

1989

IMPLEMENTING DESKTOP COMPUTING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND QUALITY OF WORKLIFE

Stephen J. Lepore
University of California, Irvine

Rob Kling
University of California, Irvine

Suzanne Iacono
University of Arizona

Joey George
University of Arizona

Follow this and additional works at: <http://aisel.aisnet.org/icis1989>

Recommended Citation

Lepore, Stephen J.; Kling, Rob; Iacono, Suzanne; and George, Joey, "IMPLEMENTING DESKTOP COMPUTING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND QUALITY OF WORKLIFE" (1989). *ICIS 1989 Proceedings*. 37.
<http://aisel.aisnet.org/icis1989/37>

This material is brought to you by the International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS) at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in ICIS 1989 Proceedings by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact elibrary@aisnet.org.

IMPLEMENTING DESKTOP COMPUTING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND QUALITY OF WORKLIFE

Stephen J. Lepore
Rob Kling
Public Policy Research Organization
University of California, Irvine

Suzanne Iacono
Joey George
Department of MIS
University of Arizona

ABSTRACT

This article presents preliminary findings from a three year longitudinal study on the role of desktop computing in the work of 38 work groups that have integrated computing significantly into their work lives. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected from surveys and interviews. End-users' participation in the process of implementing desktop computers in work groups is examined as a primary contributor to the quality of their work life, as is the available infrastructure (training, supplies, and consulting) to support computing in the work groups. Two primary implementation processes are examined: "top-down" and "grass-roots." We discuss the quality of work life of computer users along five dimensions: participation in decisions about work, job complexity, expertise and involvement in computing, changes in job enrichment attributed to desktop computing, and changes in work effort attributed to desktop computing. The quality of working life is most improved in work groups that computerize with grass-roots processes and have adequate infrastructure to support their work with computing.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper examines the social dimensions of computerization in work groups where computers are dominant features of worklife. The central question is: What factors influence the quality of worklife when computing is a pervasive feature of work places and information handling? There are two primary reasons that extensively computerized work groups were selected to participate in the study. First, some work environments make desktop computing so salient that its influences on worklife are likely to be inevitable, important, and measurable.¹ Second, desktop computing is a relatively new phenomenon that will potentially affect many white collar workers. Desktop computing (DTC) refers to computer-based services that are accessible through terminals or micro-computers near people's immediate work areas. More services, such as text-processing, communications, and programming, can be readily accessible to people when equipment is physically proximate.

Data on the effects of computer-based information technology or the role of computerization in shaping worklife are often contradictory. Studies that rely upon deterministic impact models often argue that computerization necessarily leads to improvements (Giuliano 1982; Strassman 1985) or degradations (Braverman 1974; Mowshowitz 1986; Zuboff 1982, 1988) in the quality of

work life. These studies may come to different conclusions because the work groups they sample to test their models differ along many dimensions that appear to moderate or mediate the effects of technology on work life (e.g., Danziger and Kraemer 1986; Kling and Iacono in press). In this paper, two central dimensions of work groups that influence workers' experiences with computerization in their worklives are examined: the process of implementing computing in the work group, and the quality of the infrastructure to support computer use (e.g., training, supplies, and consulting resources).

2. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESSES

Social processes that shape the implementation of computer systems are a key influence on organizational behavior (Lucas 1981). Bikson (1986) reports that most advanced computing implementations are carried out at the work group level. She also argues that implementations are a continuous process, though they are often falsely conceptualized as occurring in discrete stages (see also Kling and Scacchi 1982; King and Kraemer 1985; Kling and Iacono 1984; Kling 1987). We have found that computer-using organizations implement computer-based systems in line with one of two major types of processes: top-down and grass-roots approaches.

Top-down and grass-roots implementations differ in the locus of control over key issues pertinent to computerization: what will be computerized, the mix of equipment selected, the patterns of allocation, training resources, and so on. In a prototypical top-down implementation, actors **outside** the computerizing work group, such as upper managers and technical experts in centralized support departments, make all the key decisions. Conversely, in a prototypical grass-roots implementation, participants **within** the computerizing work groups make all the key decisions. The concepts of "top-down" and "grass-roots" implementations are ideal types. In practice, the control patterns are more varied and subtle, but most computer implementation processes can be categorized as predominantly top-down or grass-roots. In the next section, a description of a grass-roots work group and a top-down work group from our study are presented.

2.1 Descriptions of Implementation Processes

Pension Systems Control (PSC) typifies a work group that computerized from grass-roots efforts. PSC is comprised mainly of application analysts for the Pensions division of a large insurance company, INSURE. PSC has a very heterogeneous mix of computing hardware, software, and systems. Some analysts have terminals connected to a Hewlett-Packard (HP) 3000 minicomputer, while others have microcomputers that are used as HP terminal emulators or in a standalone capacity. The software varies from machine to machine, though text processing software is standardized on all machines. Even the microcomputers differ in brand, memory capacity, type of disk drives (floppy versus hard), etc. This heterogeneity of computing hardware and software stems from the incremental nature of computer systems development in grass-roots work groups.

According to the manager of PSC, the systems developers (i.e., actuaries and programmers) and application analysts provided most of the impetus for software and hardware acquisitions and enhancements in the work group. It was an actuary, who was part of the PSC work group when it originated, that convinced an INSURE vice-president to allow the Pensions division to purchase the HP 3000. The Pensions division, including PSC, had been using INSURE's centralized data processing department that used an IBM mainframe. The data center frequently had a backlog of applications because many programmers were forced to wait in line to get their work done. The shift to the HP 3000 minicomputer allowed the Pensions division to gain local control over their computing and work. They could develop their own systems and process their own data. Today, PSC's analysts continue to push for new equipment (to replace terminals with microcomputers or floppy drives with hard drives) and negotiate how their computing environment is operated and maintained.

In contrast to the grass-roots implementation process in PSC, the centralized Word Processing Center (WPC) at

INSURE was computerized in a top-down fashion. The vice president of the Information Resources Management department decided to implement IBM dedicated word processing work stations in WPC to replace the Wang equipment that the word processors had been using. The processors objected to the changeover because they felt the IBM equipment had a complex, cumbersome menu-driven program. The vice president's main concern was to make WPC's equipment compatible with the rest of the organization, which mainly used IBM equipment (except for the Pensions division). Typical of top-down implementations -- and in contrast to grass-roots groups -- the computing equipment in WPC is very homogeneous. All of the word processors use IBM 5520s, which are dedicated word processing machines. Only one person has a terminal connected to an IBM mainframe in order to exchange documents and use electronic mail. One benefit of WPC's implementation was that all workers got new, ergonomically designed workstations.

Most studies of computerization and worklife assume that implementations are top-down even when there is no explicit discussion of the locus of control of the implementations (Otway and Peltu 1983; Hirschheim 1986). In top-down implementations, top managers decide upon specific processes and then follow through with relatively large-scale implementations in planned stages. Top-down implementations are common to studies of computerization that focus on clerks (National Research Council 1986) and machinists (Shaiken 1985).

Grass-roots processes for implementing DTC are common yet receive little scholarly attention because they are unspectacular (see, however, Rockart and Flannery 1983). Grass-roots implementation processes typically start when a small coalition of professionals within a work group, often with their manager, convince resource controllers to allow them to adopt equipment for local computing. Additional equipment is gradually acquired as other work group members perceive benefits in local computing use and as users develop expertise.

2.2 Hypotheses about Implementation Processes

Most analysts of computing and work life expect implementation processes to affect workers' attitudes toward computing and the quality of their work life (Bikson 1986; Kling and Iacono in press). We have developed hypotheses pertaining to five dimensions of work groups' quality of work life and their members' attitudes toward computing that will be affected by implementation processes:

- participation in decisions about and influence over work processes
- job enrichment
- expertise and involvement in computing
- work complexity
- work effort

Admittedly, there is some overlap between these dimensions. We try to discuss them separately to highlight their importance. Work complexity and effort are so highly related that they are discussed in the same section.

Participation in Decisions About Work. The first hypothesis (H1) focuses on the degree to which work group members control their work and participate in work processes. We expect that grass-roots groups will report greater influence over their work and more participation in work processes than top-down groups. Thus, we expect that grass-roots groups will fare favorably on this dimension, because workers with more control over their work are presumably happier and more productive than workers who do not participate in work decisions and practices. Members of top-down groups will probably report greater managerial control over work behaviors than members of grass-roots groups, mainly because top managers will be more interested in equipment use in top-down groups because they have typically invested a lot of money and effort in the implementation. It is also likely that workers in grass-roots groups participate in decision making in a broader array of work-related decisions than workers in top-down groups. That is, workers that influence the development of computing in their work group probably have influence over other aspects of their work.

Job Enrichment. The second hypothesis (H2) relates to the extent to which jobs are enriched as a result of implementation processes in work groups. Our definition of job enrichment does not focus on the development of worker skills or expertise, as other constructions of this concept do (e.g., Attewell 1987). However, we do treat expertise and skill development as a unique dimension of quality of work life (see H3). Our job enrichment variable encompasses workers' perceptions of the extent to which DTC has increased or decreased the level of challenge in their job, how pleasant their work area is, how much unenjoyable work they do, the level of skills they need to do a good job, the amount of annoying rules, and how trapped they feel in their job.

We expect that grass-roots groups will experience more job enrichment than top-down groups. In part, we have developed our expectations from the literature that has shown a positive relationship between end-user participation in the design of computing systems and their morale and motivation to learn (Land and Hirschheim 1983; Mumford 1983). However, it should be noted that previous research on the relationship between participation in implementations and work life outcomes has really examined the effects of limited participation of workers on systems that have mainly been implemented in a top-down manner. Most researchers do not examine the effects of participation in computer implementations that are ongoing and intrinsic to the operations of the work group -- as in our grass-roots work groups. Thus, although there is little relevant data or theory on the topic, we expect that grass-roots groups will report greater job enrichment as a result

of their continuous participation in the development of their DTC environment. In contrast, members of top-down groups will probably find that their jobs are more constricted. They will, for example, have to contend with more annoying rules because top management will want to exert greater control over the workers' use of computing in their work.

Computing Expertise and Involvement. The third hypothesis (H3) is that grass-roots groups will report greater computing expertise, skill, and involvement in discussing computing with coworkers. Economic and social analysts (e.g. Braverman 1974; Glenn and Feldberg 1977) suggest that increased automation and heightened managerial control degrades work as a result of job fragmentation, particularly in capitalist societies. That is, skill requirements for jobs decline and work becomes more simple and repetitive. Attewell (1987) has challenged the conclusions of Braverman (1974) and of Glenn and Feldberg (1977, 1979), arguing that work is becoming upgraded. Attewell (1985) and others (Giuliano 1982) have argued that employers are not substituting skilled employees with sophisticated technology, but are automating the routine work in order to allow workers the time to do more interesting and complex work.

There is nothing inherent in technology that degrades or upgrades work. We believe that job complexity, interest level and skill requirements are contingent upon a number of factors, including the way in which technology is implemented in the work group. Compared with workers in top-down groups, those in grass-roots groups are expected to develop more skills on the job than through formal training, to be more motivated to learn about the computer systems, and to discuss computing more often with coworkers because they have had some input into the design of the systems (Land and Hirschheim 1983; Mumford 1983). The relationship between implementation process and skills is discussed in more detail in Section 3.

Work Complexity and Work Effort. Hypothesis four (H4) is that grass-roots groups will report greater work complexity than top-down groups. Hypothesis five (H5) is that grass-roots groups will report greater decreases in work effort as a result of DTC than top-down groups. Issues of work complexity and work effort, such as computing skills, are addressed in the deskilling literature (Attewell 1987). The literature suggests that productivity increases but that work is simplified and tasks are easier to perform. We believe that major productivity gains result when increases in complexity are accompanied by decreases in effort. When workers can use technology to do more complex work than was previously possible -- but with less effort -- then there has been a considerable increase in productivity. How can respondents simultaneously report that DTC has increased the complexity of work and made tasks easier? We believe that this relationship between complexity and ease of work can be explained by increases in workers' skill levels. On the basis of the skill hypotheses

developed above, we predict that grass-roots groups would be more likely to report increases in work complexity and decreases in work effort than top-down groups.

In summary, we have suggested that the social and organizational processes of computing work groups have important implications for workers' quality of work life and attitudes about computing. Specifically, members of work groups that have control and influence over their implementation process (grass-roots groups) should respond more positively to our questions about quality of work life and attitudes toward computing than work groups whose members have had little or no say about the implementation of computing (top-down groups). Another important organizational predictor of our outcomes is the infrastructure that has evolved in an organization or work group to support computer operations. In the next section we describe the expected relationship between infrastructure and implementation and the five dimensions of quality of work life.

3. INFRASTRUCTURE

One way of ensuring a successful implementation of computing is to develop an adequate computing infrastructure (Rockart and Flannery 1983). Computing infrastructure denotes all the resources and practices required to help people adequately use computer systems to carry out their work (Kling and Scacchi 1982; Kling 1987). Computer systems often require additional resources besides hardware and software (e.g., paper for printers, space for equipment, support staff). These adjunct resources cannot be taken for granted and often become an issue when computer users find them unavailable. Few organizations invest in large amounts of computing staff support for each user. Many firms seem to support microcomputers with about one person per 50 workstations. As a result, support staff may become so backlogged in their work that they reduce their jobs to installing equipment and altering configurations; users may find that they must resolve many operational problems themselves or work around them. Computer use requires skill and the "consequences of computerization" can hinge on users' skill levels. People who do not have the skills to use computing equipment in the way their managers, co-workers or clients expect can feel greater pressure and perform less well on the job than their counterparts with computer skills.

Skill development comes with experience and training. Practices for training users of new systems or software vary from organization to organization. Some organizations routinely send workers to computer courses or provide "one-on-one" tutorials; other organizations offer no systematic training -- all training is on-the-job. In our interviews, we observed that supervisors of clerical work groups that process routine documents and transactions take greater pains to systematically train their staff than managers of professional work groups or groups with a mix of clerks and professionals.

3.1 Hypothesis about Infrastructure and Implementation Process

Hypothesis six (H6) focuses on the degree to which work groups have developed an adequate infrastructure to support their computing environment. We expect that grass-roots groups will develop less adequate formal infrastructure than top-down groups. Computer users in grass-roots groups may receive little or no formal training; individuals may be expected to learn on their own or from other workers. Grass-roots groups will experience more problems as a result of the lack of support services provided by the central organization. When equipment breaks down, staff will often manage repairs themselves. Although workers in grass-roots groups may report increases in work complexity as a result of computerization and computer-related work, they also should be reporting increases in their DTC skills because of their necessary involvement in troubleshooting. In addition, workers who have had to fight for and develop their own infrastructure for computing should report greater involvement with computers and more discussions with coworkers regarding computers than workers who have had little involvement in the implementation process.

4. METHODS

4.1 Sample and Data Collection

Our primary unit of analysis is the work group.² There are several plausible criteria for drawing work group boundaries (Thompson 1967). We used a simple criterion which works well most of the time: we clustered people who reported to the same supervisor into the same work group. We selected 38 white collar work groups with enough DTC equipment that its use might significantly shape work practices and worklife. Based on informal pilot studies, we decided to select work groups that had at least one terminal or workstation for every two members. Work groups differed along many other dimensions, such as the number of staff, occupational mix, computer implementation process, turnover rates, and so on. We administered a questionnaire to every member of the 38 work groups in the spring of 1988.³ The questionnaire included approximately 200 closed-response questions covering topics such as the patterns of the individuals' computer use, job characteristics, patterns of computer use and computing practices in the work group, and changes in worklife that the respondent attributed to desktop computerization. We received 357 completed and usable questionnaires (86 percent response rate).

We aggregated individual scores in each work group to form a single score (the work group mean). We used aggregated scores to measure work group characteristics. Alternatives to survey measures of work group characteristics were not feasible in this study because we had a very large sample of work groups. Instead, we sought to

supplement our surveys with observations and indepth interviews with work group members, including the supervisor from each work group. These data were used to develop our survey as well as cross-validate survey responses. Thus, while our measures were not standard, we did use a standard measurement strategy by aggregating individuals' responses to the survey (Price and Mueller 1985).

We complemented our quantitative data collection with approximately 50 hour-long semi-structured interviews. We interviewed at least one person from each work group -- usually the supervisor -- though we focussed our interviews in eight work groups and selected informants who represented each job type and hierarchical level. We also interviewed some people outside the work groups who influenced computing arrangements in the groups, such as top managers and computer support staff who controlled key resources. During our initial interviews with the work group supervisors, we ascertained the extensiveness of computing in the work group (e.g., ratio of workstations to workers), the work group size, the mix of clerks and professionals, and how computing was implemented in the work group -- in a top-down or grass-roots process. This information was coded and later validated with work group responses to questionnaire items about these aspects of the work group.

Twenty-five out of the sample of 38 work groups came from three large organizations -- INSURE, AIRCRAFT, and COAST PHARMACEUTICALS. The other thirteen work groups came from seven other organizations.⁴

4.2 Index Construction

In addition to analyzing work group level responses to individual items, we created eight composite indices for analysis.

- Two indices were developed to validate our a priori coding of the work group's implementation process as primarily top-down or grass-roots.
- One index was created to measure the adequacy of the infrastructure for supporting computing.
- Five indices were constructed to measure characteristics of work and computing: work complexity and participation in work decisions, changes in work effort attributed to DTC, changes in the quality or richness of individuals' jobs, and expertise and involvement in computing.

The eight indices are presented in Table 1 along with a sample item and a measure of their internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha). The original, self-administered survey questions were coded on a seven point agreement scale ranging from 1 (No!No!No!) to 4 (Neutral) to 7 (Yes!Yes!Yes!) or on a 7-point change scale ranging from

1 (Greatly decreased) to 4 (No Change) to 7 (Greatly increased). We recoded the work group level scores in the indices for clarity. Scores below 4, the "neutral" or "no change" midpoints, on the scales were recoded into negative numbers for disagreement and decrease scores. Score above the "neutral" or "no change" midpoints were recoded into positive numbers for agreement and increase scores. Certain items were reverse coded to match the direction of the index. After recoding items to match the direction of the scale, all items and indices ranged from -3 (disagree or decreased) to 0 (neutral) to +3 (agree or increased).

5. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESSES: GRASS-ROOTS VERSUS TOP-DOWN

As mentioned previously, specific questions about the implementation process were asked in the survey in order to validate the researcher-coded values of the implementation process. Two indices were formed from items pertaining to participation in decision making related to computing: NIDPART1 and NGDPART. We built NIDPART1 from respondents' reports of their own participation in DTC decisions and NGDPART from respondents' reports of other work group members' participation in DTC decisions (see Table 1). The two indices were, as expected, highly correlated ($r = +.79$, $p < .01$).⁵

On the basis of our interviews, we expected certain occupational characteristics and computing arrangements and uses for grass-roots and top-down groups. Our descriptive data confirmed our expectations.

- Grass-roots groups were predominantly men (57%) and top-down groups were predominantly women (84%) [Chi-sq=61.42, df=1, $p < .001$].
- Grass-roots groups were comprised primarily of professionals (80%), and top-down groups were comprised primarily of clerks (67%) [Chi-sq=22.00, df=2, $p < .000$].
- A greater proportion of grass-roots groups had a high (1:1) ratio of workstations to employees than top-down groups (75% versus 56%), although the difference was not statistically significant.

Given that the grass-roots groups were extensively computerized, we were surprised that their highest ranked problem out of fifteen questions about DTC problems was "Not enough equipment" (mean=2.0: sometimes a problem, $sd = .67$). In contrast, equipment shortages was only the fifth ranked problem for top-down groups (mean=1.7: sometimes a problem, $sd = .98$). Grass-roots groups were also more likely than top-down groups to have standalone microcomputers rather than terminals and microcomputers attached to a LAN or shared computer [Chi-sq=11.32, df=3, $p < .001$].

Table 1. Reliability, Description, and Example of Seven Indices

INDEX (Alpha)	DESCRIPTION	EXAMPLE ITEM
NIDINFRA (.64)	Respondent's assessment of training and computer support availability.	Most everyone has received adequate formal training about the systems and applications we use. ^a
NIDPART1 (.72)	Respondent's participation in decisions about DTC.	I have little influence over the computerization of my work area (reverse coded). ^a
NGDPART (.60)	Work group's participation in decisions about DTC.	Individuals (in this work group have little say in how they use DTC in work) (reverse coded). ^a
NIWPART1 (.79)	Respondent's participation in decisions about work.	I frequently give advice to my co-workers about work procedures or practices. ^a
NIWCOMP2 (.68)	Complexity of respondent's job.	I am often given new tasks and responsibilities. ^a
CIWWKEFF (.78)	Respondent's assessment of changes in work effort.	The number of hours per day that you usually need to work to get your job done. ^b
CIWJOBR3 (.69)	Respondent's assessment of changes in the quality of his/her job, emphasizing job enrichment.	The extent to which your primary place to work is not a pleasant place to work. ^b
NIDGEXPT (.69)	Respondent's involvement and perceived expertise in DTC.	I am the expert on some parts of the systems or applications that I use. ^a

^aScale: -3=NO!, -2=disagree, -1=slightly disagree, 0=neutral, +1=slightly agree, +2=agree, +3=YES!

^bScale: -3=greatly decreased, -2=decreased, 1=slightly decreased, 0=neutral, +1=slightly increased, +2=increased, +3=greatly increased

In sum, the grass-roots groups in our sample were primarily professional men who used standalone computers in an extensively computerized environment. On average, individuals in grass-roots groups participated in decision making related to computing and had some influence over the computing arrangements in their work group. Top-down groups were mainly comprised of clerical women who used attached computers in a medium to highly computerized environment. Members of top-down groups, on average, did not participate in decision making related to computing nor did they exert substantial influence over the computing arrangements in their work groups.

6. PATTERNS OF DESKTOP COMPUTER USE

Stereotypes of computer use in work settings range from highly positive accounts of usage that emphasize multifunctionality and flexibility (Giuliano 1982) to more

pessimistic accounts that emphasize the routine character of activities like pushing buttons -- such as the enter key (Zuboff 1988). These largely deterministic views of computing do not match our empirical observations of the immense variation in computer work that is shaped by multiple and interacting factors (Kling and Iacono in press). We have found an immense amount of variation in patterns of desktop computer use, particularly between users in top-down versus grass-roots groups.

6.1 Access and Control

We have argued that social factors, such as influence over implementation processes, affect workers' control over and access to computing (Kling and Iacono in press). Grass-roots groups should have greater control over their available computing resources than top-down groups. This hypothesis was partially confirmed by the data on work

group participation in DTC decision making (see above). We also expected grass-roots groups to rate their access to computing lower than top-down groups because availability of computing would be limited -- which is presumably why they are fighting for more computing resources.

Two objective measures of access were constructed on the basis of workers' computer proximity (e.g., "on my desk," "within arms reach") and computer sharing (e.g., "I do not share," "I share with only one other person"). Grass-roots and top-down groups had comparable computer proximity (i.e., on desk) and sharing (i.e., unlimited access) (see Table 2). Subjective ratings of access indicated that grass-roots and top-down groups both believed that they could get immediate access to computing.⁶

Table 2. Access to Desktop Computing as a Function of Implementation Strategy

ACCESS	GRASS-ROOTS (n=20 ⁺)	TOP-DOWN (n=18 ⁺)
On my desk, or within reach from my desk	74%	66%
Access is virtually unlimited because I share my equipment with few people	85%	77%

⁺ "n" refers to the number of work groups

The high level of access to computing in our sample probably resulted from two major factors: we sampled work groups with a high ratio of workstations to employees; and, over time, grass-roots groups that had been negotiating for computing resources probably received those resources, which then increased their access. However, during our work group interviews, we have observed that computer-saturated, or extensively computerized, grass-roots groups continued to push for new computing equipment but they focused on implementing more advanced or upgraded equipment (e.g., replace dot matrix printers with Laser printers) rather than acquiring equipment for the first time.

6.2 Dependency and Amount of Use

Dependence upon DTC was slightly higher among grass-roots groups (M= 2.0: agree, sd=.6) than top-down groups (M= +1.6: agree, sd=1.0).⁷ Participants in both grass-roots and top-down groups spend approximately 40 percent of their work week using their equipment.⁸ We were surprised that grass-roots groups reported greater dependence upon DTC than top-down groups, because the groups reported equivalent hours of usage. Because our top-down groups were predominantly clerical, and the

literature portrays such groups as "tied to their terminals" (e.g., Zuboff 1988), we also expected top-down groups to report higher average hours of computer usage.

6.3 Use of Desktop Computing for Information Processing Tasks

Text processing was reported as the most common computer-supported information processing task (IPT) in grass-roots groups (M= 5.5: once or twice a day), but was only the second ranking IPT for top-down groups (M= 4.7: once or twice a week). The top ranking IPT for top-down groups was searching and retrieving records (M= 4.9: once or twice a week), which was a much less common usage for grass-roots groups (M= 3.9: once or twice a month). Both groups claimed to be coding and entering data approximately once or twice a month, on average.

The only additional IPT that was used with any frequency by top-down groups was transferring files using a communications package (once or twice a year). Other notable IPTs for the grass-roots groups included using spreadsheets for numerical calculations (once or twice a quarter), creating or restructuring spreadsheets (once or twice a quarter), making tables or graphs (once or twice a quarter), designing graphics (once or twice a quarter), calculating statistics (once or twice a quarter), programming computers (once or twice a quarter).

In sum, grass-roots groups tended to use DTC to support a much greater range of information processing tasks than top-down groups. Grass-roots groups also used computing to assist them in more complex work than top-down groups (e.g., calculations and analysis versus record keeping and data entry). This discrepancy in usage patterns and complexity of use may be explained partially by occupational differences. However, during our work group interviews, we frequently observed that clerical work groups were manually doing some IPTs, such as numerical calculations, that easily could have been automated. Therefore, it appears that grass-roots groups have been able to leverage the complexity of their work by pressing for -- and getting -- more computing resources. This hypothesis is explored in greater detail below.

6.4 New Packages

Grass-roots groups reported that, on average, they are currently learning two new software packages (M=2.0, sd=2.0); top-down groups reported that they are learning approximately one new package (M=.93, sd=.4) [t=2.3, df=21, p<.05].⁹ These results suggest that grass-roots DTC environments are more dynamic than top-down ones, but also that both types of work groups report some degree of dynamism.

6.5 Summary: Patterns of Desktop Computer Use

Our data describe some of the basic differences in the patterns of DTC use for grass-roots and top-down groups. Members of grass-roots groups have more influence over their DTC environment and are more likely to participate in decision making related to DTC than are members of top-down groups. However, participation in the implementation of computing did not seem to determine the degree of access to computing: both grass-roots and top-down groups reported that computers were conveniently located and that sharing computers was minimal.

The function of DTC in the two kinds of work groups was also an important discriminator. Grass-roots and top-down groups tend to use DTC for the same amount of time but in different ways. Grass-roots groups indicated greater dependence upon DTC to do their job well and tended to use it to support more information processing tasks than did top-down groups. Grass-roots groups also appeared to have more dynamic DTC environments because they are currently learning more new software packages than top-down groups.

7. QUALITY OF WORKLIFE

We expected five dimensions of quality of work life to be affected by implementation strategy:

- participation in work decision-making, or influence over work
- changes in job enrichment attributed to computing
- expertise and involvement in DTC
- complexity of work
- changes in work effort attributed to computing

The following analyses examine and compare each of these five aspects of quality of work life for grass-roots and top-down groups. We developed five hypotheses on the basis of the literature describing the effects of desktop computerization on the quality of work life:

- (H1) Grass-roots groups will have greater influence over their work and a higher degree of participation in work processes than top-down groups.
- (H2) Grass-roots groups will experience more job enrichment than top-down groups.
- (H3) Grass-roots groups will report greater computing expertise and involvement in discussing computing with coworkers than top-down groups.
- (H4) Grass-roots groups will report greater work complexity than top-down groups.
- (H5) Grass-roots groups will report greater decreases in work effort as a result of using DTC than top-down groups.

Few researchers have examined the contingency of work life outcomes on factors other than the presence of computing in work groups. The limited research available on the impact of computing implementations on the quality of worklife typically focuses on work groups that have followed top-down implementation processes. For these reasons, our analyses have necessarily been partially exploratory and will need to be tested more rigorously with longitudinal data.

7.1 (H1) Participation in Decisions About Work

Grass-roots groups tended to participate more in decisions about their DTC environment than top-down groups. Grass-roots groups also participated slightly more in work decisions and had slightly greater influence over their work environment [NIWPART1] than top-down groups. While the majority of both grass-roots and top-down groups agreed that they had some influence over their jobs [NIWPART1], grass-roots groups ($M = 0.6$, agree, $sd = .6$) had more control than top-down groups ($M = 0.0$, neutral, $sd = .4$) [$t = 3.0$, $df = 33.6$, $p < .01$].

In addition, the context for computing seemed more supportive and conducive to skill building in grass-roots groups than in top-down groups. Although both grass-roots and top-down groups reported adequate computing access, grass-roots groups reported slightly better access to DTC. None of the grass-roots groups reported restricted access to computing, though a few of the top-down groups strongly agreed (e.g., $M = 5.2$) that computer access was limited.

7.2 (H2) Job Enrichment and (H3) Computing Expertise/Involvement

Grass-roots groups usually agreed (NIDGEXPT, $M = 0.5$, agree, $sd = .5$) that they were expert in some computing systems in the work group and that they were involved in discussing computing with others; top-down groups usually disagreed ($M = -0.1$, $sd = .7$) that they were experts or involved in discussing computing [$t = 2.7$, $df = 30.6$, $p < .01$]. Both grass-roots and top-down groups tended to agree that job enrichment [CIWJOB3] had increased as a result of using DTC. However, grass-roots ($M = .4$, neutral, $sd = .3$) groups agreed slightly more than top-down ($M = .2$, neutral, $sd = .3$) groups that computing enriched their work [$t = 2.59$, $df = 35.7$, $p < .01$].

7.3 (H4) Work Complexity and (H5) Work Effort

Both grass-roots and top-down groups reported that their work was complex [NIWCOMP2], though members of grass-roots groups reported somewhat more complex work than members of top-down groups [$t = 2.5$, $df = 35.5$, $p < .01$]. The difference in reported changes in work effort attributed to DTC were more striking (see Table 3). As we predicted, grass-roots groups, on average, reported that DTC decreased individual work effort [CIWWKEFF],

while top-down groups reported the opposite -- that DTC has increased individuals' work effort [$t=2.2$, $df=25.3$, $p<.05$].

Table 3. Mean Work Complexity and Work Effort as a Function of Implementation Strategy

INDEX	GRASS-ROOTS (n=20 ⁺)	TOP-DOWN (n=18 ⁺)	t	p
Changes in individual work effort attributed to DTC [CIWWKEFF]	-0.2 (decreased)	+0.1 (increased)	2.2	<.05
Current individual work complexity [NIWCOMP2]	+1.0 (slightly agree)	+0.6 (slightly agree)	2.5	<.01

⁺ "n" refers to the number of work groups

7.4 Summary: Quality of Work Life

The five central hypotheses pertaining to implementation processes and quality of work life were all supported by our data. Compared with top-down groups, grass-roots groups reported greater influence over their work and more participation in decision making within the work group; greater increases in job enrichment due to DTC (e.g., a pleasant work environment, few annoying rules); higher levels of computer expertise and involvement in discussions about DTC; more complex work; and greater decreases in work effort because of DTC. Work groups, such as grass-roots groups, that have high work complexity and no concomitant increase in work effort benefit the most from computing. The combination of higher work complexity and decreased work effort reflect an increase in work efficiency. In contrast, those work groups, such as top-down groups, that have high work complexity and increasing work effort appear to be burdened by computing. These results provide good systematic evidence that the implementation process is an important component of work life and individuals' attitudes toward computing in extensively automated work groups.

8. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS AND COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE

A sixth hypothesis (H6) was developed on the basis of our qualitative interviews and field observations: top-down groups should have a better computing infrastructure (e.g., training and support) than grass-roots groups. We found, however, that average scores on the infrastructure variable, NIDINFRA (see Table 1), were similar for top-down ($M=+0.1$:neutral, $sd=.6$) and grass-roots ($M=+.3$:neutral, $sd=.4$) groups. Moreover, members of both kinds of groups reported that their computer infrastructures ranged quite widely in adequacy: grass-roots groups ranged from

inadequate infrastructure (-.7) to adequate infrastructure (+.5); top-down groups also ranged from inadequate infrastructure (-.9) to adequate infrastructure (+1.0).

Because the grass-roots and top-down groups each had a considerable range on the infrastructure index, we were able to investigate the joint effects of implementation process and infrastructure on the quality of work and computing environments. We were interested in testing whether there were variations within our different implementation work groups based on the adequacy of the computing training and support in the work group. Because grass-roots groups tend to benefit the most from working in an extensively computerized environment (e.g., make productivity gains, learn new skills), we expected these groups would have even greater advantages if they had a strong infrastructure of support for computing (e.g., good training and computer consultants). Therefore, we predicted that grass-roots groups with highly adequate computing support, or infrastructure, would report the best computing and worklife outcomes.

Conversely, we expected that work groups with inadequate support for computing (e.g., little or no training, no consultants) would be the most burdened by working in an extensively computerized environment -- especially if the work group had little input into the design of computing systems in the work group. Thus, top-down groups with highly inadequate computing support should be very burdened by working in an extensively computerized environment. However, grass-roots groups with inadequate infrastructure also might be burdened. Because grass-roots groups typically use computing for a very wide range of information processing tasks and for complex tasks, an adequate infrastructure could be more crucial for facilitating work in grass-roots groups than in top-down groups.

Top-down groups with adequate infrastructure should be somewhere in between the other three groups on the measures of quality of work life and computing outcomes. Although top-down groups do not have great influence over the computers and computing systems they use, they at least have sound training and adequate resources for solving computer-related problems and keeping their computer systems running.

We created a joint implementation/infrastructure variable with four levels to examine the subgroups of interest:

- Grass-roots/Adequate Infrastructure (GRI+)
- Grass-roots/Inadequate Infrastructure (GRI-)
- Top-down/Adequate Infrastructure (TDI+)
- Top-down/Inadequate Infrastructure (TDI-)

The five dependent variables related to quality of worklife and the computing milieu were examined [see Table 4]. One-way ANOVAs indicated substantial overall effects of the newly created implementation/infrastructure variable for the five dependent variables (see Table 4).

Table 4. Worklife and Computing Outcomes for Workgroups by Implementation Process and Infrastructure

Dependent Variable	Adequate Infrastructure		Inadequate Infrastructure		F	p
	GRASS-ROOTS (n=16) ⁺	TOP-DOWN (n=10)	GRASS-ROOTS (n=4)	TOP-DOWN (n=8)		
Work Complexity ^a [NIWCOMP2]	1.2	0.6	0.4	0.6	5.2	.005
Change in Work Effort ^b [CIWWKEFF]	-0.3	0.0	0.0	0.2	2.2	.10
Computing expertise and involvement ^a [NIDGEXPT]	0.6	0.2	0.1	-0.5	6.0	.002
Change in enrichment of work ^b [CIWJOBR3]	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.1	5.0	.006
Participation in Decisions in Work ^a [NIWPART1]	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.1	4.0	.02

⁺"n" refers to number of work groups

^aScale: -3=NO!, -2=disagree, -1=slightly disagree, 0=neutral, +1=slightly agree, +2=agree, +3=YES!

^bScale: -3=greatly decreased, -2=decreased, -1=slightly decreased, 0=neutral, +1=slightly increased, +2 increased, +3=greatly increased

Post-hoc comparisons using the Bonferoni method (see Miller 1985) were used to test our major hypotheses. Comparisons were made between the weighted means of dependent variables in the GRI+ cell and the average means of the dependent variables in the combined cells of the other three groups. These comparisons confirmed our hypothesis that GRI+ work groups had the best work and computing outcomes. GRI+ work groups had the highest average score in

- work complexity ($p < .001$) [NIWCOMP2],
- decreases in work effort attributed to DTC ($p < .03$) [CIWWKEFF],
- expertise and involvement in computing ($p < .002$) [NIDGEXPT],
- changes in job enrichment attributed to DTC ($p < .004$) [CIWJOBR3], and
- participation in decisions in work ($p < .01$) [NIWPART1].

Although we expected work groups with inadequate infrastructure (GRI-, TDI-) to be the most burdened by working in extensively computerized offices, we did not directly test this hypothesis for two reasons -- one theoretical, the other methodological. First, although we felt confident our predictions of positive outcomes for GRI+ work groups were theoretically sound and grounded, there was little theoretical justification for predicting when TDI-groups would have better or worse outcomes than GRI-work groups. Second, Bonferoni post hoc comparisons are conservative tests to begin with and diminish in power rapidly as the number of unplanned comparisons increases.¹⁰

8.1 Summary: Implementation Process and Computing Infrastructure

The effects of the implementation process on the quality of work life are moderated by the computing infrastructure in work groups. Grass-roots groups with highly adequate infrastructure leveraged their work to the highest degree of complexity and reported the greatest decreases in work

effort because of DTC. That is, those groups that chose the computer systems and software appropriate for their work *and* had the training and resources to support their computer environment were most able to make substantial gains in productivity (i.e., increased complexity and decreased effort). Moreover, the joint effect of a grass-roots implementation and a sound computing infrastructure was positive for all measures of quality of worklife and computing environments. In contrast, top-down groups, which had computing imposed on them from an external source (e.g., upper management) and did not have an adequate infrastructure often appeared to be the most burdened by computing. For example, they were the only work groups to report, on average, a lack of expertise and involvement in computing. On other measures, such as complexity of work, change in work effort attributed to DTC, change in job enrichment, and participation in decisions about work, the means of TDI- groups were quite similar to those of TDI+ and GRI- groups.

9. CONCLUSIONS

This paper provides the first comparative, quantitative assessment of the role of different implementation processes and infrastructures in altering working conditions in highly computerized work groups. It also breaks new ground by examining data about computerization and work at a work group level of analysis rather than only at an individual level of analysis.

We characterized implementation processes by the locus of control and identified two ideal types: grass-roots and top-down processes. We found that DTC is used differently according to the type of implementation process in the work group. Although grass-roots and top-down groups tend to use DTC for the same amount of time, they use it in different ways. Members of grass-roots groups are more dependent upon DTC to do their job well and they use it to support a larger variety of information processing tasks than do top-down groups. Grass-roots groups seem to have more dynamic DTC environments than top-down groups.

Our initial hypotheses regarding the relationship between implementation processes and infrastructure were not supported. We were surprised to find some grass-roots groups with an adequate infrastructure and some top-down groups without an adequate infrastructure. We suspect that variations in infrastructure are a function of the length of time since computers were introduced to the work groups: Work groups with a long history of computing should have a stronger infrastructure than those with a more recent implementation of computing. This hypothesis will be tested in later analyses of our data.

Most of our hypotheses pertaining to the role of the implementation process in the quality of work life in work groups were supported.¹¹ The quality of work life was not

degraded or upgraded by the mere presence and use of technology in our work groups. Rather, quality of work life was contingent upon workers' participation in the computer implementation process in their work group. Further, quality of work life was also contingent on the availability of an adequate computing support infrastructure. We found substantial interactions between implementation processes and levels of infrastructure: The grass-roots groups with adequate infrastructure reported much better work life on several dimensions that did other work groups. In summary, the social organization of computing shapes people's experiences of work much more than does the character of the computing equipment.

10. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Jim Brennan, Lisa Dowdy, Marc Munasque, and Pratik Shah helped us conduct some of the research that supports this article. This research was funded by National Science Foundation Grant Number IRI-87-09613 and University of California-Irvine's Focussed Research Program on Work Environments. Please direct all correspondence to Professor Rob Kling.

11. REFERENCES

- Attewell, P. *The Automated Office: A Case Study*. Department of Sociology, State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York, 1985.
- Attewell, P. "The Deskilling Controversy." *Work and Occupations*, Volume 14, Number 3, 1987, pp. 323-346.
- Bikson, T. "Understanding the Implementation of Office Technology." In R. Kraut, Editor, *Technology and the Transformation of White Collar Work*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1986.
- Braverman, H. *Labor and Monopoly Capital*, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.
- Danziger, J. N., and Kraemer, K. K. *People and Computers: The Impacts of Computing on End-users in Organizations*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Giuliano, V. "The Mechanization of Office Work." *Scientific American*, Number 247, 1982, pp. 148-164.
- Glenn, E. N., and Feldberg, R. L. "Degraded and De-skilled: The Proletarianization of Clerical Work." *Social Problems*, Number 25, 1977, pp. 52-64.
- Glenn, E. N., and Feldberg, R. L. "Proletarianizing Clerical Work: Technology and Organizational Control in the Office." In A. Zimbalist, Editor, *Case Studies in the Labor Process*, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979.

- Hirschheim, R. A. *Office Automation: A Social and Organizational Perspective*, London: Wiley, 1986.
- King, J. L., and Kraemer, K. L. *The Dynamics of Computing*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Kling, R. "Defining the Boundaries of Computing across Complex Organizations." In R. Boland and R. Hirschheim, Editors. *Critical Issues in Information Systems Research*, New York: Wiley, 1987.
- Kling, R., and Iacono, S. "The Control of Information Systems after Implementation." *Communications of the ACM*, Number 27, 1984, pp. 1218-1226.
- Kling, R., and Iacono, S. "Computerization as a Social and Technical Intervention into Work Organization: The Case of Desktop Computerization." *Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, in press.
- Kling, R., and Scacchi, W. "The Web of Computing: Computer Technology as Social Organization." *Advances in Computers*, Volume 21, 1982, pp. 1-90.
- Land, F., and Hirschheim, R. A. "Participative Systems Design: Rationale, Tools, and Techniques." *Journal of Applied Systems Analysis*, Number 10, 1983.
- Lucas, H. C. *Implementation*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Miller, R. "Multiple Comparisons." *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*, New York: Wiley, Volume 5, 1985, pp. 679-689.
- Mowshowitz, A. "The Social Dimensions of Office Automation." *Advances in Computers*, New York: Academic Press, Volume 25, 1986.
- Mumford, E. *Designing Human Systems*, Manchester, England: Manchester Business School Publications, 1983.
- National Research Council. *Computer Chips and Paper Clips*, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1986.
- Otway, H. J., and Peltu, M. *New Office Technology: Human and Organizational Aspects*, New Jersey: Ablex, 1983.
- Price, J. L., and Mueller, C. W. *Handbook of Organizational Measurement*, Massachusetts: Plenum, 1985.
- Rockart, J. F., and Flannery, L. S. "The Management of End-User Computing." *Communications of the ACM*, Volume 26, Number 10, 1983, pp. 776-784.
- Shaiken, H. *Work Transformed. Automation and Labor in the Computer Age*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1985.
- Strassman, P. A. *Information Payoff*, New York: Basic Books, 1985.
- Thompson, J. D. *Organizations in Action*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1967.
- Zuboff, S. "New Worlds of Computer-Mediated Work." *Harvard Business Review*, Volume 60, Number 5, 1982, pp. 142-152.
- Zuboff, S. *In the Age of the Smart Machine: The Future of Work and Power*, New York: Basic Books, 1988.

12. ENDNOTES

1. Some earlier studies of computerization and work have found modest changes in work because computerization was limited. In the 1960s and 1970s, information system users usually received printed reports. Data entry clerks often had terminals at their desks; professionals and managers would use terminals outside their immediate work area.
2. Work groups are located within larger organizational units -- departments, divisions -- which shape some work group practices about the organization of work, the nature of internal labor markets, and computerization strategies.
3. This survey is the first wave of a three year longitudinal study. We are examining changes in work over time with our second wave of data which we collected in the spring of 1989.
4. These organizations can be characterized as providing especially good work places. At INSURE, women valued subsidized child care, good benefits, and pleasant surroundings. At AIRCRAFT, laboratory engineers mentioned good career ladders and respect from superiors. At COAST PHARMACEUTICAL, the organization pushed an up-scale image with tennis courts, an excellent cafeteria, and original art in public spaces. However, we noted some negative aspects of worklife in each organization. At INSURE, work was relatively bureaucratized and routinized; significant innovations and individual initiatives were rarely rewarded. INSURE was also in the process of "right-sizing" or decreasing the size of some work groups by offering incentive lump sum payments to people who would agree to leave. At AIRCRAFT, members of a large aerospace engineering laboratory expressed concern over a lack of funding for new research and development which might preclude future growth. There was also a space crunch so that lab employees were currently working in small windowless cubicles rather than in the larger two-person private window offices they had previously. At COAST PHARMA-

- CEUTICALS, work groups were leanly staffed so that employees seemed to work under high pressure most of the time. Top managers often mandated new policies in work procedures or practices with little consultation or advance notice.
5. We used the mean work group scores on NIDPART1 and NGDPART to validate our a priori codings of the implementation process. We changed only 8 percent of our classifications on the basis of these data. Work groups in the positive range on both indices were kept or re-classified as grass-roots work groups; work groups in the negative range were kept or re-classified as top-down. For ambiguous groups (i.e., positive on NIDPART1 and negative on NGDPART), we maintained our original implementation process classification. Grass-roots groups were in the agreement range on NIDPART1 (mean = +.81, sd = .63) and NGDPART (mean = +.66, sd = .70); top-down groups were in the disagreement range on NIDPART1 (mean = -.26, sd = .65) and NGDPART (mean = -.53, sd = .55). Although the groups were not entirely pure -- i.e., some grass-roots groups were in the disagreement range and some top-down groups were in the agreement range -- the difference between grass-roots and top-down work groups' means was reliable on NIDPART1 [$t=5.13$, $df=35.2$, $p<.001$] and on NGDPART [$t=5.80$, $df=35.4$, $p<.001$].
 6. The level of agreement to this question was not statistically different between grass-roots groups ($M = +.7$: slightly agree, $sd=.9$) and top-down groups ($M = +1.0$: slightly agree, $sd=.9$).
 7. The difference between groups was only marginally statistically significant [$t=1.4$, $df=29$, $p<.10$].
 8. Grass roots, $M = +16.4$ hours, $sd=6.0$ hours; top-down $M = + 15.0$ hours, $sd=8.0$ hours. The difference in the means was not statistically significant at less than the .05 alpha level.
 9. Degrees of freedom vary across t-tests because the separate variances were used in estimating t, rather than the pooled variance. All statistical analyses were computed using the SYSTAT v4.0 of July 1988.
 10. We examined the number of computer related problems (out of fifteen) in each of the four levels of the Implementation/Infrastructure variable. Inadequate infrastructure groups (TDI-, GRI-) had a greater number of problems (seven problems) that occurred "sometimes" to "often" than adequate infrastructure groups (TDI+, GRI+) (one problem). Inadequate infrastructure groups also reported more minor problems that occurred "rarely" to "sometimes" (seventeen problems) than did adequate infrastructure groups (fourteen problems). These results suggest that inadequate infrastructure increases problems and burdens on workers in intensively computerized offices. Implementation processes also seemed to influence the number and severity of computer-related problems, although not as strongly as infrastructure. Grass-roots groups (GRI+, GRI-) had 21 problems that occurred with some degree of intensity (i.e., sometimes to often) while top-down groups (TDI+, TDI-) only had eighteen problems that occurred with the same degree of intensity.
 11. The findings about changes over time presented in this paper will be tested again in a more rigorous manner when the second year of data, are collected. With longitudinal data we will be able to replicate our analyses and eliminate plausible alternative hypotheses regarding the causal direction between variables and potential spurious relationships between variables.