

# **The Transformation of Work in the New Economy**

*Sociological Readings*

**Robert Perrucci  
Carolyn C. Perrucci**  
*Purdue University*

2007



**Roxbury Publishing Company**  
Los Angeles, California

6.	Global Economy and Privileged Class. . . . .	63
	<i>Robert Perrucci and Earl Wysong</i>	
	Describes how the emerging global economy has benefited the most privileged Americans while eliminating jobs and depressing wages of working-class Americans.	
7.	The Price of Jobs Lost . . . . .	83
	<i>Louis Uchitelle and N. R. Kleinfield</i>	
	In the 1990s, many of the largest and most powerful companies in America engaged in massive downsizing of white-collar workers.	
8.	Grapes and Green Onions . . . . .	93
	<i>David Bacon</i>	
	Documents how the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) affected Mexican agricultural workers in the Southwest.	
9.	'Workers Wanted': Employer Recruitment of Immigrant Labor. . . . .	101
	<i>Nestor Rodriguez</i>	
	This chapter examines the role of employers and the U.S. government in recruiting and employing foreign-born workers into the U.S. labor market.	
<b>B. Technology . . . . .</b>		<b>116</b>
10.	Technology: The 'Great Growling Engine of Change' . . . . .	116
	<i>Peter Dicken</i>	
	Examines how new computer-based technology applied to production and telecommunications has contributed to the globalization of economic activity.	
11.	Worker Skills and Computer-Mediated Work . . . . .	128
	<i>Shoshana Zuboff</i>	
	Describes the feelings of loss of control by skilled workers when their work changes from being "action centered" and located in concrete reality to being "intellective skills" located in computer-based technology.	
12.	'They Used to Use a Ball and Chain': Technology's Impact on the Workplace . . . . .	140
	<i>Jill Andresky Fraser</i>	
	Looks at today's new technologies that have increased the monitoring and controlling of white-collar workers.	
13.	How Computers Change Work and Pay . . . . .	150
	<i>Frank Levy and Richard J. Murnane</i>	
	An analysis of how computer-based work has changed the demand for different types of jobs, for necessary worker skills, and for the distribution of wages.	
<b>C. Organization . . . . .</b>		<b>166</b>
14.	Flexible Firms and Labor Market Segmentation: Effects of Workplace Restructuring on Jobs and Workers . . . . .	166
	<i>Arne L. Kalleberg</i>	
	Discusses how contemporary work organizations strive to become more flexible by multi-tasking workers and using workers who are not regular full-time employees.	

# 12

## 'They Used to Use a Ball and Chain': Technology's Impact on the Workplace

*Jill Andresky Fraser*

It sometimes seems that everyone has a personal computer, a laptop, a cell phone, an Ipad, a BlackBerry, and any other piece of electronic Internet-linked gadget that some computer engineer can dream up. We often think about this electronic bazaar as a part of our leisure life, but consider what it might mean when all this electronic technology becomes a part of the standard equipment on your job.

This chapter examines how electronic technology in the workplace can become oppressive, narrowing the space between work and nonwork lives. Originally designed to increase office efficiency, electronic technology can also be used to expand daily working hours by keeping people working when they might otherwise be relaxing. Now you can be reached for work when you are on a commuter train, in a hotel room when traveling, driving in a car, flying around the globe, or relaxing at home on the weekend. In addition, employee monitoring has been elevated to a normal workplace practice designed to raise productivity, especially among the growing pool of contingent temporary workers.

We've all got the cell phones, the beepers, the laptops. "I bring mine back and forth between my home and office every day," commented Phyllis, a finance officer with one of the nation's large retail chains. "Everybody does it—you feel like you always need to be accessible. Even when you're on vacation, you've got to be accessible. You've got to be prepared to check in all the time." She sighed, then concluded, "All those pieces of equipment are a big reason we're working harder."

Today's new technologies, for all their ability to lighten routine job tasks, lower business costs, and boost performance levels, are inextricably linked to contemporary overwork patterns. As many people's work lives seem to be moving inexorably toward a "24/7" vision of round-the-clock, ever-increasing productivity, they could hardly meet their employers' rising expectations without a ready arsenal of workplace tools—Internet-linked computers, personal digital assistants, cell phones, pagers, laptops, and even e-mail-receptive watches—at home as well as at the office.

Technology has done more than simply facilitate the current trend of working longer and harder. It may, indeed, have exacerbated patterns of overwork and job stress by broadening many white-collar staffers' (and their employers') definitions of "on the job" to include areas far beyond the traditional confines of their office space.

Technological developments, meanwhile, have permitted corporations to extend their control over employees to an oppressive degree: all in the interest of keeping men and women at maximum productive efficiency, whether they find themselves in their cars or commuter trains, hotel rooms, or even master bedrooms. White-collar staffers themselves have responded by using the Internet to vent their hostilities and anxieties about deteriorating conditions, as well as, increasingly, to mobilize resistance to "sweatshop" trends.

## Technology Encourages Job Spill

When I set up an Internet discussion site to explore issues like these relating to work and technology, here's how "tickler" responded: "I had two phone lines (local and toll free (at home, 2 voicemails, email, and the rest . . . [and] was besieged with the usual crap of being assaulted during the evening, nights, weekends, and the like."<sup>1</sup> Those images of "siege" and "assault" are apt, since many people feel as though the office is invading their home front—an invasion facilitated by the introduction of at least some of these pieces of electronic equipment into the house, the car, or another personal space.

White-collar workers increasingly find themselves somewhere in the vast space that looms between "just checking in with the office" and "just having one or two things to finish up," whether it's during their after-dinner hours, commuting time, weekends with the family, sick days, vacations, or holidays. Workloads inevitably increase: according to a study of people who spent five hours or more each week on the Internet, 25 percent of them reported that they were working harder at home without any reduction at the office.<sup>2</sup>

Despite workers' complaints about excessive job demands, however, more and more workplace gadgets keep showing up outside the office. As they do, they blur the old lines between home and office. In 1997 more than one quarter of American families owned pagers—twice as high as the year earlier—and more than one third of U.S. households owned cellular telephones.<sup>3</sup> That same year, 3.6 million households purchased fax machines, 14 million bought notebook computers, and a whopping 31 million bought personal computers.<sup>4</sup>

The trend only accelerated. By the year 1998, two thirds of all households had cellular phones; just about half of them had pagers.<sup>5</sup> Market researchers projected "home market" sales of personal computers and related consumer electronic appli-

ances at about 35 million units during that same year.<sup>6</sup>

Many, if not all, of these tools can be used by families for personal matters, too, as when children swap homework assignments by fax or surf the Internet for fun. But for large numbers of people, one significant result of having these workplace technologies at home was greater access to work, clients, colleagues, the office. The flip side was that the business world now had greater, round-the-clock access to its workers.

By the late nineties, it was estimated that 7 million Americans regularly checked their business e-mails from outside the office.<sup>7</sup> At more and more workplaces, such checking became an unspoken requirement of many people's jobs. America Online, for example, "occasionally announces e-mail-free weekends, usually around a holiday, when employees are not expected to check e-mail. On all other weekends, of course, they are expected to check their e-mail."<sup>8</sup>

What about when they're on the road? The many Americans who find themselves traveling for their jobs—and 32 percent do, at least occasionally<sup>9</sup>—have been robbed by high-tech equipment of whatever personal downtime they once might have cherished: in the quiet of an airplane (where, now able to plug their laptop computers into new "Empower" jacks, they never run out of battery power and so can never doze off or idly leaf through a magazine); in airport lobbies (where Internet-access kiosks allow them to check e-mail accounts, while frequent flier clubs provide faxes, copiers, data-ports, and the like); in rental cars (where rental cell phones and beepers are usually available, along with cars and adapters that can turn cigarette lighters into sources of power for portable computers); or in hotel rooms (which increasingly provide the same range of office-electronics comforts that their customers have come to rely upon in their homes and workplaces).<sup>10</sup>

One could say, simply, that all this new technology has increased the capabilities and outputs of business travelers. Or an ob-

server of the current corporate scene could view new workplace gadgets from a different, darker perspective: as instruments designed to eliminate human inefficiency or "personal downtime," all in the interest of creating an optimally productive white-collar work machine. Whether these work machines (that is, business travelers) return home more stressed out than they were when they left the office scarcely matters in this new business-world order.

Here's how "technoid," another visitor to my Internet chat room, described the way technology had ratcheted up the demands on his travel time. "When I travel to another country, someone from a local office always escorts me with a cell phone. This means I'd have problems to fix at the customer site, problems they'd call in on the phone, and problems in e-mail when I got back to the hotel."<sup>11</sup> All those mobile pieces of electronics allowed "technoid's" employer to keep him working at what the company deemed an appropriate level of efficiency, "10–12 hour days, and they'll always ask you to work seven days a week." He added, "If a customer canceled meetings or I finished early, they'd always have more meetings lined up to replace the time so that I couldn't go home early."

Perhaps business travelers should expect to perform business tasks whether they're in the air or on the ground; after all, they are on their employers' payroll. But until recently, most vacationers were freed from similar constraints, unless they were such high-level executives that their companies simply could not function without them, even for a few days.

Thanks to the democratization of workplace technologies, however, that's no longer the case. One recent survey of "messaging technology" found that 53 percent of all those who owned pagers had been paged during a vacation. Meanwhile, 41 percent of those who owned cell phones had used them to call their offices while on vacation; another 32 percent who had access to the Internet while on vacation had checked their e-mail; and 34 percent had

checked their office answering machine or voice-mail account while on vacation.<sup>12</sup>

"Yes, people feel good about the stock market going up. Yes, some people are taking better vacations and they've got more money to spend on them," Zachary, a long-time employee of Citicorp told me. But the trade-off wasn't worth it, he explained. "If you've got to be on call during the whole vacation—if you've got to check in with the office through the voice mail and the e-mail, and everyone out there can reach you if they need you—then you're worse off." He quipped, "It's kind of like, people have the money to buy toys, but they're so busy with work that they don't have the time to play with them." . . .

Elsewhere, signs of the "you can't get away from it all" times abound, often tied to some type of technology. One was a recent advertising campaign from Sheraton Hotels of New York that boasted "everything you've always wanted in an office. In a hotel room." The traveler's fantasy list that appeared in this ad included "HP fax/copier/printers, data ports and more." Also noteworthy was an article that appeared in *Gourmet* magazine's typically pleasure-oriented "Travel Journal." It focused on such devices to stay "linked-up, logged-on and tuned-in" as "OFFICE Pro by Kluge," a portable mini-office/computer center masquerading as a piece of luggage which enables travelers to carry their laptops, batteries, diskettes, power cords, personal digital assistants, cell phones, papers, and files, along with their clothing.<sup>13</sup>

If we can, as we increasingly do, take our offices and workloads along with us wherever we go, this is clearly a mixed blessing at best. As one business observer, writing in the *Harvard Business Review*, put it: "What those tools have done . . . is help to extend the working day: in effect, they have created a portable assembly line for the 1990s that 'allows' white-collar workers to remain on-line in planes, trains, cars and at home. So much for the liberating technologies of the Information Age."<sup>14</sup>

## The Negative Impact on Work Conditions

Physical discomforts tied to inescapable office technologies abound. Eye strain, wrist strain, and back strain are all common complaints among those who spend long hours at their computers, whether at the office or at home. So are stress-related headaches, especially for corporate staffers who carry pagers, beepers, or cell phones in their pockets, handbags, or briefcases which enable them to stay "on call" at the office virtually twenty-four hours each day. . . .

If new technologies have contributed to workers' stress by changing the settings in which white-collar employees perform their jobs (and the conditions under which they perform them), these tools have also, for many people, changed the *pace* of work.

Electronic mail, currently used by an estimated 82 million American workers, has played a key role in the corporate speedup. Since e-mails are frequently slapdash and ungrammatical, one might expect them to be taken less seriously than other forms of business communication. Yet perhaps because of the involvement of the computer in their transmittance (or because their very sloppiness conveys the impression that their authors were too busy to worry about dotting every *i* and crossing their *t*'s), they seem to carry much more weight than the same messages would if conveyed via telephone or some other method.

They're a huge source of job stress in corporate America. Remember, "tickler"'s description of feeling besieged by work? One survey found that 28 percent of today's "message users" feel more pressure to respond quickly to work-related messages than they used to feel five years ago. An estimated 24 million Americans suffer from so-called message overload.<sup>15</sup> And that problem will likely continue to worsen, since market researchers predict that by the year 2001, 135 million Americans will have e-mail access.<sup>16</sup>

The concept of message overload would sound all too familiar to Jimmy, a consultant on international sales, who was interviewed by Arlie Russell Hochschild for her recent book *The Time Bind*. He described the following: "I'm gone for a couple of hours, and I have twenty electronic messages on my computer when I get back. People are working weekends; you can see by the dates. They send things Friday at 10 p.m., Saturday mornings at 9 a.m., Sundays at 9 p.m. Of the twenty messages on my machine, I have to do something about twelve of them. My head spins."<sup>17</sup>

Within many corporations, there seems no electronic end in sight. A Silicon Valley executive complained that he received about one hundred e-mails every single day. "On average, it takes one minute per e-mail to answer. I don't have 100 minutes a day however." Another added, "There will be ten e-mails between the time you pack your briefcase and lock the door" to head home from the office.<sup>18</sup>

When one looks beyond e-mails, the problem only intensifies. A 1998 survey by Pitney Bowes found that the average office employee sent or received 190 messages *every single day*, including faxes, traditional letters, telephone calls, and electronic messages. By 1999 this volume had spiraled even higher, to 201 messages daily.<sup>19</sup> Nearly half of the people surveyed reported being interrupted by six or more messages every single hour they spent in their offices. One of every four people complained about being "distracted" or "very distracted" by these various interruptions.

No wonder white-collar workers complain about job stress.

It's also not too hard to figure out why people frequently check in with their voice-mail and e-mail accounts when they're not at the office: they're just trying to keep the message landslide from burying them alive. The analogy to an assembly line seems all too apt. At the same time that corporate men and women feel *more* pressure to respond—and more quickly than ever—to office communications, their work pace has picked up as well, in part because they keep

receiving increasing numbers of communi-  
qués that demand prompt attention.

Craig Brod, a clinical psychologist, coined the term “techno-stress” back in 1984 to describe these and other experiences he observed in people adapting to new technologies at the workplace and elsewhere. “For the manager, as for the clerical worker,” he wrote, “a key element of technostress is a distorted sense of time. Days, hours and minutes take on new meaning as time is compressed and accelerated. Recognition of what is humanly possible fades.” Among the many results, he argued, was people’s “tendency to push themselves harder than ever to match the efficiency and tirelessness of the computer.”<sup>20</sup>

Technological innovations are speeding up the work pace in other, even more fundamental ways as well. In her provocative study *The Electronic Sweatshop*, Barbara Garson explored how corporate employers had begun using what she called “a combination of twentieth-century technology and nineteenth-century scientific management . . . [to turn] the Office of the Future into the factory of the past.” At first, she added, “this affected clerks and switchboard operators, then secretaries; bank tellers and service workers. The primary targets now are professionals and managers.” To Garson, the objective of these changes was simply “to make white-collar workers cheaper to train, easier to replace, less skilled, less expensive and less special.”<sup>21</sup>

Garson examined the ways that new technologies had begun to affect a wide range of white-collar professionals, including investment advisers and social workers. Her study of airline reservation clerks illustrates the patterns she uncovered: “American Airlines had divided the two-minute reservation conversation into segments—opening, sales pitch, probe and close—and provided a set of interchangeable conversation modules for each segment. An acceptable conversation could now be put together like a mix-and-match outfit or a Chinese dinner—one from column A, two from column B. On one level, it’s obvious why this is considered efficient,” she ex-

plained. “In industry, production is routinely arranged so that the bulk of the work can be done with a minimum of skill. The more an airline can standardize the reservation conversation, the less they need to depend on the agents’ experience and judgment. This should make the agents cheaper and more interchangeable.”<sup>22</sup> . . .

From a vantage point ten years after Garson’s study, it now appears that white-collar workers can be sorted into three basic categories: those whose jobs have been “reengineered” by technology, somewhat along the lines described above; those who are increasingly being replaced by technology (as when nearly 180,000 bank tellers were replaced by ATMs between 1983 and 1993);<sup>23</sup> and those whose work lives appear—at least for now—to be resistant to such changes, typically because of the high levels of skill, experience, or creativity their jobs require.

That third category is small and shrinking, seemingly before our eyes. That’s because new technological advances have pushed computer and other electronic capabilities far beyond the realm most people would have imagined possible even a decade ago. At the same time, the business world has displayed an insatiable appetite for all those advances that can be translated into productivity measures (often by facilitating human resources cutbacks).

In his book *The End of Work*, Jeremy Rifkin warns of the unprecedented problems the United States will increasingly come to face as the result of “technological displacement.” Rifkin predicts that the trend, now seen in all three traditional sectors of the economy (agriculture, manufacturing, and service), will eventually affect hundreds of millions of people. Already, he argues, “most Americans feel trapped by the new lean-production practices and sophisticated new automation technologies, not knowing if or when the re-engineering drive will reach into their own office or workstation, plucking them from what they once thought was a secure job and casting them into the reserve army of contingent workers, or, worse yet, the unemployment line.”<sup>24</sup> . . .

## Monitoring and Controlling the Workforce

The *New York Times*, Xerox Corporation, and Edward Jones & Company, the brokerage firm, do not appear at first glance to have much in common.

But all three captured headlines in 1999 for firing groups of employees after catching them in the act of some type of electronic no-no. At the *Times*, "inappropriate and offensive" e-mails led to the termination of more than twenty employees from its Norfolk, Virginia, payroll-processing center; at Xerox, Web surfing nailed forty staffers (some of whom had used office access to the Internet to visit pornography sites).<sup>25</sup>

Here's another way that technology has helped worsen work life: by providing corporations with an arsenal of new, and continually improving, tools with which to supervise their employees' activity and output. For white-collar workers, who have traditionally enjoyed greater latitude than their blue-collar brethren (themselves regulated by tools such as time cards and assembly-line monitors), this is yet another feature of the corporate "sweatshop."

Two business-software packages gained popularity during the late 1990s. The "Investigator" program, sold by WinWhat-Where Corporation, can be installed by a company in any or all of its desktop computers in order to record how many keys are stroked, mouses clicked, and commands entered by each employee during a day. Its users include Exxon Mobil Corporation, Delta Air Lines, and Ernst & Young LLP. "Desktop Surveillance," which marketed itself as the "software equivalent of a video surveillance camera on the desktop," allows employers to view, in real time or playback, whatever tasks their staffers are performing on the computer.<sup>26</sup>

While some people might argue that these monitors are not all that different from the time records long maintained by high-end professionals such as lawyers and accountants, the comparison is anything but apt. These software packages were de-

signed to be installed and operated within someone's computer without him or her being aware of that fact. "Investigator" can do far more than indicate productivity: its corporate users can adjust the software program so that anytime a staffer types an "alert" word (such as boss or union), the document in which it appears is automatically e-mailed to the appropriate supervisor. Some so-called keystroke loggers keep such comprehensive records of computer activity that an employer can read every single thing a person types at the office—whether or not he actually stores it in his desktop computer's hard drive, prints it out, sends it to someone via e-mail, or decides to discard it instead.<sup>27</sup>

And software packages like these represented only one part of a trend. "Back in the fifteenth century, they used to use a ball and chain, and now they use technology," one public relations executive complained to me. Some corporations have programmed their internal computer networks and security systems to make it possible for anyone within their organization to track the movements of anyone else at any time. That can include the exact moment each person starts work, leaves the office, or vacates his or her desk for a trip out to lunch or to the rest room.

One manager who begged me not to mention her company (or even her industry) told me about a time when supervisors had figured out that two of her colleagues were having an affair, because they could track electronically the exact timing of each of their movements into and out of the building in which they worked. One of the pair was eventually fired—not, she assured me, because of the affair, but because of his lack of productivity.

The justification for electronic monitoring is as old as the industrial age itself: greater efficiency. After all, business operations can be much more productive when coworkers and supervisors know how to track people down at any point in the workday. What's unusual about today's monitors, though, is their target: initiatives like these strip white-collar workers of their traditional perquisites (most importantly, a



degree of independence). The message not so subtly being conveyed by their employers is this: We need everyone to work harder and longer but can't trust *you* to do it unless we start watching more closely . . . and if we find out that you're not working as we expect, we'll replace you.

In a disturbing article written for *PC Week*, Bill Machrone, then the vice president of technology for Ziff-Davis, compared many of today's corporate employers to Santa Claus ("he knows when you are sleeping, he knows. . ."). As Machrone explained, "He or she may not be able to pry into your personal life, but when you're at work, there's little you can do in the office that can't be monitored."<sup>28</sup>

Employee monitoring, like other deteriorating-workplace trends, continues to pick up steam, owing to the business world's seemingly endless quest to raise productivity regardless of the toll exacted upon working men and women. Back in 1993, for example, a survey by *Macworld* magazine found that nearly 22 percent of the companies surveyed engaged in electronic monitoring of their workforce. (Less than one third of those companies bothered to inform their staffers.) Nearly 30 percent of them justified the practice by citing a desire to "monitor work flow."<sup>29</sup> The American Management Association estimated that by 1999 45 percent of American corporations were monitoring their employees' e-mails. But that's not all. When video surveillance, phone-call tracking, electronic monitoring of computer work, and other types of supervision were counted in as well, a whopping 67 percent of companies acknowledged the practice. *Business Week* termed it "Big Brother at Work."<sup>30</sup> . . .

## White-Collar Protests in Cyberspace

. . . To someone seeking to understand the experience of work, as well as employees' attitudes about it, in today's hard-driving corporations, there may be no better way to begin than by exploring the Internet.

Indeed, the Net has surfaced in recent years as a virtual town meeting hall where growing numbers of people interact and share their work-related complaints and anxieties.

The big draw for them, of course, is the cloak of anonymity provided by e-mail addresses and cyber-aliases. It's true that this cloak can be penetrated through extraordinary measures, as when hackers or employers intrude themselves into computer correspondence that once seemed private. But consider the real-world alternatives for those white-collar workers who may fear that layoffs, workload reorganizations, or even their own replacement by temporary staffers are just around the corner, *any corner*. Those conversational venues that are closer to home (the traditional watercooler gripe session, stress management seminars, or a host of mental health services paid for, and potentially monitored, by employers) often seem fraught with far greater risks of personal exposure than anything cyberspace can offer.

Given the variety of forces conspiring against them, today's white-collar workers may indeed be afraid to challenge their employers about their workloads or express their resentments face-to-face. But a tour of work-related Internet sites reveals a working population that is angry, exhausted, sometimes crude, and almost invariably frustrated by conditions on the job. "All jobs are bad," commented one anonymous visitor to <www.disgruntled.com>, a slick monthly Internet magazine whose focus on the dysfunctional world of work drew on average about three thousand "page views" each day from visitors.<sup>31</sup> . . .

Calls for corporate sabotage abounded at <www.disgruntled.com>, as elsewhere in cyberspace. "If your readers want to think about revenge . . . they need to think about stealing equipment, destroying or corrupting important files, blowing the whistle on illicit practices, and selling proprietary information to competitors."<sup>32</sup>

It's highly unlikely that most white-collar workers would actually carry out these threats. During my own research, not a single man or woman whom I interviewed

acknowledged committing any act, even a petty one, of sabotage. (In fact, the consistency with which people seemed surprised or offended by my questions on this subject demonstrated how closely they still identified with notions such as self-responsibility, personal integrity, and their status within the corporate hierarchy, even when they felt betrayed or otherwise misused by an employer.) Still, the electronic conversations that appear in work-related chat rooms and other websites makes it clear that, if nothing else, these Internet threats provide over-stressed workers with a valuable opportunity to play out their collective revenge fantasies.

The growing pool of contingent white-collar workers are among the most vocal workplace critics on the Internet. Most are practically invisible and almost certainly interchangeable within the corporate world. The Internet gives them an opportunity to articulate their resentments in an electronic forum in which their status is the same as everyone else's and their voices can be as easily heard. . . .

Group therapy in cyberspace is a big part of the appeal of work-related websites for such people. In an era in which newspapers and other old-media venues continually trumpet the signs and success stories of economic prosperity, the cynicism that flourishes across the Internet comes as a relief. Net surfers seek comrades who can convince them that they're not the only ones for whom the world of work has become something in between a hassle and hell.

But what they find on the Internet varies. The "greedy" employer, the stupid employer, the abusive employer: hostility to the corporation, or to the top management that many people view as synonymous with the corporation, are basic themes.<sup>33</sup> At one site among many, web visitors can find "Bad Managers": (which describes itself as reporting on "true life horror stories of software development cowboys"), where one message continuously blinks across the right-hand corner of the screen: "You are not alone. Is your boss giving you the Hump? You are not alone."

One reason these sites have quickly gained popularity is because many "hyperlink" their web pages to each other. That enables visitors to identify and travel easily between a vast selection of electronic hot spots that share their antiwork perspectives. Some of these antiemployer or workplace-support messages turn out to be marketing ploys by entrepreneurial individuals or companies. Their goal, fairly simple to identify, is to attract more and more unhappy workers to their websites and thereby lock in revenues from either advertising or merchandising sales. Fairly typical of the genre is <www.jobhater.com>, which mainly sells T-shirts that enable unhappy workers to broadcast their woes.

At the other end of the spectrum are activist sites that attempt to rally Internet visitors into getting involved with some type of organized group, running the gamut from existing trade unions to self-help groups of, say, downsized employees. And somewhere in between are electronic chat rooms and websites that basically exist to help working people air and share their grievances.

In the late-1990s business boom, accompanied as it has been by ever more difficult and demanding workplace conditions, one trend seems clear: the number of antiwork websites, as well as their legions of visitors, seem to be endlessly proliferating. Current listings, as I write these words, run the gamut from "The Official Anti-Nike Site" and "The Disgruntled Ex-Burger King Employees Page" to "Working Stiff," <www.dinosaurclub.com> (aimed specifically at downsized, middle-aged executives) and "TempSlave." There's even a site called <www.nynexsucks.com>, whose allure for unhappy employees (as well as customers) proved so powerful that it continued to receive active electronic postings long after NYNEX had merged with Bell Atlantic.

The long-term implications of this trend remain uncertain. Even electronic communication may, like so many other technological advances, be subtly contributing to the spread of today's white-collar "sweatshops." While cyberspace camaraderie, and all those rants and raves about work that

dot the e-waves, may help over-stressed workers release some steam, the Internet may—by pacifying some people and intimidating others through the implicit message that work life is tough for everyone these days—rob many white-collar workers of the strength to resist excessive employer demands.

## Discussion Questions

1. How does electronic technology raise the specter of Big Brother in the workplace?
2. How can workers develop their own strategies of resistance to workplace monitoring?
3. Have you ever experienced intrusive technology in your life?
4. Can you think of some useful ways to use electronic monitoring in the workplace?

---

From *White Collar Sweatshop: The Deterioration of Work and Its Rewards in Corporate America*, by Jill Andresky Fraser. Copyright © 2001 by Jill Andresky Fraser. Used by permission of W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

## Endnotes

1. Excerpted from correspondence from "tickler," May 6, 1999, on <<http://alex.bla-bla.com/bla/go.cfm?goto=3644>>.
2. Survey conducted by Stanford Institute for the Quantitative Study of Society. Cited in John Markoff, "A Newer, Lonelier Crowd Emerges in Internet Study," *New York Times*, February 16, 2000, A1.
3. Amy Harmon, "Plugged-in Nation Goes on Vacations in a New Territory," *New York Times*, July 13, 1997, section 1, 1.
4. The respective sources for these statistics, all cited by Data Analysis Group at its website, <<http://www.cifl.com>>, are "1999 Industry Outlook-Forecast: Consumer," Appliance Manufacturer/CEMA, January 1, 1999, 92; "1998 Buyers Guide," Presentations, December 1, 1997, A10; EDN, April 1, 1990, 80.
5. Ownership statistics come from Dataquest, a division of Gartner-Croup. According to Census Bureau projections, there were 102,118,600 households in the United States during 1999.
6. Statistics from EDN, see citation in note 4 above.

7. 1997 estimate provided by IDC Corporation, cited in Harmon, 14.
8. Katie Hafner, "For the Well Connected, All the World's an Office," *New York Times*, March 30, 2000, G1.
9. Cited in Sue Shellenharger, "Business Travelers Reshape Work Plans in Rush to Get Home," *Wall Street Journal*, March 18, 1998, B1.
10. Tom Mainelli, "Working While You're Away," *Smart Computing*, February 1998, 79; Patricia J. Bell, "Travel Journal: Taking the High-Tech Road," *Gourmet*, March 1998, 72.
11. Excerpted from correspondence from "technoid," April 20, 1999, on <<http://alex.bla-bla.com/bla/go.cfm?goto=3644>>.
12. Statistics from the "Casio PhoneMate Report: Managing Messages in a Wired World," research conducted by Yankelovich Partners, March 10–22, 1998.
13. Bell.
14. Technology and the 24 Hour Day," *Harvard Business Review*, November–December 1996, 85.
15. "Casio PhoneMate Report."
16. Inter@ctive Week/Forrester Research. August 10, 1998, 39, cited by Data Analysis Group, <<http://www.cifl.com>>.
17. Arlie Russell Hochschild, *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1997), 129.
18. Christopher Grimes, "As 'Bandwidth' Goes By, Tech Workers in Silicon Valley Coin Timely Phrase," *Wall Street Journal*, June 8, 1999, B4A.
19. "Messaging Practices in the Knowledge Economy," Pitney Bowes survey released on June 21, 1999; Tammy Reiss, "You've Got Mail, and Mail, and Mail. . .," *Business Week*, July 20, 1998, 6.
20. Craig Brod, *TechnoStress: The Human Cost of the Computer Revolution* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1984, 68–69, 41.
21. Barbara Garson, *The Electronic Sweatshop: How Computers Are Transforming the Office of the Future into the Factory of the Past* (New York: Penguin Books, 1988), 10.
22. *Ibid.*, 60.
23. Jeremy Rifkin, *The End of Work: The Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of the Post-Market Era* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1995), 144.
24. *Ibid.*, 194.
25. Nick Wingfield, "More Companies Monitor Employees' E-Mail," *Wall Street Journal*, December 2, 1999, B8.
26. "A Different Type of Computer Monitor," *New York Times*, August 27, 1998; Michael J. McCarthy, "Thinking Out Loud: You Assumed 'Erase' Wiped Out That Rant Against the Boss? Nope!" *Wall Street Journal*, March 7, 2000, A1.
27. McCarthy, A1.
28. Bill Machrone, "The Depersonalization Continues," *PC Week*, September 2, 1996, 63.

29. Cited in Daniel S. Levine, *Disgruntled: The Darker Side of the World of Work* (New York: Berkley Boulevard Books, 1998), 118–19.
30. Statistics based upon an American Management Association survey of 1,054 member companies, cited in "Upfront: The Big Picture," *Business Week*, May 31, 1999, 8.
31. Founded in 1995 by financial journalist Daniel Levine, <[www.disgruntled.com](http://www.disgruntled.com)> combined a raucous and irreverent style with relentless, often well-researched criticisms of the workplace. Its revenue-producing ventures included the sale of advertising, antiwork T-shirts, and a range of books, among them a published collection of articles and letters excerpted from the website. In his "memo from the boss" to new visitors, Levine wrote, "We work because we need food, shelter, clothing and anything that numbs the pain of work itself. If it weren't for the fact that the only thing that sucks worse than work is being unemployed, who'd do it." The Internet magazine ceased publication in early 2000.
32. <<http://www.disgruntled.com/anonymous1297.html>>.
33. Mike France and Joann Muller, "A Site for Soreheads," *Business Week*, April 12, 1999, 86–90. ♦