions that I observed during the conversation.

Other Data Sources

Following the downsizing, I monitored the investor site message board on the Internet; monitored corporate press releases on the company web site; asked for intracompany newsletters from some internal contacts to learn about what was being said (none were forwarded to me); signed up for the *Wall Street Journal* on line; obtained the company's annual report; requested electronic weekly updates about the unemployment outlook from the BLS; and continued to monitor the U.S. unemployment figures.

Findings

Multiple findings emerged from this study, such as, 1) a description of four broad experiences of the same downsizing event, 2) the downsizing was experienced as a violative, according to Stanage's and

Truty & Truty

Galtung's definitions of violence, 3) participants' belief that TREBCO's decision-makers knew that the downsizing would possibly be harmful to the employees who had been sent away and that they did not care, and 4) downsizing at TREBCO and in the wider U.S. business society had been institutionalized and blindly accepted by many of the study participants themselves. A delicate interweaving of context and perspective revealed the participants' perceptions of the same downsizing event as well as the seeming institutionalization of downsizing. Please see Truty, 2003, for a full discussion of each of these findings. In this paper, I will focus on the experiences of this downsizing event and constitutive elements of unique relevancy structures that shaped these experiences. I will also present the participants' perspectives about whether or not decision-makers at TREBCO knew how the downsizing would possibly impact their lives.

Context and Perspective

Evidence of an intricate interplay between context and perspective quickly emerged to inform the disparate experiences of this downsizing. Etymologic roots of "perspective" (Stange, 1987) suggest a "looking through." Looking through the confluence of societal and organizational institutions, participants' employment relationships with TREBCO, and individual relevancy structures, participants described ways in which this downsizing experience affected their constructed senses of order and propriety.

Relevancy Structures

Participants experienced this downsizing in various ways, depending on individual perspective. Perspectives were shaped by relationships with immediate bosses and skip-a-level bosses, personal embeddedness within the social fabric of the organization, one's values, family or personal health concerns, age at time of separation, perceived and/or reported on-the-job performance, continuation of benefits, longevity with the company, perceived

fairness of the separation process and selection criteria, job search skills, race, class, gender, career status, developmental life stage, transferability of job skills, and sense of self.

Combinations of these elements composed the relevancy structures of different people. Ironically, 28 categorical labels emerged to encompass the distinctions among elements in different peoples' relevancy structures as they related to their stories about the separations and the jobs at TREBCO. The 28 categorical labels were social connectedness, finding one's niche in life, this job, significant other, stability, concern about re-employment, career advancement, respect for people, self-worth, well being, company well being, reputation, need to know, career trajectory, perseverance, retirement milestone, challenge in one's job, control, structure, time to try new things, belonging, ethical behavior on the job, a better life, trust, role identity, achievement on the job, pride in work, and external networks. In descending order, the following elements were cited by at least half of all participants in this study, spanning across three or four experiential categories: stability, social connectedness, company well being, pride in work, and well being. Each of the four experiential categories, however, revealed various elements as having been important to participants in those groups. In this study, elements of one's relevancy structure sprang mostly from personal upbringing and corporate, religious, and cultural ideologies.

Four Experiences of the Downsizing

Four broad experiences of this downsizing emerged: "layoff was a godsend;" "opportunity came;" "it happened, move on;" and "we were hurt."

"Layoff was a godsend" (Dale). Alexandra and Dale reported an exceptionally difficult stay at TREBCO. They experienced psychosomatic symptoms that they believed were directly related to their jobs. For them, the separation was a godsend. Four others--

Cara, Charlie, Mel, and Archie--reported being miserable during the most recent job and welcomed separation as deliverance.

Participants in this experiential category welcomed the downsizing because it represented a transition to something better. Their job experience had deteriorated to such a level that it had assaulted their sense of well being:

He didn't like me, but he didn't want to do without me. . . . Have you ever seen, like, a big brother/little brother situation, where the big brother holds his hand on the little brother's forehead while the little brother's trying to punch his way out? . . . That's kinda how I felt. (Charlie in Truty, 2003, p. 157)

I was laughing, I was crying because it was such a relief. . . . NO [emphasis in original] more B.S., no more politics, no more crying in the morning, going, "How am I going to stay busy for eight hours and so bored?" No more traffic. So when people saw my tears, I had to tell them, it's because I'm happy. . . . It's over. I'm done. I'm outa here! (Cara in Truty, 2003, p. 155)

For Alexandra and Dale, this had resulted in psychosomatic illness so that the separation was not only welcome but also necessary:

It was very aggravating, very stressful, and I started taking a lot of sick time, and it was putting . . . even more pressure on me because then, you know, [my boss] didn't like the fact that I was taking sick time, and I wasn't there when he needed me, and . . . I'd go for six days without sleep. . . . I'd get up in the morning, and I threw up my breakfast because I hadn't slept or because I was so stressed out. . . . I had panic attacks on the train, where . . . I felt like I couldn't breathe because the train was late, . . . that I'd get yelled at for being late, because [my former boss] yelled at me for being late. . . .

(Alexandra in Truty, 2003, p. 151)

Almost a year before the layoff, I called the 800 number [for the Employee Assistance Program]-- . . . normally I'm a runner; . . . I kind of quit doing that . . . --she goes, "Well, it sounds like you might be mildly depressed," . . . the more I thought about it, yeah, I probably was, and . . . in June of this summer [2000], it got to the point where I didn't want to physically get up and go to work, . . . and I knew it wasn't me, I mean, . . . this wasn't normal. . . . (Dale in Truty, 2003, p. 151)

The downsizing experience itself was de-emphasized. How it was done was not as important as it perhaps was to participants in other experiential categories. For these people, it was simply a rite of passage that was more tolerable than continued employment under their most recent circumstance.

It is not surprising that the language used to tell their stories, with few exceptions, included violatives (words and expressions having the characteristics or traits of violence, according to English-speaking people in the U.S.) applicable to the job experience more than to the separations. (Stanage, 1974) The words and expressions suggested the psychological, physical, personal, structural, direct, indirect, and cultural dimensions of violence as described by Galtung (1990). These participants experienced their most recent job relationship as violative of freedom, identity, and well being. Galtung refers to these as basic human needs that, in peaceful situations, are satisfied to full potential. Because the participants' job experiences widened the gap between potential and actual realization, the jobs were constitutive of varying degrees of violence.

The participants' expectations of their jobs had not been met; therefore, experiences on the job acted as thrusts against elements of the participants'

Truty & Truty

relevancy structures. The job experiences were distrusives, according to Stanage's (1974) theory of violatives. When distrusives forced unwanted adaptations by these participants, they could also be intrusives. Evidence of job as a distrusive could be found in expressions such as, "I did what I thought I was supposed to do" (Dale in Truty, 2003, p. 152); and "or at least give me some other compensation to let me know that I'm doin' a good job" (Archie in Truty, 2003, p. 159). When balance between work and personal life was not respected, Alexandra had to make changes to what she wanted to do. In this sense, the job was an intrusive as well as a distrusive: "you're pushing in my personal time" (Alexandra in Truty, 2003, p. 153).

Job experiences were painful to each of these participants for different reasons, reflecting unique relevancy structures that had been violated. As a group, these individuals gave evidence of 16 elements that had been affected: appreciation of self and work, well being, visibility to higher boss, self-worth, balance of work and personal life, job security, reputation, freedom to move internally, harmony, need to know, perseverance, tools to excel, retirement milestone, respect, making a contribution, and feeling challenged. Individual accounts suggested that gaps existed between actual and potential realization of one or more of these relevancy components and that constructed order in their lives had been disordered.

The decision to terminate the employment relationship was made by organizational actors regardless of the participants' wishes one way or another. Some managers perhaps felt justified in doing so because of the employee's degenerating attitude, attendance record, or performance level. There was no evidence that they attempted to understand their own roles or other structural factors in the employee's attitude, attendance, or performance level; and therefore, they made no effort to ameliorate the situation. The separations

were welcome as last resorts when participants were unable to affect positive change in their employment relationship. Although these participants were happy to be separated from the job, this had not been their decision. In this regard, the downsizing was a distrusive and a violative against the basic human need for freedom.

"Opportunity came"-Steve.

Although the separation had not been solicited, participants in the "opportunity came" category saw it as an entrance way to opportunity. Some participants in this experiential category would have left TREBCO or moved on to a different position internally because they knew that the most recent job was no longer satisfying what they believed to be important in their work. They stayed for various reasons that offered them comfort and contentment until they were ready to make the move. At the same time, they could envision opportunity beyond this job that would permit them to satisfy other professional and personal goals that were important to them but for which they had insufficient time or possibility while employed at TREBCO. These goals included spending time with the family (Bob); working for a trade organization (Roger); using an opportunity to grow, learn, and contribute (Jim); pursuing the financial planning or financial services field (Bob); fixing up the house (Bob and Steve); traveling (Bob); having "more variety, more orientation, the ability to build my knowledge, my skills" (Sabrina in Truty, 2003, p. 165); and writing professionally on her own terms (Julia).

I've always kind of wanted to pursue financial planning or potentially working in the financial services area. . . . We have a pretty full job jar of things to do around the home, . . . you know, paint and the refinishing of some vanities and put a new floor surface in here and . . . So we enjoy doing that and we're kind of trying to get a lot of those around the house things done here in the first couple of months before we take off on our trip.... (Bob in Truty, 2003, p. 166)

I've been on the board of directors, and I still am on one, two trade associations within my field and met a lot of people that I can work with and talk with and network with, and people have said, you know, "If you wanna get to work, give us a call." (Roger in Truty, 2003, p. 162)

These participants appeared to have a foot on each side of the divide, so to speak--one still in a dream and the other firmly grounded on what they knew they already had. Their list of wants appeared to be juxtaposed to their list of haves. What they had was comfortable if not privileged, so there was no pressing need to move on. Separation had not been their decision nor perhaps their choice at the time that it occurred, but they understood that on the other side something equally or more desirable awaited them. Although the separation took away their freedom to stay at TREBCO, it simultaneously offered them the freedom to explore something different, as Julia explained. They had not planned to leave then, yet they held that this was just what they needed at the time. The timing of the downsizing, for most in this category, was simultaneously good and bad--"a kick in the pants," (Sabrina in Truty, 2003, p. 165) "a boot in the rear," (Steve in Truty, 2003, p. 166) or "a jolt," (Jim in Truty, 2003, p. 160) even though they may not "have signed up for" it (Julia in Truty, 2003, p. 161) and they may not have "had it my way" (Steve in Truty, 2003, p. 165).

I kinda get stuck in places sometimes, so that was kinda like okay to push there. I mean, I needed it. . . . I actually think about, okay, now I have to go look for something. I know I should have done this years ago, but now I have to. . . . Somebody else made the decision for me. . . . I tried to look at it as more of an opportunity. . . . It just came six months sooner than I wanted it to. (Sabrina in Truty, 2003, p. 165)

This opportunity came to me at a time

when it was very ripe. I was looking for a change, . . . and because I have settled in, because I was very comfortable, I was well respected, I was able to make some difference, although I had run into several walls, . . . I wasn't pursuing other opportunities at the pace that I would have, and I just needed a jolt to say, you know, you could do a lot more. . . . because I need to grow, and I felt I would not grow unless I left TREBCO. . . . Instead of that happening, the downsizing happened. (Jim in Truty, 2003, p. 165)

It's [the downsizing] not something I would have signed up for; . . . who in this room wants to get downsized? . . . Who thinks it's a good thing? Right? . . . I think the most real part of me is I'm a writer, I just wanna write, I wanna do it on my own terms, and this is gonna allow me to do that, you know what I mean? (Julia in Truty, 2003, p. 161)

I didn't have it my way, I guess. Okay? 'Cause this was not something that I had planned for. . . . I still miss the camaraderie and going into work every day, cause I enjoyed what I did. And I enjoyed the people and stuff. . . . And plus I was looking forward to working in the new building because it was half the distance [some metropolitan company locations were scheduled to move to a different location in the near future]. (Steve in Truty, 2003, p. 165)

Because separation occurred before the participants had planned to leave, the downsizing was an obtrusive; because it happened when they wished to continue working at TREBCO for a while longer, it may have been a distrusive. For Roger, separation after so many years at TREBCO was perhaps a retrusive because looking for a new job was not something that he thought he would be doing at this time. Because the separation was not the choice of these participants and they had no option to stay, it widened the gap between potential and

Truty & Truty

actual realization of freedom as a basic human need and was, therefore, a violative.

If Galtung (1990) were to look at these experiences, he might say that the suggested dimensions of violence were structural, cultural, and psychological, affecting perceived well being for Jim, Julia, Steve, and Sabrina, for example. But the overall experiences of this group of participants suggested that separation was a violative against freedom and that it was constructive. These participants had not appeared to engage in the same ruminative activity as others did in the “it happened, move on” or “we were hurt” categories. Steve queried, “Why did it have to happen to me?” (Steve, in Truty, 2003, p. 268), but nothing in our conversations indicated that this had been a particularly difficult question for him. For the most part, this group of participants appeared to accept their separation as a rational business decision, distinct from who they were or from the quality of their work. Guilt or self-doubt did not cause them discomfort. They provided no evidence, therefore, that their identity had been violated by this downsizing experience.

“It happened, move on”-Joe. Seven people--George, Joe, Lois, Neil, Peter, Sam, and Xman--viewed the jobs as means to an end, that is, as vehicles for the provision of income and benefits and/or preparation for a better job. Life at the workplace had not been perfect, but at the same time, they did not want to leave the organization--at least, not at that time. Unlike colleagues in the “opportunity came” category, many of these participants still needed and intended to work, and some questioned their employability. Additionally, they interpreted their selection for separation as a personal affront instead of as an organizational decision based on business reasons alone. For them, the separation was not a portal to opportunity, although it could turn out to be that way; rather, it was something to be endured and overcome.

Although the participants in this study

could slide into different experiential categories, particularly those in the middle two, I believe that those in the “it happened, move on” experiential group experienced loss more acutely than their colleagues in the “opportunity came” category. They “missed” their co-workers, the job that they enjoyed, or the security of knowing that they had a job and regular income. Unlike many in the group before who did not need to work if they did not so wish, most of these people needed or wanted to work for different reasons that were important to them. People in this category believed that this downsizing had been an unwelcome and unpleasant experience. They seemed to dismiss it as something that happened, although they did not necessarily agree with the decision or the way that it was carried out. Whereas those previously described saw the separation as a door to opportunity, these people saw it as a disruption that they needed to overcome before moving forward.

This downsizing had not been their choice, thus assaulting their basic need for freedom. In this way, they were no different from colleagues in other experiential groups. Because of their perceived dependence on continued employment for income and benefits, this separation also threatened well being. For most of these participants, this downsizing had been a distrusive to their relevancy structures, frustrating what they longed to have or continue in their work relationships with TREBCO. Indeed, the job itself at times widened the gap between reality and desire. Loss of a sense of belonging, loss of membership in the workplace family, and perceptions of having been singled out among others constituted an assault on identity.

In their words-

Xman and Lois yearned for inclusion in the organization or within the work group:
I just was sad because I liked the company, and I just wished that I could have stayed there and found a home there. . . . I was also kind of sad from the standpoint that . . . I applied for

three positions in the two years I was there, okay? And only one position was I satisfied with the reason why I didn't get it. The other two, I think, was total blow-off reasons. . . . We don't want you. We picked somebody else. Okay? (Lois in Truty, 2003, p. 177)

No, I still don't understand it. . . . One of the things that bothered me also was the fact that I was the only one in that department, and . . . well, I don't know; I think I felt [that] in a department between five people, I just didn't feel good about being let go, that I was the only one. . . . I just don't think I should have been singled out in my group. . . . You know, there are people there are not trained . . . still there . . . that I gave work to. . . . The projects that I had been doing, I gave work to them, and showed them how to get started on it. They may have been there only a short time, they're still there, so . . . I could never say I think it was the right thing that they did on a personal level. (Xman in Truty, 2003, p. 186)

Lois and Peter looked for professional challenge, learning, development, and growth. Lois wanted to move into the strategic aspect of organizational life. Peter wanted a better life:

I received a job--what I was, I'd have had a dream, because I was dreaming to work with lab work, and I was promising to do that, I was promising to be trained, educated, as the company standards, and so on Well, I had lots of promises, but in reality doing little bit. (Peter in Truty, 2003, p. 180)

Lois, Sam, Xman, and Joe valued and missed their work colleagues:

I guess for the first month after I left, I would always compare TREBCO to what I was doing . . . and I would do it subconsciously. . . . I really liked the people and the job that I kept comparing everything to them. . . . It's like a break-

up [laughs]. . . . I guess the parable would be . . . when you break up with a person that you . . . had a relationship with that you go through those. So . . . I'm over it now [laughs] . . . clinging to the . . . probably basically made me miserable [laughs]. (Lois in Truty, 2003, p. 177)

There's one time, I was sittin' there, you know; I said, "Well, why would they let me go?" So it was fine, it's over with, you go on, that's it; and my biggest thing now is just looking for a job and then that's behind me, other than the people, and that's another thing I gotta deal with. (Joe in Truty, 2003, p. 191)

George expected ethical behavior from organizational members, not just toward himself but to other stakeholders as well.

The company did things intentionally to hurt (a) the suppliers by the way they treated the supply base; [and] (b) the hurt that's on employees, by the way they dealt with the layoff.

. . . . So how did these . . . ? Well, number one, because of the unethical approach that certain individuals in [his department] approached the supply base. . . . The suppliers were harmed because they now could no longer trust TREBCO to be a viable paying entity. . . . That hurts, because . . . you have to set money aside to cover your risk. That's expensive . . . so that takes money away from your ability to improve your own company because now you have to put it away to cover a risk. . . . Customer focus as a value gets harmed, too, because now the supply base is unreliable because now they have a risk issue with TREBCO. If the company runs into trouble, is the supply base willing to work with the company to supply the necessary parts . . . to produce [the vehicles]? Well, that clearly jeopardizes our ability to deliver [the vehicles] . . . and the stockholders are harmed. Because these three guys impact the bottom line. (George in Truty,

Truty & Truty

2003, pp. 171-72)
Sam, Neil, Joe, and Xman wanted continued employment that provided an uninterrupted source of income and benefits, particularly health insurance:

Well, I wanted and I probably need to work another four or five years. . . . If I had a choice, obviously, I'd still be working there . . . and then ultimately retire . . . but having gone through this, it obviously changed that dramatically because . . . now I've gotta go through the whole drill of locating another job and those kinds of things. So that affected . . . my life. (Sam in Truty, 2003, p. 185)

So I felt that mainframe programmer, if that job came along . . . well, not pass it by. . . . So then I . . . went to a job fair and got the [current company where he works] interview and . . . so that came up, and . . . then I took that job. There were . . . financial considerations there, plus, well, the medical's too . . . the [current job] came through with an offer; I jumped on it. You know, I didn't bother looking around. . . . My best chance in making a decent salary was in this field, but if I had to switch fields, I would definitely have to take what I would think a severe financial hit, you know, you probably found another job doing something else, but it wouldn't be near that kind of money, I would say maybe . . . anything over 20% to 30% lower, what I thought. . . . I know this is all I know, this is where I'm most skilled, so what are you gonna do? And a lot of times, companies don't want to start training you. That's a problem; . . . you're making a certain amount of money, and they want to bring in experienced people at that level. . . . They want the ready-made skill, and at my age, they want people who are actually functional in it. (Neil in Truty, 2003, p. 143)

Consistent with Stanage's (1974)

theory of violatives, participants in this category described the separation as a distrusive as they explained how it had surprised and disappointed them. In some cases, for example, for Peter and Neil, it had also been an obtrusive because they had neither time nor opportunity to update or broaden their skills for employability before being thrust into job search. For Xman, who had planned to ultimately leave this profession and delve into his writing career, the separation had been a retrusive as well as an obtrusive:

They were just . . . disruptive in bad timing. . . . I didn't want to have to spend my time lookin' for another job at that time. I had other things to do on my own time, and . . . one of 'em was not trying to restart a career. . . . And you could say I wanted to get out of the career eventually, anyway, so I definitely don't want to restart anywhere. . . . So in that way, it was disruptive, bad timing, . . . I don't know. I guess that was wrong, pretty wrong. (Xman in Truty, 2003, p. 189)

Because the downsizing had occurred before a fledgling side business was ready to support him financially (obtrusive), he was required to begin his "old" career once again at a different location (retrusive). His language, i.e., "restart", for example, suggested that he had been placed in a situation in which he was required to revisit something that he thought was already behind him (retrusive). Then again, because Xman and others in this category needed to find another job and engage in job seeking activity instead of continuing on with their daily routines or other activities that they had planned, the separation had been an intrusive as well as a distrusive.

It is important to note that for everyone in this study, the violence experienced had been structural, and for some, it had also been personal. For example, the selection for separation may have been personal, made by a specific person they thought they could name; but involuntary separation as a

response to perceived economic threat had been a structural decision embedded within the psyche of the organization, its competitors, and cultural institutions within the wider U.S. business society. For example, some participants often spoke of an ambiguous “they” or “the organization” when referring to the separation as it was done unto them. For all, the separations had been allowed to materialize against a cultural backdrop that was characterized by a demand for compliance, punishment for challenging those more powerful, diversity aversion, and reluctance for risk taking. In such a climate, selection and involuntary separation caused neither outrage nor open resistance.

Through George's story, it was possible to understand the instrumental essence of violence (Arendt, 1970) and its unpredictable outcomes. For example, George had terminated his eligibility for continued insurance coverage through TREBCO after the separation because he had immediately landed another job with benefits. As it turned out, he was soon separated from that job as well, causing him to purchase COBRA if coverage were needed or desired:

If I'd known that I was gonna get laid off here, I would have continued that [the insurance coverage included in the separation package from TREBCO], 'cause now I've gotta pay COBRA, which is like, almost \$600. . . . (George in Truty, 2003, p. 171)

When the decision to downsize via involuntary separation was made, it could only approximate consequences to those affected. It could not predict them. Turns of events, such as George's subsequent separation, could not have been foreseen or foretold. This was consistent with the literature on violence, which holds that because violence is instrumental and uses complex human beings to carry it out, it is impossible to consider or control all possible outcomes for all individuals. One could argue that George's ultimate loss of subsidized coverage had been the most recent

employer's concern or perhaps that it had been George's problem because he should not have been dependent on others for his personal needs. Although these might in part be true, I would argue that not to admit a degree of culpability as a result of the downsizing is tantamount to corporate exculpation and scapegoating. Such administrative behaviors find parallels in the stories of “administrative evil” told by Adams and Balfour (1998). Therein, for example, they cite distance as a tool frequently used to disguise evil being perpetrated and/or the perpetrator's identity. In George's case, distance was created by the passage of time and intervening events, that is, re-employment, between his separation from TREBCO and his current state of unemployment.

Peter, Joe, and Sam illustrated the notion of TINA (there is no alternative) when applied to the separations. The literature (“PR World,” 1999) discussed TINA as a communications or propaganda tool that presents an event or action as an unquestioned or unquestionable truth. This is suggestive of the process of institutionalization, creating and feeding into a concept such as “that's the way it is.” I saw evidence in Peter's, Joe's, and Sam's stories that they did not agree with the separations or the way that they had been done. Outwardly, however, they discussed the downsizing as part of capitalism or the market economy and the way that it had been carried out as simply the way that downsizing was done. In some cases, it *had* to be done that way, they claimed; that is, the manager could *only* say the standard lines during the separation meeting (Xman), and the company *had* to escort employees from one point to the next that day. I called this the “language of exigency,” suggestive of creating, demonstrating, and perpetuating institutionalization. No one in this study spoke of resistance to the downsizing decision itself. (George came closest to doing so; however, it was unclear if he spoke about resistance to the downsizing decision or to politics involved in the selection criteria). For Sam, Peter, and

Truty & Truty

Joe, it was not worth their time to do anything about it, and anyway, there was nothing one could do:

I didn't agree with what they have done and how they have done it . . . but . . . they did it. And like I said, we pick up" (Sam in Truty, 2003, p. 185).

I wouldn't ask management because the decision been made. Just accept and say good-bye or say a couple bad words if you don't like the person. . . . But I'm not ready for that. . . . Well, I'm not okay with that [the downsizing], but it's a business. So, nothing you can do. (Peter in Truty, 2003, p. 183)

You can have all this fanfare and everything else, but . . . it's a job, and you're there to do a job, and when that job's done, you're gone. That's all. It's as simple as that. . . . When we go into a corporation, you are hired by them. . . . You're not really in control even though they may say; . . . you're just an employee. . . . You are really employed by somebody else who has the . . . authority or power to say whether you work there or not, for whatever reason, so . . . that's your framework where you're working. (Joe in Truty, 2003, p. 192)

Instead of resisting, they called upon their ability to manage their emotions in response to the situation, opting to pick up the pieces and move on. Their dependence on a job, that is, the need to quickly find another, their desire to stay in control of their emotional and professional well being, and their resilience shut out resistance and potentially contributed to the perception of downsizing as an institutionalized Truth.

"We were hurt"-Patrick. Nine individuals--Andrew, Elizabeth, Homer, KT, Patrick, Peggy, Rocky, Samantha and Trinity--loved this job and/or wanted to stay at TREBCO until *they* elected to retire or leave the job. Unlike their colleagues in the other categories for whom

the job was a means to an end, these participants wanted to stay in *this* job for different reasons. Therefore, this separation had been unexpected, untimely, and unwelcome for all. Their disappointment, sense of hurt, loss, betrayal, rejection, and failure were financially and/or emotionally distressing even at the time of our conversations months afterwards. I suspect that my interpretation of demonstrated emotions might not always have been congruent with perceived intensity of the experience and that the selected vocabulary was likely dependent on multiple constitutive influences. However, it seemed clear to me that although some were able to see some promise and even excitement as they ventured into the unknown, their preference at the time had been continued employment at *TREBCO*.

Reasons for wishing to remain at TREBCO differed among participants. Age-wise and longevity-wise, employees in this group were not unlike the others, including some of the youngest and some of the oldest participants in this study. This cast doubt on the assumption that age and longevity might have been predictors of the overall experience of these separations. Andrew, one of the oldest participants, for example, had expected newer employees to be in better shape financially, because of the portable 401k plan for which they were eligible:

A person hiring in today will not be in that position because the retirement program's different. They're on matching 401K that moves with 'em, so the younger employee today with TREBCO isn't gonna care so much about getting laid off between 50 and 53, it's not gonna affect 'em that much. It's gonna affect 'em [in] total dollars and pension they're gonna have because they're gonna have less years to build up, but the point is, it's not gonna be a severe penalty, so those workers are gonna be better off on a layoff status than the workers of

today. (Andrew in Truty, 2003, p. 61)
However, Elizabeth, one of the youngest, explained,

There was a brief period of time where I was very depressed! And I was starting to think about suicide, which I was angry about; you know, I'm thinking, I'm 31 years old, I'm not a depressed teenager, and let's take a real look at these things. I mean, it's not that bad, and yet at the same time, I felt soooo baaad, I thought, well, pprrrrft! This would be an easy way to take care of it, you know, and . . . I didn't turn to alcohol or drugs to make me feel better, so . . . the only time I felt better was when I was sleeping, 'cause, you know, I was sleeping. (Elizabeth in Truty, 2003, pp. 239-40)

Peggy, Trinity, Elizabeth, and Samantha had been newer employees. All were eligible for a small lump stipend upon involuntary separation and no retirement payments because none had been employed long enough (five years) to be vested in the pension plan.

Andrew was surprised to see that younger people at his location appeared to be upset about their separation as if they believed that they could opt to leave if and when they wished but the company dare not separate them at will (my paraphrase of Andrew's words). Interestingly, in this Midwestern state either "party" may legally terminate the employment relationship "at will." The assumption, protected by law, is that humans and corporations are entities with equal rights. However, the younger employees' reactions illustrated their desire to reclaim agency and to subordinate the corporation as a human artifact. Trinity, too, could only imagine how people who had worked at the company for many years must have felt:

You don't know . . . how they're going to react; that person could have been perfectly fine, and then next thing you're telling somebody who's been

with the company for 32 years, sorry, bye, nice to see you, get out the door. . . . You just shove something down someone's throat who's . . . been with the company that long; that's a lot to swallow. . . . And how can that person or that corporation not think that? . . . It's how you ought to be respected, it's how you're going to get respected back. . . . You are cold-hearted enough to be laying someone off, and you tell 'em you can't go back to your desk, or you can't do this, or you can't do that. How do you think that person's going to live? They're going to retaliate, what happened to all that [culture initiative] training? . . . I think the word is respect. . . . I respect my people, because I know what they've done for me. (Trinity in Truty, 2003, pp. 237-38)

She had seen and heard the pain at the transition workshop shortly after the downsizing. She cited loss of daily social structure, betrayal, and expulsion as particularly insidious outcomes. Her main concern for those participants had not included loss of income or accrued benefits. In fact, all participants in this category described a hurtful experience. What was important to one was not necessarily important to someone else.

Participants in this experiential category included five males and four females. They represented organizational Levels 3 to 7. (Level 3 was an administrative level, and Level 7 was a top-end middle managerial level.)

Six of the nine represented professional or lower middle-management levels. Four of five men in this group described their separations as violative of their "duty" as financial providers and/or caregivers for their families. Upbringing, religion, culture, and ethnicity were cited as constitutive of this perceived responsibility:

I guess you just feel like you're not wanted or you're an outcast. . . . I guess being a part of society, that I have a job, I

Truty & Truty

go to work, I get home, I go to work, you know. Some people, that doesn't mean anything, but that's very important to me. . . . During the summer, I would sit outside and watch people go and come, and they have such organization to their life. They have such a more secure feeling than I do. . . . Nothing's guaranteed, like we all found out, but they know they get a check, . . . it's just a way of life, . . . that's what people have, they get up and go to work, come home, go out, do things, get up, go to work. . . . I lack that work thing, so I have a big void for eight hours of my day. . . . I was brought up that way. My dad always worked. . . . For some families, I don't think it's a very big deal, but I guess, with me, maybe, it's a macho thing that . . . I have to bring home the bread. (Homer in Truty, 2003, p. 205)

I've never been out of work, or I've never been out of school. . . . For 47 years, I've been working, so this has been such a dramatic, I mean you, you can imagine, and my heritage is German, okay? And Germans always work. . . . You just do it because that's what you're supposed to do. . . . There has been a tremendous amount of guilt associated with this idea of not working. . . . And even though a lot of my work has been to try to find work, that's not work, see? . . . You have to be producing something. . . . (Rocky in Truty, 2003, p. 212)

Participants in the "we were hurt" category described 15 elements altogether that composed their relevancy structures, that is, balance (holistic), stability (not moving from job to job), knowing what is ahead, trust (betrayal), continued income, role identity, fairness of selection, respected member of society, social connectedness to others affiliated with the workplace, this job, full retirement, acceptance (belonging), achievement (reputation), structure, and pride. These elements could be collapsed under Galtung's (1990) basic needs, including

well being, identity, and freedom. Each participant perceived that this downsizing had violated at least three elements of the relevancy matrix. "This job" and "social connectedness" were most frequently mentioned, followed by trust, fairness of selection, acceptance, and achievement. Although the others were cited less frequently, their importance to the people referencing them was neither diminished nor suggestive of frequency, salience, and intensity:

I was just beside myself! In the car, driving away, screaming, crying, swearing, I can't believe he did this, I can't believe he did this! . . . I mean, leaving this parking lot, . . . this grungy old plant, . . . I really love that place, I love it, and I still love it, and I still feel a part of it! . . . Separation really is . . . the perfect word because I feel like how people must feel when their husbands or wives walk in and say, "Well, I want a divorce," and then . . . they pack their shit and they leave, or they tell you to leave . . . because the shock of it is unreal, and the acceptance of it takes a very long time. I mean, . . . I'm two and a half months into my new job and feeling more a part of [the place where I worked] than my new job and missing my friends, missing the places and the people and the faces and . . . the people I worked with. . . . There was something about this group of people at [the location where she worked] that I really connected with, you know, and we had fun, I mean . . . things were funny. (Elizabeth in Truty, 2003, p. 240)

He [a previous manager who had recently retired] took care of us. . . . He just was very concerned about our well being. He was my friend. See, I get teary-eyed...He was my buddy...He just was my buddy.

Q: He was your buddy. Do you see him still?

A: No. It's my fault [still tearing]. . . . I

guess I'm embarrassed. And [he] don't feel that way. . . . He understands . . . but maybe I don't understand. . . . [He] helped me a lot, a lot of personal things. . . . And when [he] left, [another colleague] . . . and [another]. . . . And I still talk to [these colleagues], and I should talk to 'em more, but I'm still embarrassed [tearful]. I don't have a job now [tears]. . . . Well, I'm not in the same social plane . . . as [these colleagues]. . . . I have nothing to contribute to a conversation [shakily spoken]. When they talk about work, I can't talk about work. You know? Maybe that sounds corny, but . . . there for a while, I didn't call [my colleague] for about three weeks. That was bad on my part . . . but I feel very awkward with them now [sad facial expression] that I'm not part of 'em. . . . There's nothing in common anymore. You know, what draws people together is your work. . . . So I've lost that bonding thing [sad voice]. . . . I lost friends [sad]. . . . I don't know why I feel so awkward. I even talked to my wife about this. She says, "You shouldn't feel that way." But I just do [sad]--that they're productive, and I'm not productive . . . bringing a paycheck in, you know, being able to do this, I can't do that no more. (Homer in Truty, 2003, pp. 206-07)

To you, or to the person who was laid off, it is very personal. . . . TREBCO, depending on what location where you worked, I think is a family organizational company. . . . Where I worked, we bonded, very well. They worked hard, they backed each other up, things needed to be done, they got done, if you couldn't do it, your partner did it for you, it was just a very well-oiled machine. . . . (Trinity in Truty, 2003, p. 235)

It still hurts this time; . . . it hurts for a couple different reasons. Because they aren't allowing me to fulfill my plan,

if you will, to work 'til 62. I think that is a real travesty. I think that is really punishing an employee who had put in . . . 38 good years. I never had a bad review. I had nothing but positives . . . and just because we change direction drastically and to think that I'm not part of that, I think is a real insult. In other words, if they wanna change that's their option. . . . Instead of coming to me and talking to me about that, saying, here's what we're gonna do; would you like to be a part of that? No. They have elected to eliminate me, with three years to go, before you hit full retirement. I think that's a travesty. I think that's a travesty. (Andrew in Truty, 2003, p. 197)

Resolving the conflicts, getting the job done, making sure it's right, saving them the money . . . canceled vacations and everything. Because there was a project going on, I didn't trust anybody else to do it. It had to get done, it had to be done right. . . . I mean, I gave 'em that much, plus with the conditions that you have, personal recognitions, and they just, "Oh, good-bye." . . . You're just devastated. . . . I just gave 27 years to the company. . . . I had a stroke, and I went in to work. . . . But that's how dedicated I was. That was me. (KT in Truty, 2003, p. 203)

I didn't like the answer . . . because I knew I was one of the best customer service reps there, or *the* [emphasis in original] [best], because I knew what I had to get done, it was done; I had letters upon letters from dealers, . . . and it hits you really hard because you knew you did a good job, but . . . there's some people that you know in your heart has not done what they should do. I call it going above and beyond. . . . I was more sad and more shocked, so a more emotional state came in where I cried.. You give yourself to a company--your time, your dedication--and you feel crushed, they're a part of

Truty & Truty

my family. (Trinity in Truty, 2003, p. 234)

Number one . . . I take great pride in my technical skills and abilities. I've worked very hard to get them. I tried to keep myself well versed in training methodology and skills that go along with that. That was ignored. Shunned. That hurts. So . . . they eliminated my position and they really tried to eliminate the ideas. And that probably hurt even more . . . the ideas that you could actually have measurable objective training for technicians, and through it there was a skill transfer. . . . That's what hurt. . . . I guess the in-depth part of this would be [pause], the fact that I really believed it. I felt that the proof existed that it was true, and no matter how much you tried to emphasize that, no one was listening. . . . I'm a very passionate person about what I believe in, and that passion probably got in my way. You could call it pride if you want. There's not much difference. . . . If it required a change in position, maybe that's what it would require, based on new information, but someone needed to tell me somethin', and I was told nothing, including by my superior, okay? Which is also troubling, and I'm pursuing this thing, thinking I have full blessing and full support, and I didn't. (Patrick in Truty, 2003, pp. 217-218)

Languaging, that is, giving commonly understood verbal and gestural form to one's feelings, experiencing, and consciencing (Stanage, 1987), was obviously employed by all participants in this study. Notably, however, to describe the intensity of this downsizing experience as vividly as they could, participants in the "we were hurt" category utilized rich imagery in the forms of demonstrative words, similes, and metaphors. Much of the imagery consisted of death, war/combat, sports, film, and the break-up of relationships, such as divorce. These were not of themselves newly invented expressions designed specifically for these

narratives. Sometimes they were expressions used by other colleagues, experienced through film, recalled from one's youth, or that had emerged from a passion for history or from personal experiences with sports. At times, this language was used unconsciously; but at other times, it was deliberately and meticulously selected to bring experiences to life for me, the listener, and hopefully for the reader of this study. At any rate, the transfer of images from one lived sphere to this downsizing experience highlighted the desire not only to understand but also to make themselves deeply understood.

Q: You used words, like tear at you, hurtful, crushing, or crushed.

A: Rip apart.

Q: Rip apart. I'm picturing . . . something like *Braveheart*, you know; there's this person that we're gonna tar and quarter. Rip apart. That's pretty painful. I'm picturing crushing, like one of those horses, falls on top of the chest of one of these people. Pretty darn painful. . . . I'm thinking of hurtful. Ouch! Pain. Thinking of tear apart, . . . with the claws that tear at flesh. Okay, that's pretty violent.

A: I'm thinking of the last scene of *Braveheart*, where Mel Gibson is getting torn apart. . . . Inside, that is what I felt. . . . Um-hm. Pretty gruesome. . . . *Braveheart's* probably one of my favorite movies. . . . I think another scene is when he was betrayed. I felt betrayed . . . [by] just the company. . . . I kind of felt like Mel Gibson. When you work for a company and, . . . it's like the rug was pulled underneath you, . . . out of nowhere, . . . kind of that look where you were surprised and it puts a tear to your eye . . . because you just sit there in awe and don't know what to say.

Q: But you hurt, and you said it felt like you were being torn apart.

A: Um-hm. Inside. Because I was . . . going through a lot emotionally, and that was the last thing I needed. Yeah, . . .

it gives you a feeling that you cannot explain. It's something that you have to go through to understand . . . and very painful. . . . It makes you feel like you've had your insides torn out.

Q: You could have chosen different words than those.

A: But it's the best kind of word to, . . . I think it's a points given. If you've seen the movie, you'll understand. (Trinity in Truty, 2003, pp. 238-39)

At some point throughout the process, it is possible that imagery and metaphors were also means through which participants attempted to make sense of what had occurred to them by experimenting with ways in which this phenomenon compared to other contexts and situations that were different yet similar enough to illuminate what had transpired. This is an example of what Stanage (1987) meant when he referred to the "feeling, experiencing, and consciousing" structure of **person**. In this case, the involuntary separation was the feeling, or the phenomenon, with which these persons came into contact in their lifeworlds. Experiencing consisted of all of the sense-making activities, including the metaphorizing, that persons attempted in order to understand this downsizing and to integrate it within their existing knowledge schema. Consciousing was a sense of knowing, understanding, and coming to terms with the experience of this downsizing. Stanage's message appeared to be that it was not sufficient to simply observe or accept peoples' language at surface level, at least not if one wished to understand how they perceived this phenomenon. By conducting a full phenomenological investigation of the language used by these participants and by attending deeply to what flowed forth from **person**, one could attain an appreciation for difference among people due in part to their unique perspectives. Having done so, it is possible to accept that different people might experience the same phenomenon differently and certainly differently from ways in which it might have been intended or predicted.

Despite this painful experience, participants utilized multiple means for coping. One way to cope with the separation was to actively engage mind management and emotion work (Hochschild, 1983) as a protective tool:

And in order for me to understand why I'm angry, I have to be able to break that down and convince . . . my inner being . . . that those are real or that they're not real and deal with it. You either look at it and then you say you can't change it, . . . it's not gonna be any good to continue to dwell on something like that, and so your choice is I will continue to worry about this, to be sad about it, to be angry about it, or somehow or another I will put it in a place where I cannot necessarily bury it, 'cause I don't think that's particularly healthy, but deal with it in such a manner so as you could get rid of it. And as the term is used, you've gotta move on. (Rocky in Truty, 2003, p. 210)

As he moved forward, Andrew resolved "**to stay positive and stay looking forward, and don't look back**" [emphasis in original]. "If I make contact with them, it's drawing me back to the old world, and I gotta get out of that old world" (Andrew in Truty, 2003, p.198).

Participants in the "we were hurt" category described their downsizing experience as a violative. It was personal, direct, structural, cultural, and psychological, and often struck at employees' self-perception. Perceptions of personal identity were threatened or called into question as a result of separation. Anxious speculation and ruminative activity, often coupled with the stress of not knowing what lay ahead, threatened or disturbed personal well being. None of these participants had wished to leave the organization--they were forced to do so. For all, expectations of freedom in the forms of choice and human agency had been frustrated.

They Knew and Did Not Care

Truty & Truty

AND YET-When asked the question, an astounding majority of participants believed that organizational decision makers were aware that the downsizing could negatively impact their lives and that they did not care. Of these participants, Lois, Sabrina, Bob, and Peter *upheld* the organization's lack of focus on individual experiences, stating that organizational decision makers could not or should not care.

I argue: Given the findings from this study, particularly as they relate to peoples' unique relevancy structures, it is not possible for organizational decision-makers to predict how individuals will perceive the experience of downsizing. Given evidence of the violative potential of downsizing from the perspective of the persons separated from the job, TREBCO should have found alternative ways to downsize for cost reduction, market position, and profitability. How else could these workers' talents, passions, commitment, social and professional networks, knowledge, skills, and other positive traits have been channeled for mutual benefit? Or, shall one be resigned to, one can make someone aware, but one cannot make another care?

Author #2--John Counters: Why Should "They" Care? Understanding Person in a Downsizing Environment

The qualitative study described above recounts various personal interpretations of a downsizing event. To believe that an organization would care about peoples' experiences of the downsizing just to be "nice" would be naïve-although decision-makers likely admit that it is unfortunate that some employees are being let go. The focus, from the organization's perspective, is always on profitability. Along with recounting these events, there is a tacit suggestion that if the organization would have invested the resources to understand persons, the organization would somehow have profited.

Given the current mainstream philosophy of American business, one

question that can be asked is, why should "they" care to understand? Situating the downsizing within the business context at the time establishes a justification for the event. Suggesting an alternative model that would utilize some or all of the 1100 employees whose jobs were taken away would need to be scrutinized against a quantifiable return on the corporate investment; it would need to be rationalized via accepted business metrics. Furthermore, this alternative model suggests a high degree of cooperation between labor and management. While this level of cooperation may be supported within the business and management literature, it is problematic within the labor literature. Therefore, in response to the first author's implication that TREBCO ought to have a program that utilizes the latent talent, skills, and aspirations of employees, several questions need to be asked. The first is from TREBCO's point of view, why should they? Second, might not the level of cooperation suggested actually be detrimental to the employees in the long run? Without some collectivity to offset the power of the corporations, such cooperation may result in a slippery slope that has more to do with furthering a management agenda than a neutral or labor agenda.

Why Should They?

There are many programs operating in countless worksites around the globe that are intended to improve organizations' efficiency, productivity and competitiveness within the market. One such program/campaign is downsizing, the process that TREBCO selected. I operationalize the term as Cameron (1994) defines it from an objective management perspective. From his perspective, downsizing is not necessarily just one event or activity but several to achieve organizational ends. The term *activities* is constructed in such a manner that downsizing, total quality management, introduction of new accounting software, capital equipment purchases, or any other program becomes roughly equivalent when taken as a strategy to accomplish corporate goals. This paints the activity of people losing

jobs, disruption of livelihoods and jeopardizing old age financial security as neutral activities at best. Within these campaigns and operating within the purview of managerial prerogative, there are associated human relations consequences. Each organization approaches these consequences, their human relations "problems," with a mixture of uniqueness and collectivity. From a clinical point of view, I suspect, many within a business context would hardly take issue with the logical positivism implicated in either the Cameron definition or the unfortunate, but often necessary, consequences to the human beings within those organizations.

TREBCO is a publicly owned and traded large automotive manufacturing organization that has utilized downsizing numerous times in response to market conditions. Given TREBCO's economic condition at the time of the downsizing, the stated reason for employing downsizing as the strategy of choice was for cost reduction purposes. Therefore, the removal of 1100 white-collar workers from their jobs represented a quantifiable improvement to the financial bottom line in wages and benefits--pure dollars unspent. Literature in the field is demonstrating that the concept of downsizing is becoming more socially acceptable, and more specifically, a taken-for-granted process in the minds of managers and employees alike (Edwards *et al.*, 2003; Hickok, 1998; S. Jacoby, 2000; Sennett, 2000).

As these notions become more prevalent, means to deal with the unintended consequences are becoming more popularized. For example, becoming a free agent and brokering one's skills and experience has become a viable alternative (Pink, 2002). The dissolution of the longstanding social contract between capital and labor has propelled multiple job/careers, entrepreneurial experiences, and other non-traditional means of long-term employment such that aggregate careers are being constructed as the preferred development path (Mainiero & Sullivan, 2005). A common

thread that runs through these new ways of working is the altering of the relationship between the worker and the organization. This alteration takes the shape of a shift in responsibility concerning job rights and protection. It also relieves the corporation from any long-term issues of welfare capitalism. Workers are now expected to have the resources to deal with the shifting economic times. So given these events and given that the purpose was to reduce business costs, why should TREBCO have opted to utilize these employees' latent talent, skills and aspirations? There is no expectation that TREBCO do such a thing.

Labor-management cooperation, and cooperation in general, is seen as a positive method for groups of people and organizations to achieve goals. Therefore, suggesting a cooperative program that would find alternative uses for all or part of the 1100 TREBCO workers sent away would seem to, at least on the face of the issue, be a positive method with which to achieve TREBCO's goals. However, from TREBCO's point of view, the re-allocation of these assets into useful activities would need to be rationalized via cost benefit analysis. There is a presumption that TREBCO did look for obvious pairings of talent and staffing requirements. The unfortunate 1100 did not have the obvious required skills or the skills they did possess were not considered of value for the current needs of the business. But the solution set given above suggests a broader vision of including these human resources.

The solution suggests an active inventorying of each person's skills, talents and aspirations. This inventory would need to be actively monitored. When there are conditions that would normally warrant an adverse job action, management, in cooperation with the internal labor pool, are then able to match talent, skills and aspirations to just-in-time needs for addressing the situation. Therefore as an example, if TREBCO were lagging in sales, this inventory could reveal hidden, unutilized or underutilized talents in marketing, or

Truty & Truty

design, or manufacturing efficiency which, when put to better use, would help offset the current sales situation and provide a return on that employee's retention.

When Nadler (1970) defined human resource development (HRD), he envisioned three active roles: training employees for their current job, preparing employees to fill vacant positions in the future by continuing workplace education, and developing employees for future jobs that the company would need to fill but is unaware of what those jobs might be or what they would entail. This last notion of development Nadler saw as a fairly lofty goal; and because of its very nature, the development process is the least connected with tangible organizational benefit. It is somewhat an ideal conception, in that it proposes that change is both inevitable and unknown. This increased capacity will be useful organizationally in the future because its employees are familiar and acceptant of new learning, and it will reduce their resistance to change. In the 20 years between the 1st and 3rd editions of their book, the Nadlers found it difficult to get specific information on development programs. Some executives fear that these activities might not be viewed as profit-enhancing efforts. In the first edition, there was the notion of employee development as a preparatory process for the organization as it moves through its lifecycles. The organization's workforce needed to be ready for the future. The history of the times was rife with technological advancement (the space race, computer science, medical advances and so on). Although the employee's development was not directed per se, Nadler believed that it would ultimately benefit the organizations and, as a result, the people within them. The third edition seems less optimistic and more cost-focused. The pragmatic and economic conditions of the late 1970s and 1980s appear to de-emphasize the benefits of employee development, and the authors reflect these changes in tone as well as space dedicated to the topic (Nadler & Nadler, 1989).

From a pragmatic standpoint, one based on a return on investment, there is little evidence that inventorying and utilizing excess capacity in the form of latent talents, skills and aspirations would have sufficient value within an accepted strategy of improving business efficiency and productivity via cost reductions (i.e. reduction in the workforce). The metrics are directly tied to those wages and benefits. Again, then, why should TREBCO utilize the 1100 separated workers' latent talents, skills and aspirations? It doesn't seem to pay.

Constructing Co-operation (A Labor Argument)

The notion of cooperating within the workplace appears, on its face, to be a reasonable course of action. The idea that both the management and the employees of the enterprise can find ways to release the synergy of their talent and skills so that a greater level of efficiency, productivity and improved competitiveness raises the rewards for all in a democratically defined equitable manner is difficult to argue against and contributes to increasing just society. Since the early 1970's, there has been a shifting in management philosophy from one that is autocratic to one that is more open to democratic methods of participation.

Labor-management participation teams (LMPT), employee involvement (EI) and quality of work life (QWL) programs began in the 1970's and were popularized in the mid 1980's as means of introducing a greater level of management-labor cooperation. These programs shared an overt common charge: to reduce antagonistic barriers between management and labor (Lawler III *et al.*, 1992; Parker, 1985). Undergirding this charge was the proposition that due to the economic condition, both management and labor "are all in this together" and therefore labor ought to cooperate with management to improve efficiency and productivity-- it is a win-win proposition. Along with improving efficiency and productivity, these management-led teams of workers were

tasked with, among other tasks, improving the work process and transferring the workers' tacit knowledge to explicit job manuals and job aides. This in turn became the vehicle with which certain job skills were disseminated throughout the workforce, enabling management to reduce higher paid job categories both in number and in wages (Banks & Metzgar, 1989; Parker, 1985).

Of particular interest to this paper is a general agreement among labor scholars (as opposed to management scholars) that downsized laborers' uncritical cooperation with management in making the enterprise more efficient, productive, and profitable failed to safeguard their future well-being (Baily et al., 1994; Oulton, 1998; Parker, 1985). Those who would assist management to understand persons more deeply could, in fact, be complicit in the ensuing psychological coercion to extract even greater levels of cooperation from the employees (Gee et al., 1996; Schied et al., 1997). There are those who would advocate a position of labor-management cooperation if employed in a system which afforded greater protections for all parties. This would be constructed from a point of view that power between the community, labor and the corporation be equitable. Joint cooperation and balanced outcomes would build a more just society and foster cooperation (more communitarianism and less individualism) among all stakeholders.

Corporate programs that have, as one of their goals, to improve the economic position of the individual worker would require the protection of government and law. Even if a humanistic benevolent human resource director established programs that utilized the talents, aspirations and desires of employees and even if these programs yielded a hefty ROI, what would protect these employees from the next regime, the next management guru, the next *New York Times* best seller, the next MBA-turned-CEO? There are cases where management has discontinued profitable programs so as to gain control over labor (Noble, 1986). The

need for control, as often taught in business schools, and emotion, which is a product of our humanness, belie the myth of businessmen's rationality. Labor organizations, in order to offset the asymmetrical power relationship between labor and capital, have been instrumental in introducing pensions, shortened work weeks, safety systems, vacation pay, and the right to organize-- despite objections and physical force by management's "security" forces, (S. M. Jacoby, 2004; Montgomery, 1987). These gains can be withdrawn if not protected by law and an active labor citizenry (Harrison & Bluestone, 1988).

The suggestion that the displaced workers at TREBCO could have been better served via a program that better utilized their human talents is a positive good for society. The suggestion that these improvements, enacted on a business-by-business basis, would, in the long run, change society to a more just world, has merit. However, they must produce broad societal changes to advance social justice. There is a concern about short-term positive effects of cooperation being transformed over the long-term into "management by stress," into broad-based processes that accelerate a "race to the bottom." (Moody, 1997b). Wars, political campaigns, long projects are not won in one battle or completed in one task. These endeavors require a series of events that lead to an outcome. This is also true within the world of work. The suggested humanizing programs must have global support. They cannot survive as local individual initiatives (Moody, 1997b; Moody & McGinn, 1992). If benevolent programs, as suggested above, cannot address the concerns mentioned, then the cooperation these workers provide only extends the organization's profitability. Those professionals who support the uncritical adoption of these programs are then complicit in extracting excess labor value and thus contributing to the misery of the have-nots while believing that they are helping to correct an otherwise cruel system.

In conclusion, an answer to the

Truty & Truty

question of why would they? They wouldn't-- and they shouldn't. From an economic point of view, TREBCO was interested in cutting costs, which is what 1100 white-collar workers represented. The overhead and intangibility of cataloguing and attempting organizational matches in a time of stress between "excess" employees and some yet-unrecognized, short-term, profit-generating program, would seem beyond the reasonable for most industries. From a labor point of view, the notion of cooperation would need to be replaced with participation. Participation implies a more equitable power-sharing arrangement. True worker participation into management prerogatives has typically been a function of organized labor and other social movements (Brody, 1993; Lichtenstein & Harris, 1993; Moody, 1997a). Therefore, while the suggestion to find methods of utilizing workers' latent talents, skill and aspiration is a noble cause, it may better be served not as a local management program but as a broad-based participative activity, mutually managed by the workers, the community and the organization, with guarantees established in contract or law. (Swinney, 1989, 2000).

References

Adams, G. B., & Balfour, D. L. (1998). *Unmasking administrative evil*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Arendt, H. (1970). *On violence*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Baily, M., Neil, B., J., E., & Haltiwanger, J. C. (1994). Downsizing and Productivity Growth: Myth or Reality? *NBER Working Paper No. W4741*, from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=227004>

Banks, A., & Metzgar, J. (1989). Participation in Management: Union Organizing on a New Terrain. *Labor Research Review #14, VIII(2)*, 1-44.

Brody, D. (1993). *Workers in Industrial America* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cameron, K. S. (1994). Guest editor's note: Investigating organizational downsizing--fundamental issues. *Human Resources Management, 33(2)*, 183-188.

Cotte, J., & Ratneshwar, D. (1999). Juggling and hopping: What does it mean to work polychronically? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 14(34)*, 184-204.

Cunliffe, A. L. (2001). *Managers as practical authors: Reconstructing our understanding of management practice*. Unpublished manuscript, Durham, NC.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 1-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Edwards, J. C., Rust, K. G., McKinley, W., & Moon, G. (2003). Business Ideologies and perceived breach of contract during downsizing: The role of the ideology of employee self-reliance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24(1)*.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research, 3*, 167-191.

Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research, 27(3)*, 291-305.

Gee, J. P., Hull, G., & Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: Behind the language of the new capitalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York, NY: Aldine De Gruy.

Gozzi, R. J. (1999/2000, Winter). The nineties: The downsizing decade. *Et Cetera, 56(4)*, 458-463.

Harrison, B., & Bluestone, B. (1988). *The*

- Great U-Turn: Corporate Restructuring and the Polarizing of America. New York: Basic Books.
- Hart, M. U. (2001). *The poverty of life-affirming work: Mother work, education, and social change*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Hickok, T. A. (1998). Downsizing and Organizational Culture. *Public Administration & Management: An Interactive Journal* (Volume 3 Number 3).
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart, commercialization of human feeling*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Jacoby, S. (2000). Melting into Air? Downsizing, Job Stability, and the Future of Work. Retrieved 8 March, 2005, from <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/groups/ccsa/jacoby.PDF>
- Jacoby, S. M. (2004). *Employing bureaucracy: managers, unions, and the transformation of work in the 20th century* (Rev. ed.). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lawler III, E. E., Mohrman, S. A., & Ledford Jr., G. E. (1992). *Employee Involvement and Total Quality Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lichtenstein, N., & Harris, H. J. (1993). *Industrial democracy in America: the ambiguous promise*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Lurie, J. M. (2000). *Great job . . . you're fired! Downsizings in corporate America: A game theoretic and event study approach to the mathematics of information*. Unpublished senior thesis, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
- Mainiero, L. A., & Sullivan, S. E. (2005). Kaleidoscope careers: An alternate explanation for the "opt-out" revolution. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1), 106-123.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, R. A. (1998). Lifesizing in an era of downsizing: An ethical quandary. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(15), 1693-1700.
- Montgomery, D. (1987). *The fall of the house of labor: the workplace, the state, and American labor activism, 1865-1925*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moody, K. (1997a). *Worker in a Lean World: Unions in the International Economy*. London: Verso.
- Moody, K. (1997b). *Workers in a lean world: unions in the international economy*. London; New York: Verso.
- Moody, K., & McGinn, M. (1992). *Unions and free trade: solidarity vs. competition*. Detroit, Mich.: Labor Notes.
- Nadler, L. (1970). *Developing Human Resources* (1st ed.). Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Nadler, L., & Nadler, Z. (1989). *Developing Human Resources* (Third ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.
- Noble, D. F. (1986). *Forces of production: a social history of industrial automation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Oulton, N. (1998). A Tale of Two Cycles: Closure, Downsizing and Productivity Growth in UK Manufacturing, 1973-89. *NIESR Discussion Paper No. 140* Retrieved 10 March, 2004, from <http://www.niesr.ac.uk/pubs/dps/dp140.PDF>
- Parker, M. (1985). *Inside the Circle: A Union Guide to QWL*. Boston: South End Press.
- Pink, D. (2002). *Free Agent Nation: The Future of Working for Yourself*. New York: Warner Business Books.

Truty & Truty

- PRworld. (July, 1999). *Propaganda: New Internationalist Magazine*. Retrieved July 7, 2002, from <http://www.newint.org/issue314/worl.htm>
- Schied, F. M., Carter, V. K., Preston, J. A., & Howell, S. L. (1997). Knowledge as "quality non-conformance": A critical case study of ISO 9000 and adult education in the workplace, *Adult Education Research Conference*. Oklahoma State University, Stillwater Oklahoma.
- Schutz, A. (1972). The phenomenology of the social world (G. Walsh & F. Lehnert, Trans.). In J. Wild & J. M. Edie (Eds.), *The phenomenology of the social world* (6th paperback ed.). Vienna, Austria: Julius Springer.
- Schwandt, T. A. (1998). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sennett, R. (2000). *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism* (New ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Stanage, S. M. (1969). Linguistic phenomenology and "**person**-talk". *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 2(81-90).
- Stanage, S. M. (Ed.). (1974). *Reason and violence: Philosophical investigation*. Tokowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams & Co.
- Stanage, S. M. (1981). Order, violatives and metaphors of violence. *Thought: A Review of Culture and Idea*, 56(200), 89-100.
- Stanage, S. M. (1987). *Adult education ad phenomenological research: New directions for theory, practice, and research*. Malabar FLA: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, Inc.
- Swinney, D. (1989). Critical Responses to Participating in Management: Broadening the Arena for Participation and Control. *Labor Research Review #14, VIII* (2), 92-98.
- Swinney, D. (2000). Building the Bridge to the High Road: Expanding Participation and Democracy in the Economy to Build Stable Communities. Retrieved 3 March, 2005, from <http://www.clcr.org/publications/btb/indexBTB.html>
- Truty, D. (2003). "Do I Count?": Adult Experiences with Involuntary Separation from the Job. Context, Perspective, Violence, and Institutionalized Myth. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL.
- Turnbull, S. (2002). Bricolage as an alternative approach to human resource development theory building. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(1), 111-128.
- U.S. (April 1, 2003). *Bureau of Labor Statistics Glossary*. Retrieved March 13, 2005, from <http://www.bls.gov/bls/glossary.htm>
- U.S. (Tuesday, January 29, 2002). *Bureau of Labor Statistics Mass Layoffs in December 2001*. Retrieved March 11, 2005, from <ftp://ftp.bls.gov/pub/news.release/History/mmls.01292002.news>
- U.S. (Thursday, February 24, 2005). *Bureau of Labor Statistics News*. Retrieved March 11, 2005, from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/mmls.pdf>

Copyright of TAMARA: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science is the property of TAMARA: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.