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The dissertation empirically examines the people processing socialization strategies employed by organizations and how these tactics impact individual attitudinal responses. Two major purposes of the research project were to (1) empirically test the existence of, and relationships among, the people processing strategies posited by John Van Maanen, and (2) determine the associations between the strategies employed and certain relevant individual attitudinal responses.

A questionnaire was used to collect data from over five hundred employees employed by four diverse organizations. Different organization types were selected to provide a substantial cross-section of tasks and functions. The organizations in the survey included a military unit, a utility, a health care facility and a billing service. Over twenty job classifications were included, ranging from entry level to management and from unskilled to highly technical and professional. The data were
analyzed using correlational analysis, cluster analysis, and discriminant analysis.

The results of the research suggest a high level of interrelationship among the people processing strategies. Two clusters of people processing strategies were identified: unit and batch. Further, systematic relationships were found between these patterns of processing strategies and clusters of attitudinal measures.

Recommendations for organizational socialization programs are suggested in light of the findings of the research. It is specifically suggested that organizations can play a major role in achieving desired employee socialization outcomes by consciously selecting patterns of processing that are compatible with competitive strategies.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation is to empirically examine the strategies employed by organizations to socialize newcomers into the organization and to determine how these strategies impact the individual's behavior and attitudes towards the organization. The first section formally defines the concept of socialization in the organizational context. The second section explores the various types of socialization strategies or processes that may be employed by the organization in its attempt to transform the new employee. In the third section the current status of research on the socialization process is delineated and evaluated and the emphasis of the current dissertation is explored. The final section discusses the predicted outcomes of the socialization process and concludes by examining the impact of socialization strategies on the outcomes.

Socialization Defined

The current research deals specifically with the socialization process as it applies to the organization and as such requires a definition specific to this setting. Caplow (1964) defined socialization as an organizationally directed process that prepares and qualifies individuals to occupy organizational positions. Brim (1966) viewed socialization as the manner in which an individual learns that behavior appropriate to his position in a group through interaction with others who hold normative beliefs about what his role should be and who reward
or punish him for correct or incorrect actions. Feldman (1976) identifies organizational socialization as the process by which individuals are transformed from total outsiders of companies to participating, effective members of them. The teaching and learning of organizational expectations has also been referred to as "learning the ropes" or "breaking in" (Schein, 1968; Van Maanen, 1976a).

The attributes or characteristics of the socialization process have been succinctly identified by Feldman (1976, 1980, 1988). Feldman identifies the three most salient characteristics of organizational socialization as: (1) continuity of socialization over time, (2) changes of attitudes, values and behaviors and (3) as a multiple socialization process.

Continuity of socialization over time refers to the ongoing nature of the process. As Feldman notes, "organizational socialization does not occur in the first weeks on the job, but is achieved more slowly over a period of weeks and months" (1988, p. 78). Continuity of the process recognizes that socialization usually begins before the newcomer actually enters the organization. The process continues during actual entry and during the critical period of time (Van Maanen, 1976a; Berlew & Hall, 1966) the individual is adjusting to their new organization. The process, therefore, is in operation continuously beginning at "anticipatory socialization" (Feldman, 1976) or "pre-arrival" stage (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975), through the "accommodation" (Feldman, 1976) or "encounter" stage (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975), and continuing to the stages of "role management" (Feldman, 1976) or "change and acquisition" (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975).
A second common theme in these definitions is that the socialization process involves learning and change (Fisher, 1986). The process includes learning and change on the part of the new employee as well as learning and change on the part of the organization. Fisher (1986) has summarized some of the learning that occurs during the socialization process and identifies four categories: learning about the organization, learning to function in the work group, learning to do the job and personal learning.

Change is also noted as a common element in the definitions of organizational socialization; change occurring in the individual in the areas of attitudes, values and behaviors (Van Maanen, 1975) and in the form of self-image and levels of involvement (Caplow, 1964). Feldman (1981) distinguishes between three distinct views of change by identifying socialization as a process of acquisition, development, and adjustment.

The third characteristic of the socialization process is what Feldman (1981) refers to as "multiple socialization." This characteristic recognizes the multi-dimensional character of the process. Multiple socialization incorporates three views of the changes that occur during organization socialization; "socialization as the acquisition of a set of appropriate role behaviors; socialization as the development of work skills and abilities; and, socialization as adjustment to the work group's norms and values" (1981, p. 309). Multiple socialization reflects the simultaneous nature of the process of socialization, and as Feldman indicates, "as employees are learning their job, they are also establishing new interpersonal relationships and learning their way around the organization" (1988, p. 78).
Types of Socialization

Organizational socialization has typically been viewed as a series of steps or phases (Feldman, 1976; Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975; Schein, 1978; Van Maanen, 1976a; Wanous, Reichers, & Malik, 1984). A typical stage model includes three phases, variously described as "anticipatory," "encounter," and "metamorphosis" (Feldman, 1976, 1980). These models reflect a passage through the organization that begins prior to entry into the organization and continues throughout the relationship.

Conventional approaches to organizational socialization processes have centered on developing typologies which describe activities that take place during socialization. For example, Wanous (1980) has identified five types of strategies that may be found in an organization socialization process. These include training, education, apprenticeship, debasement, and cooptation/seduction strategies. There is present in these types of strategies a heavy reliance on the "training" aspects of socialization. Schein (1964) identified strategies typically used by organizations in their attempt to train new employees. These strategies included the sink or swim approach, the upending experience, job rotation and full-time training. Again, the emphasis is on the training that takes place as the organization attempts to educate the new employee.

As previously indicated, Feldman (1981) developed a comprehensive model which integrates the activities that occur in the organizational socialization process. Feldman expands upon his earlier work (Feldman, 1976) by considering the multiple nature of the socialization process. An integral part of Feldman's model is the identification and integration of three views of the changes that occur during socialization in the
organization context: learning the role, learning the job, and learning about the group.

**Acquisition of Role Behaviors**

The first view of socialization as the acquisition of appropriate role behaviors focuses on the individuals' attempts to clarify the demands of their new roles. As suggested by Feldman, "during the first few weeks and months, employees try to define exactly what tasks they have to do, what the priorities are among these tasks, and how they are to allocate their work time" (1981, p. 312). In this view, the new employee is attempting to reduce the tension and anxiety that occurs as the result of exposure to a new situation (Lewin, 1951; Louis, 1980). Expectations play an important part in this attempt to define the role requirements. Feldman signifies this important aspect by noting that "the more realistic the picture that employees have of their jobs, the easier it should be for them to discover what is and is not expected at work," and that "employees who feel that they have incomplete or incorrect information will have a much more difficult time sorting out exactly what they are supposed to be doing" (1981, p. 312).

Also involved in this first view is the resolution of conflict. Two aspects are important in this regard. The first is the individual's attempt to manage intergroup role conflicts, that is, conflicts "between the immediate work group and other groups in the organization" (1981, p. 312). Expectations are equally as important in this effort as indicated by Feldman's comment that "employees with realistic expectations about the organization are more likely to be aware of potential role conflicts when they accept the new job" (1981, p. 312).
A second area requiring conflict resolution is that of outside-life conflicts. This includes conflicts relating to work schedules, demands on the family and the quality of home life. Additional pressure is experienced by the employee who has failed to effectively manage this conflict. Realistic expectations are again important in this conflict management as they can allow the employee to evaluate or at least anticipate the amount of conflict that might be expected in this area. As Feldman points out, "employees with realistic expectations about the organization are more likely to choose an organization where at least the major potential conflicts between personal life and work life can be avoided" (1981, p. 313).

**Development of Work Skills and Abilities**

A critical activity in the socialization process involves the ability of the individual to develop the skills necessary to become an effective performer. The criticality of this event is highlighted by Feldman when he proposes that "no matter how motivated the employee, without enough job skills there is little chance of success" (1981, p. 313). Problems can occur with either too little skill (Dunnette, 1966; Smith, 1968) or too much skill or overqualification (Dunnette, Arvey, & Banas, 1973; Berlew & Hall, 1966).

Realistic expectations can play a major role in increasing the likelihood of skill congruence (Feldman, 1981). Realistic job previews, for example, may assist in facilitating a closer match between the requirements of the job and the skills and abilities of the newcomer.

**Acquisition of Group Norms and Values**

Feldman's third view focuses on the newcomer's attempts to learn the values and norms of the work group. The impact of the work group on the
socialization process can be significant (Van Maanen, 1978). The work group can serve as a support system (Dornbush, 1955) and provide "protection" for the new employee (Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961) as they encounter the realities of organization membership. The critical nature of the relationship between newcomers and their work groups is unquestioned. As Feldman suggests, "initiation to the group is a major determinant of adjustment to group norms and values" and "the work group is a particularly important factor in determining how closely new recruits adjust to group norms and values" (1981, p. 314).

The task of learning the group's norms and values may present the most difficulty for the newcomer because of differences between the group culture and the culture of the larger organization of which it is a part (Louis, 1983). This activity was found to be a source of frustration to new employees (Moreland & Levine, 1982) and an important but difficult task for newcomers (Schein, 1978). This experience with the realities of the work group along with cues from co-workers (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) may result in personal learning on the part of the newcomer as they develop a clearer picture of their own needs and expectations (Kotter, 1973; Louis, 1980).

Louis, Posner, and Powell (1983) surveyed recent business school graduates to determine the types of techniques employed by organizations in their socialization programs. The three most important socialization aids identified by Louis et al. were interaction with peers, supervisors and senior co-workers; of the three, daily interactions with peers while working was the most important factor in helping newcomers to feel effective. As Louis et al. (1983) point out, this factor is particularly important in terms of the processes by which the new employee truly
learns what the organization is like. These findings are consistent with those of Feldman in terms of the salience of the role of the immediate work group in helping new recruits adjust socially. It is this social adjustment process or the learning of a new culture that requires the newcomer to assimilate the unofficial rules for sorting, labeling, and interpreting experiences in the organization (Louis et al., 1983). Louis further notes that it is these unwritten rules that are important in providing cues for effective membership in the organization.

The critical importance of the newcomer's ability to adjust to the work group has been discussed by Feldman (1977, 1988). Feldman (1977) found a strong relationship between adjustment to the work group and the individual's ability to learn their job. The work group provides support in dealing with the stress associated with transition (Feldman & Brett, 1983), provides feedback on performance (Hackman, 1976) and helps the newcomer to "make sense" of the confusing information or cues encountered during this period (Louis, 1980). One additional impact of the work group is the facilitating effect that interaction with insiders may have on the rate at which the socialization process progresses (Reichers, 1987).

Given the significant impact of this relationship, it is important to explore the ways in which organizations conduct their socialization efforts or "process" their new employees.

People Processing Strategies

A question of critical importance remaining to be thoroughly examined is what specific strategies or processes do organizations employ in their socialization efforts and what the impacts of these approaches are. Van Maanen has provided a point of departure in his exploration of
organizational socialization as a "people processing" activity (Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Van Maanen defines organizational socialization or "people processing" as "the manner in which the experiences of people learning the ropes of a new organizational position, status, or role are structured for them by others in the organization" (1978, p. 19). Van Maanen's basic premise is that differences in the acquisition of social knowledge and skills are not entirely due to individual differences alone. He posits that it is differences in the techniques or strategies employed by the organization that cause differential results in the acquisition process.

Van Maanen bases his examination on three basic underlying assumptions. The first assumption recognizes the tension or anxiety associated with a transition process. Change creates anxiety in individuals as they seek to restore a sense of balance or equilibrium. Unmet or unanticipated expectations serve to heighten the level of anxiety for the individual undergoing the change (Festinger, 1957). Efforts are directed at removing or at least reducing the level of uncertainty (Lewin, 1951), and as suggested by Louis (1980), engaging in "sense-making" in an unfamiliar and novel environment. The impact of stress during this time of transition can be substantial and critical to many aspects of the individual's future in the organization (Beehr & Bhagat, 1985; Cooper & Marshall, 1977).

The second assumption underlying Van Maanen's work centers on the individual's effort to obtain information and guidance relative to their new role. This emphasizes the social context of the learning process and highlights the impact and importance of the relationships that develop with co-workers. This assumption acknowledges the importance of social
support during the learning or transitional stage (Sykes & Eden, 1985; Seers, McGee, Serey, & Graen, 1983; Pilisuk & Parks, 1981; Nelson, 1987). As Van Maanen suggests "the learning that takes place does not occur in a social vacuum strictly on the basis of the official and available versions of the job requirements" (1978, p. 20).

Stability and productivity of the organization are the concerns in the third assumption. Here the implication is that the socialization processes of the organization impact the organization's performance. Although the precise relationship between the socialization process and organization performance is not clear (Schein, 1968, 1971; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Katz, 1985; Feldman, 1976, 1981, 1984; Louis, 1980) the relationship is obviously important and in need of further research and exploration.

Building upon the assumptions described above, Van Maanen identified seven strategies of people processing that may occur in an organization's socialization process. These strategies should be thought of as a continuum, that is, "each strategy as applied can be thought of as existing somewhere between two poles of a single dimension" (1978, p. 22). It is therefore possible to view each strategy as a pair of strategies representing each end of the continuum. The seven strategies are presented in Table 1-1. Each pair of strategies is discussed in more detail below.

**Formal/Informal Strategies**

The primary differentiation between formal and informal strategies focuses on the setting in which the newcomer's learning takes place. Formal strategies or processes are typically segregated from the specific
Table 1-1
People Processing Strategies

Independent Variables

Strategy Pair 1:

1. **Formal Strategies** - The degree to which the setting in which the socialization process takes place is segregated from the ongoing work content and the degree to which an individual newcomer role is emphasized and made explicit.

2. **Informal Strategies** - The degree to which there is no sharp differentiation from other organizational members and much of the recruit's learning takes place within the social and task-related networks that surround his or her position.

Strategy Pair 2:

1. **Individual Strategies** - The degree to which individuals are socialized singly, analogous to unit modes of production.

2. **Collective Strategies** - The degree to which individuals are socialized collectively, analogous to batch or mass production modes of production.

Strategy Pair 3:

1. **Sequential Strategies** - The degree to which the transitional processes are marked by a series of discrete and identifiable stages through which an individual must pass in order to achieve a defined role and status within the organization.

2. **Nonsequential Strategies** - The degree to which the socialization processes are accomplished in one transitional stage.

Strategy Pair 4:

1. **Fixed Strategies** - The degree to which the recruit is provided with a precise knowledge of the time it will take him to complete a given step.

2. **Variable Strategies** - The degree to which the recruit is not provided with any advance notice of their transition timetable.

Strategy Pair 5:

1. **Serial Strategies** - The degree to which experienced members groom newcomers about to assume similar roles in the organization.

2. **Disjunctive Strategies** - The degree to which a newcomer does not have predecessors available in whose footsteps he can follow.
Table 1-1-continued

Strategy Pair 6:

1. Investiture Strategies - The degree to which the socialization processes ratify and establish the viability and usefulness of the characteristics the person already possesses. The degree to which the socialization processes confirm the incoming identity of a newcomer.

2. Divestiture Strategies - The degree to which the socialization processes deny and strip away certain entering characteristics of a recruit. The degree to which the socialization processes dismantle the incoming identity of a newcomer.

Strategy Pair 7:

1. Tournament - The practices of separating selected clusters of recruits into different socialization programs or tracks on the basis of presumed differences in ability, ambition, or background.

2. Contest - The channels of movement through the various socialization programs are kept open and depend on the observed abilities and stated interests of all.
work place and are explicit in terms of skill requirements and behavioral expectations. Formal strategies "stress general skills and attitudes" and "work on preparing a person to occupy a particular status in the organization" (1978, p. 22).

In the informal process, much of the learning occurs at the work position. Informal strategies "emphasize specified actions, situational application of the rules, and the idiosyncratic nuances necessary to perform the role in the work setting" and "prepare a person to perform a specific role in an organization" (1978, p. 22).

The type of information transmitted in a formal setting is typically what one would expect to encounter in a formal orientation program; rules, procedures and policies. The informal process or "on-the-job" exposure would appear to serve the purpose of transmitting some of the subtle expectations of the work group. The strategy employed has implications on the nature of the information transmitted and on the levels of stress experienced by the newcomer. And, as reported by Louis et al. (1983) a majority of the organization studied relied upon formal onsite orientation programs.

Individual/Collective Strategies

This strategy ranges from individual to collective processing of the new employees. At the individual end of the continuum, the new employee is socialized singly or in Van Maanen's words, "analogous to the unit modes of production" (1978, p. 24). In the collective process or strategy, socialization involves a "batch" of new employees undergoing the experience as a group. Van Maanen views the collective strategy as similar to batch or mass production in that "recruits are bunched
together at the outset and processed through an identical set of experiences," (1978, p. 24).

As might be anticipated, the outcomes associated with each end of the continuum differ in several respects. Those differences include changes that occur both in the individual and in the group.

It is important to note at this point the extensive use of collective processes in organizations in today's environment. As Van Maanen indicates, individual processes that reflect an apprenticeship style of socialization are costly. Collective strategies have become the strategy of choice because of their ease, efficiency, and predictability.

Sequential/Nonsequential Strategies

The distinction here is whether the process follows a set of phases or stages or if the entire process is accomplished in one step. Job rotation of increasing levels of responsibility or authority would be indicative of a sequential process of socialization. The passage may or may not be marked by some ceremony or acknowledgement of progress similar to the "rites of passage" or many of the ceremonial recognitions of acceptance (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Feldman, 1977; Schein, 1978). Nonsequential strategies are accomplished in one step. The amount of structure and the number of steps or stages involved in the sequential strategy may have differential effects on the new employee. Of equal, if not more impact, is the differences in the agent or agents who are charged with handling the different steps (Van Maanen, 1978).

Fixed/Variable Strategies

The continuum addressed by this pair of strategies is that of time. If the process is marked by distinct steps, as in the sequential process, the question becomes the length of time required to move from step to
step. If a nonsequential, or one-step program is in place, the length of
time required to transit the entire socialization program is the concern.

The length of time it takes for the socialization process to be
completed has obvious implications for the levels of anxiety and stress
experienced by the newcomer. Van Maanen acknowledges this impact by
stating that "time is an important resource that can be used to control
others" (1978, p. 39). The control of the time interval becomes a
manipulation instrument that can "give an administrator a powerful tool
for influencing individual behavior" (1978, p. 29) while also risking
"creating an organization situation marked by confusion and uncertainty
among those concerned with their movement in the system" (1978, p. 29).
The uncertainty associated with the variable strategy obviously does not
help in diminishing or alleviating the anxiety and tension felt by the
new employee.

Serial/Disjunctive Strategies

This strategy reflects the extent to which the newcomer has
available a current organization member to provide direction and receive
cues from regarding appropriate behavior. Disjunctive strategies reflect
an absence of an organizational model. Predecessors create a path which
the newcomer can follow. Without a predecessor, the new employee is
forced to forge his/her own organizational path. Whether the path
selected is the one the organization favors is left up to chance to a
certain degree. "Whereas the social process risks stagnation and
contamination," Van Maanen suggests, "the disjunctive process risks
complication and confusion" (1978, p. 32). As with the other strategies
discussed so far, the outcomes differ with each end of the strategy
continuum.
The impact of this particular strategy is highlighted by the work of Louis et al. (1983). The availability of current employees was deemed especially helpful in the socialization experience of the newcomer and significantly affected certain behavioral characteristics.

**Investiture/Divestiture Strategies**

The process involved here reflects the manner in which the organization accepts or denies the "identity" of the newcomer. According to Van Maanen, "investiture processes ratify and establish the viability and usefulness of the characteristics the person already possess," while "divestiture processes, on the other hand, deny and strip away certain entering characteristics of a recruit" (1978, p. 33). An extreme example of the divestiture process occurs in military boot camp. In this situation, the new recruit or "boot" is totally stripped of their incoming identity including the total removal of hair and the issuing of a simple green uniform without identification. "Boots" are referred to by number or some other non-specific identification. The attempt here is to "begin with a clean slate" and to rebuild the recruit in the image desired by the organization.

Investiture processes focus on the acceptability of the newcomer where every effort is made to make the transition as easy and comfortable for the new employee as is possible. It is obvious that these two extremes elicit much different responses on the part of the newcomer. The organizational outcomes may be as equally divergent.

**Tournament/Contest Strategies**

The extent to which a "track" is present in the organizational socialization process is reflected in this people processing strategy. Personal differences in ability, background or ambition are the basis for
selection into different programs or tracks (Van Maanen, 1978). Once a new employee is assigned to a particular track, progress is chartered according to the levels achieved along that track. Although there are some conflicting findings in relation to the long-term effects of a tournament strategy (Forbes, 1987) in general, failure at any point along the track results in removal from future consideration.

The contest end of the continuum is not as narrow in viewpoint as the tournament approach in that "the channels of movement through the various socialization programs are kept open and depend on the observed abilities and stated interests of all" (1978, p. 30). Rosenbaum further clarifies the distinction between the strategies by stating that "contest mobility systems delay selection and allow individuals complete freedom for mobility, and thus are totally ahistorical" while, on the other hand, "in the tournament mobility model, careers are conceptualized as a sequence of competitions, each of which has implications for an individual's mobility chances in all subsequent selections" (1979, pp. 222-223).

Van Maanen and Schein acknowledge the impact of the strategies by indicating that "regardless of the method of choice, any given socialization device represents an identifiable set of events that will make certain behavioral and attitudinal consequences more likely than others" (1979, p. 230). Although Van Maanen did not empirically examine the presence or impact of the various processing strategies, he did hypothesize relationships that may occur in terms of organizational boundary passage. He suggested how various combinations of the strategies could result in differential responses on the part of the new employee. Van Maanen and Schein suggest the speculative nature of these
relationships by acknowledging that "these dimensions or processes were deduced logically from empirical observations and from accounts found in the social science literature" (1979, p. 232) and further, "we do not assert here that this list is exhaustive or that the processes are presented in any order or relevance to a particular organization or occupation" (1979, p. 232). Van Maanen and Schein, however, do "attempt to demonstrate that these tactics are quite common to a given boundary passage and of substantial consequence to people in the organization in that they partially determine the degree to which the response of the newcomer will be custodial or innovative" (1979, p. 232). The need remains for a comprehensive empirical analysis that is directed at determining the extent to which the various strategies operate in an organizational setting and whether they operate in combination or independently.

The current study will attempt to explore, in detail, the considerations identified above. The study will empirically examine the extent of the relationships among the strategies, that is, the extent to which they operate independently and/or co-occur in some predictable pattern.

One of the few attempts to empirically explore the impact of various socialization strategies on the attitudes and performance of new employees was conducted by Jones (1986). Using a sample of one hundred and two (102) MBA graduates, Jones "investigated the relationship between the socialization tactics employed by organizations and a series of role and personal outcomes" (1986, p. 262). The subjects completed a questionnaire designed to assess Van Maanen's (1978) typology of strategies approximately five (5) months after joining their
organization. An initial questionnaire was completed prior to entry into the hiring organizations which assessed levels of self-efficacy. The subjects had been hired by ninety-six (96) diverse organizations located in the Sunbelt.

Jones found three clusters of strategies. These were: (1) investiture vs. divestiture and serial vs. disjunctive; (2) serial vs. random and fixed vs. variable; and (3) collective vs. individual and formal vs. informal. Jones further concluded that the results of his study "reveal a pattern of relationships between tactics and outcomes supporting the proposition that different socialization tactics lead to different outcomes of socialization" (1986, p. 274).

The current research differs from the work of Jones in at least two major ways. The first difference relates to the composition of the sample. Jones' research utilized "MBA students from two successive annual graduating classes of a major midwestern university" (1986, p. 267). His sample of 102 was comprised of 73 men and 29 women with an average age of 24.7 years. As suggested by Feldman (1988) there are significant changes that occur as an individual moves from the student role to the organizational role. Not only are there differences between the student environment and the work world (Kotter, 1975; Hall, 1976) but as noted by Feldman "their expectations are often way too high, and all too frequently based on faulty stereotypes or little hard data" (1988, p. 72).

The current research uses a sample of over five hundred individuals ranging from blue collar to managerial, with the majority falling into the 25-34 year age range. Over fifty (50) percent of the subjects had been employed by their organization from two to five years compared with
Jones' five month length of service. An additional consideration in this regard is the number (96) of employing organizations in the Jones study. The current study focused on four (4) diverse organizations each employing a relatively large proportion of the total sample. It is anticipated that the current study will provide data more applicable to the working world and less influenced by the impact of the student role.

The further test of a theory of socialization lies in its applicability to the "real world" or actual organizational settings. Van Maanen and Schein recognize this imperative by stating "on examining real organizations, it is empirically obvious that these tactical dimensions are associated with one another and that the actual impact of organizational socialization upon a recruit is a cumulative one, the result of a combination of socialization tactics which perhaps enhance and reinforce or conflict and neutralize each other" (1979, p. 253). They (Van Maanen & Schein) go on to conclude that "we do not consider this a completed theory in that we do not as yet have enough empirical evidence to determine in a more tightly arranged and logical scheme how the various socialization tactics can be more or less ordered in terms of their effects upon recruits being initiated into organizational roles" (1979, p. 255). Unlike Jones, this dissertation examines the role of clusters of socialization tactics.

Socialization Outcomes

The second area of difference between this study and the Jones work relates to the attempt to determine the impact of strategies on the attitudinal outcomes. Jones' study examines the direct individual relationship between each processing strategy and several outcomes. This approach is incomplete in two ways. First, it is important to fully
examine the interrelationships between all strategies to determine whether they do in fact operate independently or in combination. Secondly, we need to know what the effects of those combinations are on a full array of outcomes. The second question to be asked here, then, is: Are the combinations or patterns of attitudinal outcomes associated with various patterns of processing strategies?

The discussion of outcomes of socialization is almost as diverse as are the different approaches to the subject. The criteria or measurement of socialization results seem to vary according to the emphasis of the researcher. As Fisher has concluded, "writers who describe the outcomes of socialization in conceptual papers seem to identify a somewhat different set than those who operationally measure 'outcomes' for the sake of having a criterion" (1986, p. 110). The conceptual writers seem to stress "learning and internalization of norms and values," while the empirical emphasis is on attitudinal measures (1986, p. 110). Feldman further points out the differences in approach by stating that "researchers in the study of organizational socialization have been torn between studying outcomes of the process which accrue to individuals and outcomes which accrue to organizations" (1976, p. 26).

Edgar Schein has been prominent in the effort to conceptually describe the outcomes of socialization. Schein (1968) predicts the effect upon the degree of innovation that may be present as a result of the degree of acceptance of the pivotal and relevant norms of the organization. Schein (1985) indicates that

when the socialization process does not work optimally, when the new member does not learn the culture of the work groups, there are usually severe consequences. At one extreme, if the new employee does not learn the pivotal or central assumptions of the organization, that employee usually feels
alienated, uncomfortable, and possibly unproductive. If the new employee learns elements of a subculture that seems contrary to the pivotal assumptions of the total organization, the result can be active sabotage, or the slowing down of the work of the organization, leading eventually to stagnation, revolution, or the weeding out of the dissidents. (1985, p. 42)

Problems can arise if the socialization process is too extensive. Again, Schein points out that "at the other extreme, if the employee is 'oversocialized' in the sense of learning every detail of the host culture, the result is total conformity, leading to inability on the part of the organization to be innovative and responsive to new environmental demands" (1985, p. 43). Schein suggests that some median level of socialization is optimal in creating what he refers to as "creative individualism." Creative individualism is characterized by a conformity to the pivotal norms of the organization with selective conformity to the other less important or relevant norms. The hypothesized result of creative individualism is a relatively high level of innovative behavior on the part of the individual (Schein, 1968).

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) hypothesized responses to the "people processing strategies" posited by Van Maanen (1978). They discussed the impact of the strategies in terms of the role acquisition of the newcomer. Custodianship was identified as a possible response to socialization efforts. Custodianship implies an acceptance of the status quo. The newcomer assumes a caretaker posture in the role. No attempts are made to change or alter the role. This response is similar to Schein's "conformity" (Schein, 1968). This response to socialization is most likely to occur from a socialization process which is sequential, variable, serial and involves divestiture (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).
The second type of response to socialization identified by Van Maanen and Schein (1979) is called content innovation. Content innovation is "marked by the development of substantive improvements or changes in the knowledge base or strategic practices of a particular role" (1979, p. 228). An attempt is made by the newcomer to significantly change or alter the role definition, not unlike Schein's rebellion or creative individualism response (Schein, 1968). Content innovation responses are likely to result through a socialization process that is collective, formal, random, fixed and disjunctive (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

The third response is role innovation. While similar to content innovation, role innovation attempts to fundamentally change the mission of the role itself. Schein (1971) refers to this response as a genuine attempt to redefine the ends to which the role functions. Role innovation is most likely to result from a process that is individual, informal, random, disjunctive and involves investiture (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

Van Maanen (1978) has posited the impact of the processing strategies on individual behavioral outcomes. Van Maanen (1978) suggests that

if we are interested in strategies that promote a relatively high degree of similarity in the thoughts and actions of recruits and their agents, a combination of the formal, serial, and divestiture strategies would probably be most effective. If dissimilarity is desired, informal, disjunctive and investiture strategies would be preferable. To produce a relatively passive group of hard-working but undifferentiated recruits, the combination of formal, collective, sequential, tournament, and divestiture strategies should be used. (p. 35)
As has been indicated, empirical examinations of these outcomes have been limited (Fisher, 1986).

At a more molecular level, the empirical research that has been directed at the socialization process has tended to rely on attitudinal measures (Fisher, 1986). Attitudinal measures utilized have included general job satisfaction (Feldman, 1976; Toffler, 1981; and Louis et al., 1983), job tension (Toffler, 1981) and internal work motivation, job involvement and mutual influence (Toffler, 1981; Feldman, 1976). Another primary outcome appears to relate to the individual's level of commitment (Louis et al., 1983; Jones, 1986; Wanous, 1980) or intentions of remaining with the organization (Feldman, 1981; Van Maanen, 1975; Brief, Aldag, Van Sell, & Malone, 1979; Hall & Schneider, 1972). The outcome variables that will be used to assess the relationships described above are listed in Table 1-2.

In order to more fully understand the impact of a selected socialization strategy on employee attitudes, it is appropriate to speculate upon the impact of individual people processing strategies on the anticipated outcomes.

Formal vs. Informal

It would appear that a formal process of socialization would have the effect of strengthening trust in management because of the dependent relationship, while an informal process allows the employee to interact directly with co-workers thereby enhancing the trust relationship with peers. Commitment to the organization may be elicited by the formal process because the individual is cut off or isolated from co-workers. An informal process places the individual directly in the work group and it is possible that their commitment may be directed to that group versus
Table 1-2  
Outcome Variables

1. **Interpersonal Trust at Work** - The extent to which one is willing to ascribe good interactions to and have confidence in the words and actions of other people (Cook & Wall, 1980).

2. **Organizational Commitment** - The strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization characterized by three factors: a strong belief in, and acceptance of, the organization's goals and values; a readiness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and a strong desire to remain a member of the organization (Porter & Smith, 1970).

3. **Job-Induced Tension** - The degree to which the individual feels bothered about named features of work (House & Rizzo, 1972).

4. **General Job Satisfaction** - An overall measure of the degree to which the employee is satisfied and happy in his or her work (Hackman & Oldham, 1975).

5. **Mutual Influence** - The extent to which individuals feel some control or power over the way work is carried out in their departments (Feldman, 1976).

6. **Internal Work Motivation** - The degree to which an employee is self-motivated to perform effectively on the job (Hackman & Oldham, 1975).

7. **Job Involvement** - The degree to which employees are personally committed and involved in their work (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965).
the organization. Van Maanen (1978) suggests that an informal process may cause an increase in the tension and anxiety felt by the newcomer as they attempt to learn appropriate behaviors. The formal strategy may serve to reduce the anxiety by providing a structured environment. It is possible that a reduction in the anxiety level experienced may have a facilitating effect on satisfaction (Siegall & Cummings, 1986).

**Collective vs. Individual**

Collective strategies would appear to have their greatest impact in the areas of peer trust, tension-reduction and work group commitment. A collective strategy places the employees "in the same boat" and elicits consensual responses to the situation (Van Maanen, 1978). A collective strategy may also favorably impact the level of job involvement the newcomer experiences along with a sense of social support (Kirmeyer & Lin, 1987; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Henderson & Argyle, 1985; Pearson, 1982).

**Sequential vs. Non-Sequential**

The impact of a sequential process would be expected to be found in the areas of tension reduction. If the sequence is published or made explicit to the new employee, it may serve to provide performance feedback to the individual which, if positive, helps in reducing the anxiety level. Feldman (1988) suggests the impact of a sequential process in reducing feelings of uncertainty or insecurity thereby increasing general satisfaction. A non-sequential process may have the opposite effect if the stages are unknown or unclear.

**Fixed vs. Variable**

A fixed strategy would appear to have some of the same impacts as a sequential process. The fixed strategy provides feedback to the
individual, again serving to reduce anxiety and uncertainty (Landau & Hammer, 1986; Parsons, Herold, & Leatherwood, 1985). The overriding impacts of these strategies appear to lie in outcomes such as job tension and satisfaction. Where the time to transition is unclear, an environment of uncertainty and tension is prevalent.

**Serial vs. Disjunctive**

In a serial process, the newcomer has available an individual to serve as a guide. An obvious impact would be in the area of peer trust. The development of a "mentor-like" relationship has the potential to create a closeness in the interpersonal relationship (Baird & Kram, 1983). Tension reduction may also result as well as a strong level of commitment to the individual. If the individual is a superior, commitment may also be projected toward the organization. The rate at which the transition from newcomer to full member progresses may also be impacted by the presence of an organizational guide (Reichers, 1987; Pinder & Schroeder, 1987).

**Investiture vs. Divestiture**

The major areas of impact here appear to include trust, commitment, tension, job satisfaction, mutual influence and job involvement. Feldman suggests that an investiture process "facilitates new employees' feeling comfortable" while "divestiture can create feelings of distrust and dislike which may not be erased even after the probationary period is over" (1988, p. 91). An investiture process builds and sustains the identity of the newcomer thereby having a facilitating impact. The individual is made to feel important and contributing, resulting in a sense of commitment on the part of the employee (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986).
The implications and impacts of the early socialization period are well known (Cohen, 1973; Bray, Campbell, & Grant, 1974; Berlew & Hall, 1966; Katz, 1985). What is not quite as clear is the actual process that occurs to cause the differential outcomes that result. This dissertation will provide new data on that issue.
CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter examines the methodology used in the dissertation research. It consists of five sections. The first section presents an overview of the entire sample. The second section describes the individual research settings and their respective populations. The third section is a discussion of the method of entry and data collection techniques employed in each setting. In the fourth section, the data collection instrument and procedures are described along with descriptive statistics related to the instrument. The final section presents statistics related to the individual research settings and job categories.

Total Sample

The total sample population consists of five hundred and forty-three (543) subjects from four different organizations. The organizations are varied and diverse and include a utility company, military unit, a billing service, and a health care facility.

Fifty-nine (59) percent of the participants were female; forty-one (41) percent were male. Two-thirds of the subjects were 34 or younger. Twenty-eight (28) percent of the subjects were employed by their current employer for less than two years; fifty-one (51) percent were employed for two to five years; twenty-one (21) percent were employed for more than five years. The majority of the subjects were employed full-time (95 percent) with five (5) percent working on a part-time basis. Twenty-
nine (29) percent of the subjects were clerical workers; forty-three (43) percent engaged in technical work; twenty-eight (28) percent were managers.

**Research Settings**

All of the organizations were located in or in close proximity to a large southeastern city. In order to maintain the anonymity of the participation organizations, they are referred to by fictitious names.

**Alpha Utility**

Alpha Utility is a major subsidiary of an international corporation. It can be described as a large, high tech information and communication services organization. Of a total employee pool of 1,229 full-time employees, twenty-one (21) percent or 256 individuals participated in the research project. Sixty-two (62) percent of the sample were female and thirty-eight (38) percent male. The average length of time of employment in the organization was 39.9 months and the average length of time of employment within the subject's department was 18.5 months. In terms of the type of work performed, approximately ten (10) percent of the sample was clerical, forty-eight (48) percent technical and forty-two (42) percent managerial. The entire sample was employed on a full-time basis.

**Beta Naval Squadron**

The second organization in the study is a Naval Antisubmarine Helicopter Squadron home based in a coastal city. A total available subject pool of two hundred (200) personnel provided a participating pool of one hundred twenty-one (121) subjects, or sixty-one (61) percent of the total organization. Of the total participants, ninety-one (91) percent were male and nine (9) percent female. The average length of time in the organization was 96.8 months with an average time in position
of 20.6 months. Twelve (12) percent of the sample performed clerical activities, sixty-six (66) percent performed technical jobs, and twenty-two (22) percent performed management functions.

**Gamma Billing Service**

Gamma Billing Service is a moderately sized organization performing activities primarily clerical in nature. The organization provides the billing and collection functions for individual physicians affiliated with a large metropolitan hospital. There were one hundred twelve (112) employees available for the research, of which eighty-six (86) or seventy-seven (77) percent participated. Ninety (90) percent of the sample was female. The average length of employment in the organization was 28.9 months, with the average time on current job of 17.5 months. Ninety-one (91) percent of the total sample performed clerical functions; the remaining nine (9) percent were managers. All of the subjects were full-time employees.

**Delta Clinic**

The fourth organization participating in the research was a large, full service pediatric outpatient clinic. The clinic is equipped to provide many of the services available in an inpatient hospital and subsequently employs a broad cross section of employees. Of a total available employee pool of one hundred forty-three (143) employees, eighty (80) or fifty-six (56) percent participated in the research project. Eighty-nine (89) percent of the participating sample was female and eleven (11) percent male. The average length of employment was 41.3 months, with an average employment in current position of 29.4 months. Forty-four (44) percent of the sample performed clerical tasks, thirty-
seven (37) percent performed technical tasks, and nineteen (19) percent performed managerial functions.

Tables 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, and 2-4 provide comparative descriptive statistics on the four research sites on age, job category, time in organization, and time in current position respectively.

Organizational Entry and Data Collection Procedures

In all organizations, the initial contact was made personally by the researcher. The researcher introduced himself as a doctoral candidate at the University of Florida and an instructor in Business Administration at the University of North Florida. The purpose of the research and the expected level of involvement on the part of the organization were briefly discussed, as well as the potential benefits to the organization as a result of participation. The research project was briefly described as an attempt to understand the dynamics occurring when an employee first joins the organization and how that experience impacts the future relationship between the employee and the organization. In each case, a meeting was set to discuss the research project in detail; a presentation was made outlining the theoretical basis for the research and the actual data collection instrument was reviewed. The actual level of initial entry varied with each organization but was, in general, at the upper decision levels. The initial contact person for each organization was as indicated: Alpha Utility - Director, Organizational Development; Beta Naval Squadron - Commanding Officer; Gamma Billing Service - Director; Delta Clinic - Clinic Administrator. Entry at this level facilitated the entire review process. Acceptance of and support of the research project by this level served to enhance the levels of cooperation throughout the organization.
### Table 2-1
Sample Distribution by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Alpha Utility</th>
<th>Beta Naval Squadron</th>
<th>Gamma Billing Service</th>
<th>Delta Clinic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 55</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2-2
Job Category Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Category</th>
<th>Alpha Utility</th>
<th>Beta Naval Squadron</th>
<th>Gamma Billing Service</th>
<th>Delta Clinic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-3
Time in Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Alpha Utility</th>
<th>Beta Naval Squadron</th>
<th>Gamma Billing Service</th>
<th>Delta Clinic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2-4
Time on Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Alpha Utility</th>
<th>Beta Naval Squadron</th>
<th>Gamma Billing Service</th>
<th>Delta Clinic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the participation decision was made, the researcher maintained contact with one key individual in each organization to facilitate data collection and to coordinate the actual mechanics of the process. In each organization, the contact person was provided with a sufficient number of questionnaires to allow each available employee the opportunity to participate. Employee participation was entirely on a voluntary basis and the confidentiality of the results was stressed. The instruments were distributed to each employee by the internal mail delivery system of the organization. The organization allowed the employee to complete the questionnaire on company time. Collection points were specified where the employee could either hand deliver their completed questionnaire or return via the mail system. In each organization, the collection process was accomplished within three days.

A brief discussion of the differential response rates among the participating organizations seems appropriate. Specifically, the lower participation rate experienced at Alpha Utility requires some explanation. The participation rate of 21 percent is consistent with standard response rates in this type of survey. It is possible that the lower rates at Alpha are due to the very large size of the total organization in comparison to the others. In each organization, the project was fully and enthusiastically supported by management and the impact of this support may have been diluted with the size of Alpha.

In accordance with the participation agreement, each organization was provided with feedback. As agreed, individual employee anonymity was maintained and the organizations received aggregate data only. This information was provided upon the completion of data analysis by the
researcher, with the assurance that the organization would be provided with additional feedback upon completion of the entire research project.

Instruments and Measures

A questionnaire was utilized for data collection. An identical form of the questionnaire was used in all four organizations. A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix A, along with the cover letter. The questionnaire consisted of three parts. Each of these sections will be described in detail below.

Questionnaire—Part I

Part I of the questionnaire consisted of thirty (30) questions dealing with the socialization process as perceived by the individual employee. The questions measure Van Maanen's (1978) hypothesized "people processing strategies." Van Maanen included a seventh pair of strategies, tournament vs. contest, which were not included in the current research. Van Maanen describes the tournament strategy as "the practice of separating selected clusters of recruits into different socialization programs or tracks on the basis of presumed difference in ability, ambition or background" (1978, pp. 29-30). Contest strategies imply "the avoidance of a sharp distinction between superiors and inferiors of the same rank" (1978, p. 30). These strategies were excluded from the current research because it was anticipated that the ability to make this distinction would be limited given the nature of the data collection techniques employed. Additionally, it would appear that this separation is made by employee superiors; as such, it would be the perceptions of the superior rather than perceptions of the employee undergoing the socialization process that would be critical. (Jones, 1986, also did not measure this people processing tactic.)
Items used were largely based on Jones' (Jones, 1986) attempt to empirically measure these strategies. Slight modification of items was deemed necessary in light of the nature of the subject pool. Jones' questionnaires were originally designed for MBA's, a more highly educated workforce than the target population in this study, and it appeared that the readability level of the Jones questionnaire would be too high for present subjects. To test this assumption, a readability analysis was conducted utilizing the Random House Readability Analysis Program (1981). This program analyzes the text using recognized indices, including the Flesch Index (Flesch, 1948) and the Fog Index (Gunning, 1968). The questions were also analyzed using the Fry Method (Fry, 1969) with consistent results: the Jones instrument was found to be written at or above a twelfth grade level.

The researcher sought to adjust the level to one more in line with the large population of lower level employees, especially the large number of clerical employees in the sample. By utilizing the vocabulary feature of the IBM 360 Displaywrite program, the vocabulary level was adjusted to an eighth (8) grade level. It was anticipated that this would enhance the understanding of the question without significantly impacting the content or intent of the statements. Table 2-5 is presented as a comparison between the data obtained by Jones (Jones, 1986) and the data generated by the current research. In general, the means are lower, the standard deviations smaller and the discrete statistics are roughly comparable.

The first section contains items which measure individual perceptions of the six strategies of their organization's "people processing." The employee was to respond to the questions in accordance
Table 2-5
Comparison of Jones Data to Current Research on Independent Variable Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Jones (N=102)</th>
<th>Current (N=543)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal vs. Informal</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective vs. Individual</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed vs. Variable</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential vs. Non-Sequential</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial vs. Disjunction</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investiture vs. Divestiture</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with how they felt during the first few weeks on the job. The six scales and the items which comprised each are listed below.

**Formal/Informal**

11. I went through a set of training experiences which were specifically designed to give me and the other new people a complete knowledge of job related skills.
12. I was very aware that I was seen as "learning the ropes" by my more senior co-workers.
14. Much of my job knowledge was gained informally on a trial and error basis. (Reverse Score)
28. I did not do any of my usual job duties until I was completely familiar with department procedures and work methods.

**Collective/Individual**

4. During the first few weeks, I was largely involved with other new employees in common training activities.
16. This organization puts all new employees through the same set of learning experiences.
17. Most of my training was carried out separately from other new employees. (Reverse Score)
23. There was a feeling of "being in the same boat" among other new employees.
29. Other new employees were very helpful in my learning my job duties.

---

1Item #21 "During my training for this job I was normally physically separated from my regular work group," was dropped from the analysis because it was not significantly related to any other item in the scale.
Sequential/Random

1. I saw a clear pattern in the way one early job assignment led to another.
2. The steps in the career ladder were clearly spelled out to me.
5. In the beginning, I was moved from job to job to build up experience and a track record.
9. Each stage of the training process built upon the job knowledge gained during the previous stages of the training process.
13. This organization did not put new employees through a recognizable training program. (Reverse Score)

Fixed/Variable^2

3. The way in which my progress through this organization would follow a fixed order of events was made clear to me.
7. I had a good idea of the time it would take me to go through the various stages of the training process.
8. Most of my knowledge of what might happen to me in the future came informally, through the grapevine, rather than through regular channels. (Reverse Score)
30. I had little idea when I was going to get my next job assignment or training assignment. (Reverse Score)

Serial/Disjunctive

10. I was generally left alone to discover what my job duties should be in this organization. (Reverse Score)

^2Item #25 "I could predict my future career path in this organization by observing what happened to other employees," was dropped from the analysis because it was not significantly related to the other items in the scale.
20. Experienced employees saw advising or training me and other new employees as one of their main job duties.

22. I had little or no access to people who had previously performed my job. (Reverse Score)

26. I gained a clear understanding of my job duties from observing my senior co-workers.

27. I received little guidance from experienced employees as to how I should perform my job. (Reverse Score)

Investiture/Divestiture

6. Almost all of my co-workers were helpful to me.

15. My co-workers went out of their way to help me adjust to this organization.

18. I was made to feel that my skills and abilities were very important to this organization.

19. I felt that experienced employees held me at a distance until I conformed to their expectations. (Reverse Score)

24. I had to change my attitudes and values to be accepted in this organization. (Reverse Score)

Tables 2-6 and 2-7 present the descriptive statistics related to the people processing strategies. Included in the tables are the scale and item mean scores, standard deviations, the mean inter-item correlations, and the mean intra-item correlations. The inter- and intra-item correlations were included to assess the extent of the relationships between items comprising the scales and all other scale items. For example, the items which are expected to measure the same construct should be highly correlated with each other and should not be similarly related to items making up other constructs. With the exception of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Intra-scale Correlations</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Mean Inter-Scale Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investiture</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8*</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10*</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14*</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17*</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 (not used)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22*</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24*</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 (not used)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27*</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30*</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reported means are means after scores reversed.
scale with the lowest alpha (Formal/Informal), the average within-scale correlations are higher than the average interscale correlations. The average Cronbach alpha was .64.

Questionnaire—Part II

The second section of the questionnaire consists of a set of statements that reflect the employees' current feelings about their job. Part II contained forty-three (43) questions which comprised eight (8) scales. These scales or attitudinal measures were hypothesized to be related to the socialization process encountered by the employee. The employees were asked to respond to the questions based on how they felt at the present time about their job. The eight (8) scales are listed below indicating the items comprising them and the original source of the scale.

Interpersonal Trust at Work (Cook & Wall, 1980) Sub-Scale

Faith in Peers
39. I can trust the people I work with to lend me a hand if I need it.
53. Most of my co-workers can be relied upon to do as they say they will do.
68. If I got into difficulties at work I know my co-workers would try and help me out.

Faith in Management
55. I feel quite confident that the firm will always try to treat me fairly.
60. Management at my firm is sincere in its attempt to meet the worker's point of view.
72. Our management would be quite prepared to gain advantage by deceiving the workers. (Reverse Score)
Organizational Commitment  (Porter & Smith, 1970) Sub-Scale

31. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
36. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
47. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.
50. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.
51. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
54. For me this is the best of all possible organizations in which to work.
57. I really care about the fate of this organization.
61. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined.
64. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.

Job-Induced Tension  (House & Rizzo, 1972) Sub-Scale

32. I often "take my job home with me" in the sense that I think about it when doing other things.  (Reverse Score)
37. If I had a different job, my health would probably improve.  (Reverse Score)
43. My job tends to directly affect my health.  (Reverse Score)
45. I have felt nervous before attending meetings in the company.  (Reverse Score)
46. I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.  (Reverse Score)
Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night. (Reverse Score)

I work under a great deal of tension. (Reverse Score)

**General Job Satisfaction** (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) Complete Scale

44. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.
49. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.
63. People on this job often think of quitting. (Reverse Score)
65. Most people on this job are very satisfied with the job.

**Mutual Influence** (Feldman, 1976)

33. Any suggestions I may have for improving the way things are done here would probably receive favorable consideration by my superiors.
48. If I had an idea about improving the way work was done in this department, I doubt I could get action on it. (Reverse Score)

56. I feel I have a lot of influence in my unit.
62. I have a lot of opportunities to influence the way things are done here in my organization.

**Internal Work Motivation** (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) Complete Scale

34. Most people on this job feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when they do the job well.
35. My opinion of myself goes up when I do this job well.
40. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.
66. Most people on this job feel bad or unhappy when they find they have performed the work poorly.

70. My own feelings generally are not affected much one way or the other by how well I do on this job. (Reverse Score)
73. I feel bad and unhappy when I discover that I have performed poorly on this job.

**Job Involvement** (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965) Sub-Scale

38. The most important things that happen to me involve my work.
41. I'm really a perfectionist about my work.
42. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.
52. I live, eat and breathe my job.
59. I am very much involved personally in my work.
69. Most things in life are more important than work. (Reverse Score)

Tables 2-8, and 2-9 present the descriptive statistics for the dependent variables. Item and scale mean scores, mean inter-item correlations, and mean intra-item correlations are included. All of the mean intra-scale correlations are substantially higher than the inter-scale correlations. The average Cronbach alpha was .80.

**Questionnaire--Part III**

The third part of the questionnaire contains general demographic information. The individual items were made as specific as possible while providing anonymity for the subject. Each organization's questionnaire was customized in this section to reflect job category titles appropriate to that organization. Copies of each organization's Part III are in Appendix A. Other demographics included length of time employed by the organization, length of time in current position, age (categorized), sex, and full or part-time work. Military respondents were asked whether they were enlisted or officer rank.

**Organization and Job Category Statistics**

The final section of this chapter presents statistical data related to each of the organizations and to categorizations created by job type.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Intra-scale Correlations</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Mean Inter-Scale Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Trust</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Trust</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tension</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Influence</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Work Motivation</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-9
Item Statistics for Attitudinal Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reported means are means after scores reversed.
Table 2-10 indicates the means and standard deviations for each of the people processing strategies by organization. The same statistics are presented for the attitudinal outcomes, by organization, in Table 2-11. The results of an analysis of variance are also included in Tables 2-10 and 2-11. In Table 2-12, means and standard deviations for the people processing strategies are presented by job category. The attitudinal outcome statistics by job category are shown in Table 2-13. The results of an analysis of variance by job category are also included in Tables 2-12 and 2-13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Alpha Utility</th>
<th>Beta Naval Squadron</th>
<th>Gamma Billing Service</th>
<th>Delta Clinic</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>PR &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{x} ) s.d.</td>
<td>( \bar{x} ) s.d.</td>
<td>( \bar{x} ) s.d.</td>
<td>( \bar{x} ) s.d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>3.4 1.06</td>
<td>3.9 1.05</td>
<td>3.3 0.91</td>
<td>3.5 0.90</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>4.1 1.15</td>
<td>4.1 1.09</td>
<td>3.5 1.04</td>
<td>3.4 1.04</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>3.5 1.23</td>
<td>3.9 1.14</td>
<td>3.6 1.14</td>
<td>3.9 1.01</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>3.3 1.26</td>
<td>3.7 1.19</td>
<td>3.2 1.13</td>
<td>4.1 1.21</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial</td>
<td>4.0 1.24</td>
<td>4.0 1.21</td>
<td>4.3 0.97</td>
<td>4.2 1.30</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.3303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investiture</td>
<td>4.8 1.10</td>
<td>4.0 1.31</td>
<td>4.7 1.16</td>
<td>5.3 1.02</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Outcome</td>
<td>Alpha Utility</td>
<td>Beta Naval Squadron</td>
<td>Gamma Billing Service</td>
<td>Delta Clinic</td>
<td>F-Value</td>
<td>PR &gt; F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Trust</td>
<td>5.0 1.27</td>
<td>4.6 1.37</td>
<td>4.8 1.26</td>
<td>5.7 0.99</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Trust</td>
<td>4.2 1.53</td>
<td>3.9 1.57</td>
<td>4.3 1.41</td>
<td>4.5 1.59</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.0415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>4.8 1.16</td>
<td>4.1 1.35</td>
<td>4.4 1.02</td>
<td>4.9 1.05</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tension</td>
<td>3.8 1.19</td>
<td>3.8 1.08</td>
<td>4.1 1.16</td>
<td>4.3 1.10</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.4 1.34</td>
<td>3.9 1.26</td>
<td>4.0 1.22</td>
<td>4.6 1.21</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Influence</td>
<td>4.6 1.37</td>
<td>3.8 1.71</td>
<td>3.6 1.28</td>
<td>4.6 1.21</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Work Motivation</td>
<td>5.5 0.85</td>
<td>5.2 0.83</td>
<td>5.1 0.81</td>
<td>5.5 0.69</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>4.0 1.02</td>
<td>3.8 1.14</td>
<td>3.5 0.95</td>
<td>3.9 1.09</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>F Value</td>
<td>PR &gt; F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.1268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.9272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.0396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investiture</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.0275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-13
Attitudinal Outcomes by Job Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudinal Outcome</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>PR &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Trust</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Trust</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tension</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Influence</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>18.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Work Motivation</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>25.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3
RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the research will be presented and discussed. This chapter will include five sections. The first section presents the results of a correlational analysis among the people processing strategies. The second section indicates the results of a correlational analysis among the outcomes or attitudinal variables. In the third section, the results of a correlational analysis between the individual processing strategies and the individual outcomes are presented. The fourth section shows the results of a cluster analysis conducted to identify the patterns of relationships between the people processing strategies. The final section describes a discriminant analysis conducted to determine the impact of patterns of processing strategies on the attitudinal outcomes.

People Processing Strategy Correlations

A Pearson product-moment correlational analysis was conducted to determine the extent of the relationship between each of the pairs of people processing strategies. It is important at this point to note that the strategies were viewed as ends of a continuum for the purposes of this research. The questions were constructed in such a way that a high score, seven (7), would reflect a strategy consistent with the variable name. A low score, one (1), would reflect the opposite end of the continuum and therefore the opposite strategy. For example, the variable named "formal" is constructed to reflect a formal process when a high
score (7) is recorded while a lower score (1) represents an "informal" strategy. This reasoning is consistently applied across each of the strategy pairs.

Table 3-1 contains the results of the correlation analysis conducted among the processing strategies.

Each processing pair and its relationship to the other pairs will be considered below.

Formal vs. Informal

The formal end of the strategy pair represents the extent to which the newcomer is segregated from the regular work place while an informal strategy indicates that there is no differentiation from current organizational members. Relatively high inter-correlations are present between the formal strategy pair and four of the other pairs ranging from \( r = 0.49 \) to \( r = 0.55 \). The lowest was found between the formal strategy and the investiture pair \( r = 0.24 \).

Collective vs. Individual

The collective strategy reflects socialization as a group while individual strategies indicate the process occurring singly. The highest correlation present was that between the collective and formal strategy pairs \( r = 0.49 \). Three other pairs were fairly consistent in the range \( r = 0.32 \) to \( r = 0.35 \). Once again, the lowest relationship was with the investiture strategy, \( r = 0.12 \).

Sequential vs. Non-Sequential

Sequential strategies are marked by discrete and identifiable stages of passage. In non-sequential strategies, the socialization process is accomplished in one step. The highest relationship found here was
Table 3-1
Correlations Among People Processing Strategies

\( N = 543 \)

( ) = COEFFICIENT ALPHA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Collective</th>
<th>Sequential</th>
<th>Fixed</th>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Investiture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>(.61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>(.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>(.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investiture</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** \( p < .001 \)
** \( p < .01 \)
between sequential strategies and the fixed strategy \( (r = .68) \). Two other strategies, formal and serial, had correlations of \( (r = .55) \) and \( (r = .54) \) respectively. At the lowest levels were investiture \( (r = .36) \) and collective \( (r = .35) \) strategies.

**Fixed vs. Variable**

With a fixed strategy, the time of transition from newcomer to member is fixed. The variable strategy reflects an open-ended time frame. The highest relationship was found to be between the fixed strategy and the sequential process \( (r = .68) \). Investiture \( (r = .41) \) fell toward the lower end.

**Serial vs. Disjunctive**

The serial strategy reflects the availability of role models for the newcomer while the disjunctive strategy reflects the absence of models. Four of the strategies ranged from \( (r = .52) \) to \( (r = .54) \). The collective strategy was at the \( (r = .34) \) level.

**Investiture vs. Divestiture**

Where the newcomer's identity and ability has been ratified by the organization, investiture has occurred. A process of divestiture strips away the incoming identity of the newcomer. The strongest correlation found here was with the serial strategy \( (r = .52) \). The other strategies ranged from \( (r = .41) \) to \( (r = .24) \). The collective strategy had the lowest correlation with the investiture strategy \( (r = .12) \).

Although the actual correlations derived were not of substantial magnitude (the highest level found was .68), they do demonstrate a consistent pattern of high interrelationships among the processing strategies.
Two specific patterns appear to be present. The first pattern seems to contain strategies that are consistent with Van Maanen's conceptualization of a "batch" or "mass production" approach to people processing. This involves a strategy which is formal, collective, sequential, fixed and serial in content. This is also similar in some respects to Jones' (1986) classification of an institutionalized set of processing tactics.

The second pattern that appears to be present is analogous to Van Maanen's concept of "unit" people processing. This set of strategies would involve a process that is individual, informal, non-sequential, variable and disjunctive in form. There are similarities once again with Jones' (1986) "individualized" categorization.

The most significant difference related to the investiture strategy. In each case, the investiture strategy was an outlier, unrelated to other people processing tactics.

Attitudinal Outcomes Correlations

A Pearson product-moment correlational analysis was conducted to examine the pattern of relationships among the dependent attitudinal variables. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3-2.

Prior to discussing the relationships and patterns present in the attitudinal measures, it is informative to first examine the variables individually.

Peer Trust

This factor reflects the confidence placed in the words and actions of the newcomer's peers. The strongest relationships here were with mutual influence ($r = .50$), management trust ($r = .48$), job satisfaction ($r = .48$), and organization commitment ($r = .45$).
Table 3-2
Correlations Among Attitudinal Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peer Trust</th>
<th>Management Trust</th>
<th>Organization Commitment</th>
<th>Job Tension</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Mutual Influence</th>
<th>Work Motivation</th>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Trust</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Trust</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tension</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td>-.35***</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td>-.35***</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Influence</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001
Management Trust

Management trust is a reflection of the confidence that the newcomer has in their superiors. The impact of this factor is found to be most significant in terms of commitment to the organization \( (r = .73) \) and job satisfaction \( (r = .70) \).

Organization Commitment

Commitment reflects the strength of the individual's identification with and involvement in the organization. As noted above, job satisfaction \( (r = .70) \) and management trust \( (r = .73) \) play a significant part in the level of commitment to the organization.

Job-Induced Tension

Tension here is the measure of features of the job which "bother" the individual to a significant degree. The greatest impact of this outcome seems to be in the area of job satisfaction \( (r = .35) \). A secondary area of impact is the level of management trust \( (r = .35) \).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an overall measure of the degree to which the individual is satisfied or happy in their work. As discussed earlier, commitment \( (r = .78) \) to the organization and management trust \( (r = .70) \) are strongly associated with this factor.

Mutual Influence

The extent to which the individual feels control or power over their work is measured by the degree of mutual influence experienced. The strongest relationships here are with organization commitment \( (r = .68) \), management trust \( (r = .64) \), and job satisfaction \( (r = .63) \).
Internal Work Motivation

Internal work motivation reflects employee self-motivation to perform effectively. This variable is most highly associated with organization commitment ($r = .53$), mutual influence ($r = .46$), and job satisfaction ($r = .45$).

Job Involvement

Employee personal commitment to the work and feelings of involvement are reflected in this variable. Job involvement is most significantly related to organization commitment ($r = .49$) and internal work motivation ($r = .48$).

There appears to be a strong relationship between the dependent variables. The data suggests a relatively high level of intercorrelation among the attitudinal variables, with the exception of job involvement. Job involvement appears to be an outlier.

Relationships Between Individual Processing Strategies and Outcomes

In this section, the results of the correlation analysis between the individual people processing strategy pairs and the attitudinal outcomes are presented. Table 3-3 displays these relationships.

The first significant pattern of results is the almost complete lack of impact present in the relationship between the formal and collective processing strategies and the attitudinal outcomes. With few exceptions, the correlations are not significant, and where there is statistical significance it is of such a small magnitude as to be considered inconsequential.

A second interesting pattern of results occurs among sequential, fixed, and serial processing strategies. The results of the correlational analysis indicates a relationship among these three
Table 3-3
Correlations Between People Processing Strategies and Attitudinal Outcomes

N = 543

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Collective</th>
<th>Sequential</th>
<th>Fixed</th>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Investiture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Trust</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Trust</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tension</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Influence</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001
** p < .01
* p < .05
variables that is consistent in terms of magnitude and statistical significance. There appears consistent moderate correlations among these strategies and all the attitudinal variables except job involvement.

The third significant relationship here is that between the investiture strategy and the outcomes. Without exception, the strongest relationships occur between this one strategy and each of the attitudinal outcomes. A further distinction can be made by separating the outcome variables into internal work factors and interpersonal factors. When this is done, it is obvious that the most significant impact of the investiture strategy is in the area of interpersonal relationships.

Cluster Analysis Results

Cluster analysis is a method of classifying variables into groups, or clusters. Nunnally defines a cluster as "consisting of variables that correlate highly with one another and have comparatively low correlations with variables in other clusters" (1978, p. 429), while Kerlinger describes a cluster as "a subset of a set of 'objects'--persons, tests, concepts, and so on--the members of which are more similar or closer to each other than they are to members outside the cluster" (1973, p. 576). In the present case, the "objects" of the analysis were the research subjects. The criterion utilized for assignment to a particular cluster were the processing strategies.

The CLUSTER procedure (SAS, 1985) was utilized to determine the hierarchical clusters present in the people processing strategies. The centroid hierarchical method (Sokal & Michener, 1958) was employed in the clustering routine. The technique is briefly described by Everitt (1974) as one in which "groups are depicted to lie in Euclidean space, and are replaced in formation by the co-ordinates of their centroid. The
distance between groups is defined as the distance between the group centroids. The procedure then is to fuse groups according to the distance between their centroids, the groups with the smallest distance being fused first" (1974, p. 12).

Cluster analysis provides the capacity to deal with a large amount of data in such a manner as to "give a more concise and understandable account of the observations under consideration. In other words, simplification with minimal loss of information is sought" (Everitt, 1974, p. 4). A second objective of cluster analysis is to produce groups which form the basis of a classification scheme useful in later studies for predictive purposes (Everitt, 1974). Both of these objectives were sought in the current research.

The FASTCLUS procedure (SAS, 1985) identified two distinct clusters. Table 3-4 indicates the processing strategy mean scores for the two clusters. The two clusters represent the two distinctive patterns discussed previously: "unit" and "batch" approaches to socialization. Cluster I is reflective of the "batch" approach and Cluster II reflects an "unit" orientation. Figure 3-1 visually demonstrates the differences between the two clusters.

**Discriminant Analysis Results**

In order to determine the relationships between the clusters of processing strategies and the outcome variables described earlier, a discriminant analysis was conducted. Klecka defines discriminant analysis as "a statistical technique which allows the researcher to study the differences between two or more groups of objects with respect to several variables simultaneously" (1980, p. 7). In the present research, the group of objects are the two clusters of subjects that were derived
Table 3-4
Cluster Analysis
People Processing Strategies Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Cluster I</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investiture</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=264        N=279
Investiture __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
Serial __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
Sequential __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
Fixed __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
Collective __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
Formal __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __

Figure 3-1
Cluster Analysis
with the cluster analysis. The discriminating factors are the outcome or attitudinal variables described earlier. The process, then, is directed at finding the discriminant function, described by Kerlinger as "a regression equation with a dependent variable that represents group membership. The function maximally discriminates the members of the group; it tells us to which group each member probably belongs" (1973, p. 650).

The results of the discriminant analysis are shown in Table 3-5. It is important to note that for every outcome variable, Cluster I mean scores are higher than Cluster II mean scores. The mean scores for each cluster are plotted in Figure 3-2 to facilitate a comparison between the two. The results of the discriminant analysis, together with the conclusions of the cluster analysis, point out a significant finding. It would appear that when a "unit" type of socialization process is experienced (that is, one which is informal, individual, variable, non-sequential and disjunctive), we can expect somewhat lower attitudinal outcomes. A "batch" process (formal, collective, fixed, sequential, and serial) tends to have somewhat more positive responses on the same attitudinal measures.

The data derived from the cluster analysis and the subsequent discriminant analysis suggest that there are, in fact, recognizable patterns of people processing strategies present. Further, these patterns have a systematic relationship with the attitudinal variables described earlier. The implications and applications of these results will be developed further in the next chapter.
Table 3-5
Discriminant Analysis

Attitudinal Outcomes Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster I</th>
<th>Cluster II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Trust</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Trust</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Commitment</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Induced Tension</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Influence</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Work Motivation</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 264  
N = 279
Figure 3-2
Discriminant Analysis
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter summarizes the results of the research and discusses the implications of the results for organizational socialization programs. This chapter consists of four sections. The first two sections examine, in turn, the relationships among the people processing strategies and the relationships between the people processing strategies and the attitudinal outcomes. The third portion of the chapter discusses methodological issues in the research on organizational socialization, while the fourth, and last, segment discusses the organizational applications of the findings of the research.

Relationships Among the People Processing Strategies

One of the major purposes of the current research was to empirically examine the patterns of people processing strategies posited by Van Maanen (1978). The correlational analysis suggests that the various strategies, while theoretically conceived of as being independent, were in actuality highly interrelated. Two distinct patterns emerged: a "unit" strategy and a "batch" mode of socialization.

The "unit" strategy is indicative of a customized strategy for one individual. For instance, this strategy might be used when a single new employee enters an organization into a position for which there is no current incumbent (e.g., executive succession) or for which the time required for transition to full member is unknown or unclear (e.g., Ph.D. students). One might further speculate the application of a "unit"
strategy in situations where the organization is relatively small in size, with highly technical or professional tasks, and where innovative behavior is encouraged and expected. Examples of this type of organization might include high-technology development firms, specialized or custom-work shops, and creativity-driven organizations such as market research and management consulting firms. The "unit" approach to socialization would involve a process which is relatively individual, informal, non-sequential, variable and disjunctive in nature.

In contrast, the "batch" approach reflects a strategy which tends to be more formal, collective, sequential, fixed and serial in structure. Typically, "batch" socialization programs are conducted with large groups of new recruits, over a specified time period, and involve specific phases or steps. The types of organizations where one might encounter a "batch" type of process, not surprisingly, are also those where a high volume of rather routine tasks and activities occur. Large manufacturing or clerically based organizations would appear to be examples here. Assembly-line operations such as automobile manufacturing or firms where a high volume of paper processing occurs (i.e., insurance) would seem to be the likely location for a "batch" oriented socialization process.

However, it is not easy to globally categorize any one organization or job classification. Any single organization, for instance, may be comprised of several elements that fall into both of the above classifications. Thus, an organization may at the same time involve in its subsystems socialization processes that are both "unit" and "batch." It is for the above reason and because of the added complexity that the researcher chose not to include comparisons within the individual
organizations. These comparisons will require further attention and are more appropriate for future research and analysis.

One might also hypothesize that unit socialization would be more common with "resocialized" employees (e.g., those who are transferred or promoted to new departments) while batch socialization would be more common with large groups of new recruits. Feldman and Brett (1983, 1985) conducted a comparison of the coping differences between new hires and job changers. Some of the differences they highlighted have relevance here in terms of the different processing strategies. For example, Feldman and Brett found that new hires "are typically given three to six months to learn their new job, take part in formal training and benefit from a great deal of unsolicited, informal help" (1985, p. 62). Job changers, on the other hand "are expected 'to hit the ground running,' and to exhibit the same high level of performance on the new job as they did on the old" (1985, p. 62). Furthermore, job changers report "that they receive very little unsolicited help and feel that asking for help would be seen as a sign of weakness" (1985, p. 62). Also, Feldman and Brett note that most newcomers are hired in groups, but job changers often enter one at a time. These very distinct differences have significant relevance for the socialization process.

Another important finding of this research is the independence of the investiture/divestiture strategy from the other strategies. The analysis here suggests that the investiture/divestiture strategy is not closely associated with the other strategies. This is a different finding than that of Jones (1986). Jones found three clusters of strategies which he categorized as being concerned with context, content and social aspects. Jones' contextual tactics included the
formal/informal and collective/individual strategy; his content tactics were the sequential/non-sequential and fixed/variable pairs; and his social aspect tactics included the serial/disjunctive and investiture/divestiture sets. Jones further classified the strategies as either institutionalized (collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial and investiture) or individualized (individual, informal, non-sequential, variable, disjunctive and divestiture).

The current research does not support this classification scheme. Investiture here seems to reflect the quality of the interpersonal relationships found in the organization between newcomers and established members, and seems to be separate and distinct from the unit/batch dichotomy. It is conceivable that this result reflects the fact that newcomers can psychologically separate the mechanical processes of socialization from the emotional or interpersonal dynamics of the experience, or more simply, the difference between their "initiation to the task" and their "initiation to the group" (Feldman, 1977).

The above discussion suggests it might be possible to construct a framework which displays the different types of socialization strategies by organizational or job type. Such a matrix appears in Figure 4-1.

As suggested earlier, it is not always possible to neatly classify an organization given the complexities present. It is useful, however, to speculate in a general manner how various organizational types might be assigned. These assignments are, as indicated, speculative and were derived from both the strategy mean scores for each organization (reported in Table 2-10) and from the researcher's knowledge of the nature of the organizational activities and structures. For example, the data in the current research suggests that the military unit fits best in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investiture</th>
<th>Batch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Facility</td>
<td>Billing Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Military Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-1**
Organizational Categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investiture</th>
<th>Batch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-2**
Job Categorization
the batch/divestiture cell since the respondents report a process that is somewhat formal, collective, fixed, sequential and serial in content. Furthermore, the process was marked by relatively high levels of divestiture. This result is consistent with what we know about the nature of military basic training (Bourne, 1967; Horner, 1979; Ilgen & Seely, 1974). Bourne reports that the socialization strategy used by the military during recruit training includes an attempt to strip away the newcomers' identity and to replace it with a new one (Bourne, 1967). Furthermore, Bourne (1967) suggests that the new recruit is made to feel like an outsider and is constantly reminded that the skills they arrived with are of no value to the army. These actions are the essence of a divestiture strategy.

The billing service and the utility seem to fall into the batch/investiture quadrant because the processes reported here were again relatively formal, collective, fixed, sequential and serial. There is some basis for this cell assignment when one considers the size and nature of activities of these two locations. The utility, for example, was the largest site in the sample and together with the billing service accounted for the largest proportion of clerical functions. Given the number of employees undergoing socialization at any one time, it makes sense that a collective, standardized process would be employed. In this quadrant, the investiture tactic seems to be more prevalent. This may reflect a concerted effort on the part of the subject organizations to match the socialization process to the social demands of their tasks (i.e., friendly service to the public and to clients).

The unit/investiture cell seems to be the appropriate categorization for the health care facility since the respondents generally reported a
process that was informal, individual, variable, non-sequential and disjunctive. A relatively high level of investiture was also present. Relatively well-trained professional and technical workers have already received extensive "anticipatory socialization" prior to entry into the organization. Thus, divesting socialization processes, to the extent needed, have already taken place. Moreover, the unit strategy may be used more frequently because fewer employees are hired at any one time, and employees need to learn how to function autonomously early in their organizational career.

It is also possible to explore cell assignment by job category. In order to simplify this process, the sample job categories were combined into three major classifications: managerial, technical and clerical. Once again the cell assignments were made based partly on the strategy mean scores (reported in Table 2-12) and partly on the knowledge of the researcher of the organizations' structures and activities.

The data suggest that managerial tasks fit in the unit/investiture cell. Typically, managers are socialized in an informal, individual, variable, non-sequential and disjunctive manner. This is consistent with what Bray et al. (1974) found in their study of AT&T managers. Bray et al. (1974) found no uniform set of procedures used in socialization of newly hired managers. The responsibility for the process varied from department to department and the major means of socialization was job rotation throughout the organization. The level of investiture reflects the criticality of the social dimension of these positions. Schacter (1959) suggests that as the newcomer seeks to live up to expectations, they become more affiliative and begin to identify with significant others who can furnish guidance and reassurance. Schein (1971) suggests
that it is through interaction with veteran managers that recruits absorb the subtleties of organizational culture and climate.

Clerical jobs seem appropriate for the batch/investiture cell because they typically reflect a formal, collective, fixed, sequential and serial process. Again, this is consistent with what one would expect when the socialization process is involved with a large number of recruits performing relatively routine tasks. Organizations employing large numbers of clerical employees are typically faced with the task of socializing large numbers of new recruits. Often, turnover is high in these clerical, entry-level positions and the replacement process is almost continuous. It makes sense, then, that the organization would attempt to "streamline" the socialization process as much as possible in order to minimize costs. A batch strategy allows the organization to "package" its socialization process thereby standardizing the process and reducing costs per employee.

The technical classification appears to fit in the batch/divestiture quadrant. This classification is somewhat tenuous. Schein (1964, 1968) has reported the widespread use of debasing or upending experiences that are encountered in professional training programs. They may be used to make even well-educated workers cautious, and to reduce any cockiness which might have developed in school.

It is important to note that in both the organizational assignment and the job categorizations, one cell remained empty. The unit/divestiture cell was vacant in both cases. This makes some intuitive sense since it is highly unlikely that one would encounter this strategy set in an organization. Since the unit strategy is more labor-intensive from the organization's point of view, it is unlikely that it would be
consciously coupled with a strategy of divestiture. In the individualized socialization of a manager, it would be inconsistent and socially awkward, in light of the close one-on-one relationship, to include experiences that are debasing or upending (Schein, 1968). This would be contrary to the nature of the relationship typically found in a "mentoring" type of partnership.

It is also possible to speculate that one might find a unit/divestiture strategy used following another of the other strategy sets. For example, Van Maanen (1976b) describes the transition from new recruit to rookie policemen. The police academy could be viewed as involving a batch/divestiture strategy but, upon completion, the recruit moves to an apprentice program (e.g., rookie cop paired with a veteran) that could be categorized as unit/divestiture. A similar situation occurs in the military when an individual completes recruit training (batch/divestiture) and enters into specialized advanced training, e.g., Green Beret (unit/divestiture).

Relationships Between the People Processing Strategies and Attitudinal Outcomes

A second major objective of this research was to determine the extent of the impact of the people processing strategies on various attitudinal measures. The results of the research provided evidence for the conclusion that there is a systematic pattern of relationships between the processing strategies and the attitudinal variables measured. The "batch" process or set of strategies resulted in consistently higher positive responses on the attitudinal measures than the "unit" strategies. This is a somewhat unexpected result.

Intuitively, one might expect a "unit" or individualized process to elicit a relatively more positive attitudinal response due to the
dependency of the newcomer. For example, Bourne (1967) studied the socialization process that occurs during Army basic training and discusses the effects of the immediate environmental shock of training. He suggests the typical recruit response to this highly individualized activity as one of dazed apathy. The recruits, as a result, become very dependent upon those in positions of authority. Van Maanen suggests that "a person undergoing formal socialization is likely to feel isolated, cutoff, and prohibited from assuming everyday social relationships with his more experienced 'betters'" (1978, p. 23). Another hypothesized reason for this relationship is the suggestion that newcomers experiencing unit socialization may also be relatively malleable because they are alone and therefore feel especially vulnerable to group pressure (Heiss & Nash, 1967; Walker, 1973).

Further arguments for the contention that "unit" socialization processes should result in stronger affect towards the organization are offered by Van Maanen and Schein (1979). Van Maanen and Schein, citing the work of Burke (1950), suggest that individual strategies "can result in deep individual changes, 'secular conversion,' but they are lonely changes and are dependent solely upon the particular relationship which exists between agent and recruit" (1979, p. 234). They further argue that "outcomes in these one-on-one efforts are dependent primarily upon the affective relationships which may or may not develop between the apprentice and master" (1979, p. 234). As Caplow (1964) notes, this one-on-one practice is prevalent especially in higher levels of bureaucratic organizations where the person designated to conduct the socialization process becomes a role model for the recruit. One can assume that the relationship, especially at higher levels, will be intended to foster...
high affect and consequently a stronger affinity not only for the role model but for the organization as well.

However, in this research, being afforded individualized attention did not result in a closer affinity for the organization. The data suggests that the opposite response occurs. One could hypothesize that the "specialness" is overshadowed by heightened levels of anxiety and ambiguity resulting from less structured programs. For example, the absence of a role model or close contact with others undergoing the same experience may serve to increase the levels of tension the individual experiences in the new and novel situation.

The positive impact of the "batch" strategy can also be explained when we examine the process in conjunction with work group adjustment. Feldman (1988) suggests the importance of social adjustment for new recruits in three areas: as a source of social support, as a source of work information and direction, and as "a framework for understanding all the seemingly disparate pieces of information they are receiving" (1988, p. 91). The outcomes, then, of a batch strategy include a source of stress reduction (Feldman & Brett, 1983), performance feedback and role modeling (Hackman, 1976; Weiss, 1977), and as a source of "sense-making" (Louis, 1980). The data suggests that the "batch" approach might provide the organization with the capability to favorably impact the levels of tension and anxiety associated with the socialization experience. The more structured "batch" approach appears to lessen the ambiguity and uncertainty experienced as suggested by the relatively higher scores on the attitudinal outcomes.

A further distinction to be considered is the differential effects of the investiture and divestiture strategies. The results of the
research suggest that an investiture strategy results in higher or more favorable responses on the attitudinal outcomes. The divestiture tactic appears to result in a lowering of job-related attitudes. This is consistent with what one would expect given the nature of each strategy, and with previous research (Jones, 1986). An investiture strategy reinforces the value of the contribution of the newcomer and therefore serves to validate the self-image of the individual. This is reflected by the relatively higher scores in the areas of management trust, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and mutual influence. Tension and anxiety associated with the new position also seem to be favorably impacted.

The divestiture strategy, on the other hand, seems to disconfirm the value of the individual. A divestiture strategy not only strips away the old identity of the newcomer, but constantly denigrates the self esteem of the individual, resulting in a lowering of scores in areas such as management trust, job satisfaction and job involvement. Furthermore, job tension appears to increase with the use of the divestiture tactic.

Methodological Issues

The conduct of research in the area of organizational socialization has been, and continues to be, marked by certain methodological problems. These problem areas include issues related to research design, sample selection and data collection techniques (Feldman, 1988; Fisher, 1986).

The design issue has centered on the almost exclusive use of cross-sectional designs to assess what is, in reality, a longitudinal process. The dynamic nature of the socialization process is demonstrated by the many "stage" or "phase" models. The current research focused on one stage of the process, the "breaking in" stage, in its cross-sectional
approach. Obviously, it would have been far more complex but potentially more informative to have tracked the subjects through several steps of the process. This was not done in the current study but provides a direction and objectives for further longitudinal research. Some of the results found in the current study may be attributable to other factors.

The second methodology issue involves the selection of the sample of subjects. Subject selection has been narrow and generally restricted to a limited type or category of employee. Frequently, research has focused on samples comprised of police, military, nursing, engineers and students (Fisher, 1986). Little research has been directed at several occupational categories across several organizations. The current research sought to increase the scope of the inquiry by including several job categories and several different organization types. As noted in Chapter 2, the organizations examined included a utility, a medical clinic, a military unit and a clerical organization. This diversity of organizations provided the researcher with a wide range of job types and occupational categories ranging from blue-collar, clerical to upper level management. Several professional and technical classifications were also included in the pool of subjects. However, non-comparable samples to previous research may account for some of the new results in this study.

Another area of concern is the potential confounding that occurs when one is unable to clearly distinguish between socialization to a profession versus socialization to a particular organization. This would include the ability to assess the impact of "anticipatory socialization" experiences, e.g., educational institutions, and their relationship with the socialization efforts of the employing organization. As noted by Fisher, "the occupational socialization variable is confounded with both
post-hire socialization experiences (master's degree engineers are likely to be assigned different job activities and colleagues than Ph.D. scientists) and possible preexisting value differences which led individuals to choose one type of educational program over another" (1986, pp. 103-104).

Data collection techniques comprise the third problem in methodology encountered in socialization research. As Fisher (1986) has pointed out, with a few notable exceptions (Schein, 1978; Van Maanen, 1978, 1975; Feldman & Brett, 1983), the majority of the empirical approaches to the study of socialization have relied solely upon self-report questionnaire data with the inherent problems of reliability and validity (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). The current research also utilized self-report questionnaires for data collection. Nunnally suggests "self-report measures of attitudes are limited to what individuals know about their attitudes and are willing to relate" (1978, p. 591) and further argues "the validity of a self-report measure depends upon how results are interpreted" (1978, p. 392).

Additionally, an important issue which should be addressed is that of the differences in perception between what recruits experience and what organizations say they provide. It is reasonable to suggest that what the newcomer reports to have occurred during their socialization may be fundamentally different than that intended by the organization. It is clear that individuals behave in response to their perceptions, whether reflecting "objective" reality or not. In order to identify any perceptual differences, it would be necessary to assess the process from several different perspectives, i.e., a comparison of employee assessments with those of supervisors and managers.
Further research in this area also requires an approach that
incorporates several data collection techniques used simultaneously.
Composite or multi-method approaches may provide the best approach for
dealing with this concern (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). Several researchers
have effectively utilized this type of approach (Schein, 1978; Feldman,
1976; Van Maanen, 1975). Innovative data collection approaches will help
to enhance the reliability of research in the area of organizational
socialization.

Another methodological issue present in the current research
concerns the use of attitudinal measures versus behaviors. As Fisher
points out "certainly behavior is more visible than attitudes, and is
thus more likely to provoke influence attempts from others. However, few
studies have attempted to document behavior change during socialization"
(1986, pp. 108-109). This is an area that requires further attention
because of the significance of the impact of individual behavior in the
organizational setting. For example, the specific relationships between
the strategy sets and levels of involvement and commitment have
significant implications for the organization. The linkage between
levels of job involvement and commitment and subsequent turnover and
absenteeism have been well documented (Blau & Boal, 1987; Youngblood,
Mobley & Meglino, 1983; Blau, 1986; Farrell & Petersen, 1984). The costs
associated with high levels of turnover and absenteeism continue to be a
concern of organizational management and provide greater impetus for
achieving a "good match."

When one relies upon retrospective data, as was the case in the
assessment of the processing strategies, other threats to validity must
be considered. The subjects were asked to recall how they felt during
the first few weeks on the job. For some subjects, this was a fairly recent event while for others the time since entry was far longer. The longer the time since entry, the more opportunities for response distortion. Campbell and Stanley suggest that one "should be careful to note that the probable direction of memory bias is to distort the past attitudes into agreement with present ones, or into agreement with what the tenant has come to believe to be socially desirable attitudes" (1966, p. 66). The current condition of the employment relationship may have distorted or "flavored" the recall of the subject. Nunnally has addressed the problem of self-knowledge or recall by suggesting

there is some selective 'forgetting' of one's own actions and the ways in which other people have responded to us, and those memories that remain active frequently are reshaped in one way or another. To the extent that questionnaire items concern typical behavior over a long period of time or behavior in an earlier stage of life, individuals may be deficient in self-knowledge purely because they cannot accurately recall how they performed and how other people responded to them. (1978, p. 665)

A final methodological issue requiring attention is the relationships between the variables. The results of the analysis suggest a relatively high degree of multicollinearity present among both the independent and the attitudinal variables. Belsley, Kuh and Welsch define the condition of multicollinearity as existing with more than two variates when "there is a high multiple correlation when one of the variates is regressed on the others" (1980, p. 86). Although the specificity of the patterns are somewhat ambiguous, there appears to be some evidence for two patterns of relationships in the independent variables: "unit" and "batch." The data suggests one pattern of relationships among the attitudinal outcomes that might be representative of the work itself while another pattern is suggestive of factors related
to social aspects of the work environment. It is not totally clear at this point if the multicollinearity is due to theoretical considerations or due to the methods employed in the research. Further research is required to address the problem of multicollinearity.

**Organizational Implications**

When one considers the emphasis placed on formal socialization programs by organizations (Zenke, 1982) it becomes apparent that it is important and potentially beneficial for the organization to fully understand the objectives of its socialization program. It is imperative that the processing strategies employed by the organization are supportive of and consistent with the outcomes sought.

It is feasible at this point to begin to speculate on the various organizational objectives which may direct the utilization of one or the other strategy sets. Van Maanen and Schein suggest that "individual socialization processes are most likely to be associated with complex roles" and where "there are relatively few incumbents compared to many aspirants for a given role and when a collective identity among recruits is viewed as less important than the recruits' learning of the operational specifics of the given role" (1979, p. 234). Van Maanen and Schein further suggest that collective socialization programs are usually found in organizations where there are a large number of recruits to be processed into the same organizationally defined role; where the content of this role can be fairly clearly specified; and, where the organization desires to build a collective sense of identity, solidarity, and loyalty within the cohort group being socialized. (1979, pp. 234-235)

The above considerations suggest some specific steps that should be undertaken by organizations to enhance the effectiveness of their socialization programs. These are as follows:
Identification of Objectives

The organization should clearly delineate the types of outcomes it seeks in terms of employee attitudes and behaviors. In other words, what are the objectives the organization seeks to achieve with its socialization program? It is clear at this point that differential strategies result in different responses on the part of the individual experiencing the process. The organization, then, has within its powers the ability to "tailor" its people processing strategies to obtain the types of outcomes it seeks. This is a major consideration in light of the consequences of the various attitudinal outcomes. For example, is innovative behavior sought or is it more important to build high levels of conformity? The answer to this question would dictate whether investiture or divestiture is more appropriate.

Identification of Current Strategies

The organization should take steps to identify the current strategy or set of strategies that it employs in its socialization process. As was noted earlier, it is imperative that organizational management clearly know the strategies they are employing to socialize their employees. Equally important, management needs to be aware of the perceptions of employees as they undergo the socialization program. This might be accomplished by obtaining perceptions not only from employees themselves, but also from the human resource managers and those in line positions. It would then be possible to identify any differences in perception, and the reasons for those differences.

Design of Socialization Program to Achieve Objectives

Once the organization has specified its objectives and determined the types of processing strategies employed, it is possible to redesign
the process if required to bring it more in line with the objectives. This becomes a much more complex issue if the organization is concerned with differential responses across different job categories or departments. The more complex the occupational make-up of the organization, the more difficult it becomes to administer the socialization program. An analysis should be conducted to determine the appropriate level of complexity for the organizational socialization program.

The current research and other research on Van Maanen's typology (Jones, 1986) suggests the possibility of the development of a "fit" model (Feldman, forthcoming) that could be utilized to develop organizational socialization programs. Such a model would allow the organization to predict the outcomes that may occur given a specific set of processing strategies and to design their program to obtain desired outcomes.

An appropriate application of the results of the current study may be found in the work of Schuler and Jackson (1987). Schuler and Jackson suggest a model for linking the competitive strategies of organizations with the practices of human resource management. They specifically identify three competitive strategies: innovation, quality enhancement, and cost reduction. Linked with each of these strategies are specific employee role behaviors. For example, the innovative strategy requires a high degree of creative behavior, a relatively high level of cooperative, interdependent behavior and a high tolerance of ambiguity and unpredictability. These behavioral requirements would suggest that a unit/investiture strategy set might be appropriate since this tactic seems to encourage creative behavior while at the same time requiring the
individual to be tolerant of the ambiguity and unpredictability associated with an individualized socialization process.

The quality enhancement and cost reduction strategies require relatively repetitive and predictable behavior, a moderate amount of cooperative, interdependent behavior and commitment to the goals of the organization. One might expect these behavioral responses where a batch/investiture strategy is employed. The batch approach appears to be suited to activities requiring routine, repetitive behaviors.

The batch strategy, therefore, provides the basis for the development of stable, predictable behavior reinforced by an environment of investiture or social support. Investiture provides an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect resulting in a potentially stronger commitment to the organization and, subsequently, loyalty to the organizational goals.

The above relationships or assignments are speculative, and in need of further research, but they do suggest the practical application of the results of this research. The findings also suggest that a major reevaluation of the value of formal socialization programs needs to be conducted. Organizations should question whether their current socialization processes are contributing to the objectives sought or are resulting in outcomes that are contrary to expectations.

When the consequences of early organization experiences are considered in terms of performance, satisfaction, and productivity, the importance of successfully managing the people processing strategies becomes clear. The current research provides a step in the direction of enabling the organization to achieve the outcomes it desires in the management of its employee socialization program. This research provides
organizations with a framework to design their socialization programs to accomplish their personnel objectives. Furthermore, it allows the organization the opportunity to influence the outcomes it desires rather than reacting to the consequences of haphazard people processing.
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This questionnaire is part of a research project on the ways people become oriented to their jobs. On the following pages, you will find three sets of questions:

-- Part I deals with how you felt when you first started your job.

-- Part II deals with how you feel about your job at the present time.

-- Part III asks for some basic information about you and the type of work you do.

Please answer each question. It will take only about 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

All individual answers will be kept completely confidential. Please answer each item as honestly and candidly as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Gene Baker, Instructor
University of North Florida
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APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART I & PART II
Instructions for Part I

Below are several statements that may or may not reflect how you felt about your job the first few weeks on the job.

Using the scale below please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Indicate your feelings about each statement by writing the number which best reflects your feeling in the space to the left of each statement.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ 1. I saw a clear pattern in the way one early job assignment led to another.

___ 2. The steps in my career track were clearly spelled out to me.

___ 3. The way in which my progress through this organization would follow a fixed order of events was made clear to me.

___ 4. During the first few weeks, I was largely involved with other new employees in common training activities.

___ 5. In the beginning, I was moved from job to job to build up experience and a track record.

___ 6. Almost all of my co-workers were helpful to me.

___ 7. I had a good idea of the time it would take me to go through the various stages of the training process.

___ 8. Most of my knowledge of what might happen to me in the future came informally, through the grapevine, rather than through regular channels.

___ 9. Each stage of the training process built upon the job knowledge gained during the previous stages of the training process.

___ 10. I was generally left alone to discover what my job duties should be in this organization.

___ 11. I went through a set of training experiences which were specifically designed to give me and the other new people a complete knowledge of job related skills.

___ 12. I was very aware that I was seen as "learning the ropes" by my more senior co-workers.

___ 13. This organization did not put new employees through a recognizable training program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Much of my job knowledge was gained informally on a trial and error basis.
15. My co-workers went out of their way to help me adjust to this organization.
16. This organization puts all new employees through the same set of learning experiences.
17. Most of my training was carried out separately from other new employees.
18. I was made to feel that my skills and abilities were very important to this organization.
19. I felt that experienced employees held me at a distance until I conformed to their expectations.
20. Experienced employees saw advising or training me and other new employees as one of their main job duties.
21. During my training for this job I was normally physically separated from my regular work group.
22. I had little or no access to people who had previously performed my job.
23. There was a feeling of "being in the same boat" among other new employees.
24. I had to change my attitudes and values to be accepted in this organization.
25. I could predict my future career path in this organization by observing what happened to other employees.
26. I gained a clear understanding of my job duties from observing my senior co-workers.
27. I received little guidance from experienced employees as to how I should perform my job.
28. I did not do any of my usual job duties until I was completely familiar with department procedures and methods.
29. Other new employees were very helpful in my learning my job duties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ 30. I had little idea when I was going to get my next job assignment or training assignment.
Instructions for Part II

Below are several statements that may or may not reflect how you feel about your job at the present time. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements. Indicate your feelings about each statement by writing the number which best reflects your feeling in the space to the left of each statement. Remember, these statements are about how you feel about your job at the present time.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ 31. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.

____ 32. I often "take my job home with me" in the sense that I think about it when doing other things.

____ 33. Any suggestions I may have for improving the way things are done here would probably receive favorable consideration by my superiors.

____ 34. Most people on this job feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when they do the job well.

____ 35. My opinion of myself goes up when I do this job well.

____ 36. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.

____ 37. If I had a different job, my health would probably improve.

____ 38. The most important things that happen to me involve my work.

____ 39. I can trust the people I work with to lend me a hand if I need it.

____ 40. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.

____ 41. I'm really a perfectionist about my work.

____ 42. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.

____ 43. My job tends to directly affect my health.

____ 44. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.

____ 45. I have felt nervous before attending meetings in the company.

____ 46. I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.
48. If I had an idea about improving the way work was done in this department, I doubt I could get action on it.
49. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.
50. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.
51. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
52. I live, eat and breathe my job.
53. Most of my co-workers can be relied upon to do as they say they will do.
54. For me this is the best of all possible organizations in which to work.
55. I feel quite confident that the firm will always try to treat me fairly.
56. I feel I have a lot of influence in my unit.
57. I really care about the fate of this organization.
58. Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night.
59. I am very much involved personally in my work.
60. Management at my firm is sincere in its attempt to meet the worker's point of view.
61. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined.
62. I have a lot of opportunities to influence the way things are done here in my organization.
63. People on this job often think of quitting.
64. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
65. Most people on this job are very satisfied with the job.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. Most people on this job feel bad or unhappy when they find they have performed the work poorly.

67. I work under a great deal of tension.

68. If I got into difficulties at work I know my co-workers would try and help me out.

69. Most things in life are more important than work.

70. My own feelings generally are not affected much one way or the other by how well I do on this job.

71. I frequently think of quitting this job.

72. Our management would be quite prepared to gain advantage by deceiving the workers.

73. I feel bad and unhappy when I discover that I have performed poorly on this job.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART III (ALPHA UTILITY)
Instructions for Part III

The questions below will be used to help categorize the responses to the questions in Parts I and II.

1. Please indicate below the one category which most closely reflects the type of work you do.

   ____ Clerical (i.e., mail operation, files, secretarial)
   ____ Sales
   ____ Technical (i.e., Enclosing, Telemarketing, Shareowner Services)
   ____ Para-Legal (i.e., Account Representation)
   ____ Support Staff (i.e., Accounting, Medical Staff, HRD, Security)
   ____ Maintenance (i.e., facility maintenance, groundskeeping)
   ____ Management (i.e., Team Manager, Director, Project Leader)

2. How long have you been employed by Alpha Utility?

   ____________ & ____________
   years     months

3. How long have you been in your present position?

   ____________ & ____________
   years     months

4. How old were you on your last birthday?

   ____ less than 25
   ____ 25-34
   ____ 35-44
   ____ 45-55
   ____ more than 55

5. Are you ________?
   Male       Female

6. Are you ________?
   Full-time   Part-time
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART III (BETA NAVAL SQUADRON)
Beta Naval Squadron

Instructions for Part III

The questions below will be used to help categorize the responses to the questions in Parts I and II.

1. Please indicate below the one category which most closely reflects the type of work you do.
   - Air Crew (Pilot, Co-Pilot, ASW)
   - Technical (Maintenance)
   - Clerical
   - Management (Supervisor, Department Head, Section Head)

2. How long have you been in the Navy?
   
   
   
   
   
   
   

3. How long have you been in your present unit?

   
   
   

4. How old were you on your last birthday?

   - less than 25
   - 25-34
   - 35-44
   - 45-55
   - more than 55

5. Are you Male Female?

6. Are you Officer Enlisted?
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART III (GAMMA BILLING SERVICE)
Gamma Billing Service

Instructions for Part III

The questions below will be used to help categorize the responses to the questions in Parts I and II.

1. Please indicate below the one category which most closely reflects the type of work you do.
   _____ Clerical
   _____ Secretarial
   _____ Supervisory
   _____ Management

2. How long have you been employed by this organization?
   __________ & __________
   years & months

3. How long have you been in your present position?
   __________ & __________
   years & months

4. How old were you on your last birthday?
   _____ less than 25
   _____ 25-34
   _____ 35-44
   _____ 45-55
   _____ more than 55

5. Are you _____?  
   Male   Female

6. Are you _____?  
   Full-time   Part-time
APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART III (DELTA CLINIC)
Instructions for Part III

The questions below will be used to help categorize the responses to the questions in Parts I and II.

74. Please indicate the category below which most closely reflects the type of work you do.
   1. Clerical (i.e., Office Support, Secretarial, File, Medical Records)
   2. Nursing (i.e., RN, LPN, Instructor)
   3. Technical (i.e., Medical Technologist, X-Ray)
   4. Service (i.e., Housekeeping, Cashiers, Dietary, Janitorial)
   5. Physician
   6. Maintenance (i.e., General labor, repairs, physical facility upkeep, building maintenance)
   7. Management (i.e., Supervisor, Department Head)

75. How long have you been employed by this organization?
   76. ___ years & ___ months

77. How long have you been in your present position?
   78. ___ years & ___ months

79. How old were you on your last birthday?
   1. less than 25
   2. 25-34
   3. 35-44
   4. 45-55
   5. more than 55

80. Are you ____?
   1. Male
   2. Female

81. Are you ____?
   1. Full-time
   2. Part-time
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