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ABSTRACT

Two issues generated this study: (1) the changing nature of the Navy's Human Resource Management Support System both in regard to ideology and structure; and (2) concern from various sectors over what is perceived to be the likely Equal Opportunity Structure in light of system changes. Through the use of interviews, archival data, and subjective evaluation, the impact of the socialization phenomenon is analyzed using the three stage model of socialization. The process of Organizational Socialization is examined strategically.

Attention is also directed to these specific organizational boundaries crossed by persons when acquiring a new work role. An underlying theme of the study is simply that what people learn about their work roles in organizations is often a direct result of how they learn it. Given that the present Navy Equal Opportunity Policy calls for Command-specific and Command-managed E.O. programs, this study concludes with considerations that could be criteria for selection of specific organization Development interventions which will enhance Equal Opportunity objectives at a command level.

These criteria are focused around the organization's concerns for operational readiness and the individual's need for self-esteem and a positive self-image.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

During the decades of the sixties and seventies the Navy, as did its sister services the Army and the Air Force, experienced social upheaval and strife. Much has been written on the subject, the majority of which attempts to link racial and political unrest on the domestic scene with what was happening in the military. The author has often found this association to be limiting in regards to problem definition misleading in terms of formulating a problem solving strategy. Whereas, it is not held that incidents aboard Navy vessels were necessarily isolated, it is hard to accept that they were somehow linked to some national conspiracy spurred on by Civil Rights advocates. The changing nature of the Navy's Human Resource Management Support System (HRMSS) both in regard to ideology and structure, and concern from various sectors over what is perceived to be the likely Equal Opportunity Structure in light of system changes are the major focus of this study. The early history of the Navy's E.O. program was to create a better understanding among individual service members, and understanding, if you will, of personal worth and racial dignity. The training itself speaks to the way individuals are socialized into the Navy or a perceived lack of socialization.
Today the Equal Opportunity (E.O.) program essentially focuses in on recruitment goals, borrowing from the strategies employed in the Civilian sector, and on monitoring of numbers which when viewed with an E.O. perspective would suggest the absence of equitable treatment of minority groups. Not every base or ship Commanding Officer is in a position to affect system changes through recruitment strategies alone. The current business literature on social responsibility and organizational effectiveness directs the Chief Executive Officer to place emphasis on environmental changes which have significant effect on operational experiences. It stands to reason that initiatives which proport to benefit some are a poor second choice to these actions having far more reaching affect. Organizational culture as a collective whole is the underlying theme to research done in the socialization functions of most organizations. It is that process which lay benefit to the Navy in particular and to all organizations in general that appears to have the best perceived resulting effects, and it is an examination of that process as an Organization Development intervention which enhances Equal Opportunity (E.O.) that this author explores for systems application.

B. PURPOSE

There are two issues which generated the interest in this study: (a) the changing nature of the Navy's HRM support
system both in regard to ideology and structure; (b) concern from various sectors over what is perceived to be a dilution of effort for Equal Opportunity program initiatives. Much of this concern is voiced on the part of those who are accustomed to the familiar workshops or incident reports as a standard of an effective E.O. program. Whereas the verdict is still out on whether awareness training results in a more effective leader in E.O. related situations, most program specialists agree that in the absence of some normative data incident reports in and of themselves neither confirm or refute the existence of an effective E.O. program. There exist in the Navy today two contrasting views, philosophies with regard to Equal Opportunity. The first of these contrasting views can be articulated as E.O. being a special interest item of the Chief of Naval Operations and as such requires an elaborate reporting system and people principally employed as advisors or fire fighters. The conveyed philosophy, given this approach, is often perceived as punitive in nature with sanctions for poor performance and no rewards for having done a good job.

The second of these views can be stated as simply good leadership. To do for everyone that which results in effective and efficient resource development and utilization. The conveyed philosophy in this instance is E.O. which has no sex or color distinction. In truth most Navy commands and activities find themselves in practice somewhere between the two. The initial task was to determine to what degree are these views
held by those in a position to set Navy policy in Equal
Opportunity program matters and to determine an appropriate
organizational structure which has the highest potential for
success.

Yet still another facet of the research should speak to
what is appropriate based on the different needs of individuals
and organizational properties.
II. NATURE OF A SYSTEM WIDE APPROACH

A. ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

By definition Organization Development is planned change. It is a systematic top down approach, utilizing techniques and knowledge derived from the social sciences. Change in this instance refers to behavior which is pre-determined and measurable. Organization Development interventions which enhance Equal Opportunity by definition have system wide implications and effects. The basic doctrine of form following function, describe the tenents by which organizations derive focus for E.O., i.e., recruitment strategies, ROTC programs on predominately Black college campuses, minority affair programs and the like. Many studies have been undertaken to arrive at statistical or heuristic measures of what a "good" Equal Opportunity program should contain, feel and produce. Environmental factors with respect to social economic status of Blacks and other minorities are often examined for comparative purposes, and these same measures used in exactly the same manner of comparison of the Navy to its sister Services, and have been the impetus for establishing recruiting goals and demographic tracking requirements. To acknowledge that changes in the broader psycho-sphere of American society, of which the military is a microcosm is taking place is no easy statement to make. Change in an empirical sense is often
difficult and frustrating to measure, and is a function of an individual perception of time as an entity. What one person sees as quick is perceived by another as unduly slow. Such thinking suggests a cause and effect relationship of time and Equal Opportunity program success and begs the harder question of measurable indices. Granted that such undertakings are possible they far exceed the scope and purpose of this study. On a more pragmatic level research into the Socialization process of organizations seems to suggest alternatives which offer a greater payoff in operational readiness and organizational member satisfaction.

B. THE SOCIALIZATION PROCESS

What is it about the ways organizations recruit, select, and develop employees that makes some new recruits feel competent and others helpless, makes some feel effective as good organization members and others feel isolated and rejected, makes some workers passive observers and others active contributors to organization success? These are the basic questions in the study of the ways by which employees are transformed from total company outsiders to participating and effective corporate members.

Daniel Feldman's research as part of a doctoral dissertation presented to Yale University Graduate School identified four sets of questions germane in the Socialization process:
1. What happens to individuals as they enter organizations and adjust to new work assignments? What are the indicators of good socialization experiences?

2. What are the results, or consequences, of socialization programs? What aspects of socialization programs most influence these results? What are the differences in outcomes between the socialization experiences of professionals, paraprofessionals, and nonprofessional workers?

3. What are the specific practices and policies that organizations can follow at each stage of socialization to make the process easier, quicker, and more effective for employees?

4. What are the general implications of this research for the use and design of organizational socialization programs?

There seem to be three distinct stages that employees go through as they adjust to new jobs in organizations (Feldman, 1976). The socialization process begins even before employees enter the organization. Stage I: "Getting IN", is typified by two indicators:

1. **Realism:** The more realistically a person portrays himself or herself to the organization, and the more realistically the organization portrays itself to the person, the more likely it is that the person
will be hired for a job for which they are well suited and that they will receive the type and amount of training they need. A study of appointments to West Point, for example, found that those who receive a booklet realistically portraying life at the military academy were more likely to accept appointments to the academy and to survive the first year than were those who had received no booklet. Similarly, John Wanous found that realistic job previews for telephone operators resulted in higher job satisfaction and greater job survival without reducing the flow of minority qualified applicants.

2. **Congruence:** It is important, too, that people have the skills necessary to do the jobs that organizations need them to perform and that the jobs the organization provides can satisfy individual needs and preferences. If this congruence of individual needs and skills with organizational demands can be achieved, we can expect greater general satisfaction and work motivation on the part of individuals and longer job tenure for new recruits as well.

During the second stage of the socialization process, the "breaking in" stage, the employee actually enters the organization and attempts to become a participating member of his
own group. There are four major activities of employees at this stage:

1. **Acceptance**: The more accepted a new recruit feels, the more he or she will feel trusted and be trusted by other group members. They will also be more likely to receive evaluative and informal information that will help them both in doing their job and in interacting with other organization members. Feelings of lack of acceptance at work impacts heavily on an employee's sense of self-worth.

2. **Competence**: Employees need to feel self-confident and skilled, both to bolster self-esteem and to begin a "benign circle of development," writes M.B. Smith. Launched on the right trajectory, the person is likely to accumulate successes that strengthen the effectiveness of their orientation toward the world, while at the same time they acquire the knowledge and skills that make their further success more probable. Off to a bad start, on the other hand, they soon encounter failures that make them hesitate to try. They fall increasingly behind their fellows in acquiring the knowledge and skills that are needed on these occasions when they do try.

3. **Role Definition**: The more the individual employee can set their own priorities and allocate time
the way they would like among the jobs they have to do, the more satisfied the employees will be. When supervisors are responsive to negotiating job descriptions and assignments with employees, employees report feeling more committed to doing high-quality work and having positive feelings about supervisors and co-workers. Moreover, as Edgar Scheire points out, it is healthy for individuals to question some of the demands put on them during socialization. When an employee accepts all the behavioral demands and values of supervisors, he "curbs his creativity and thereby moves the organization toward a sterile form of bureaucracy." Organizations should demand that employees accept only those behaviors and values that are crucial to the accomplishment of organizational goals, and should allow employees some freedom to be independent and resourceful.

4. **Congruence of Evaluation:** Employers and employees should also be able to come to some agreement over the individual employee's performance evaluation and his or her success in the organization. If an employee feels that they are progressing well and a significant number of their peers agree with their evaluation, then the employee is likely to continue in their work with feelings of satisfaction
and self-esteem. If, however, they feel that they have performed well, but others feel they have not, they will continue behaving in inappropriate ways and will be less likely to continue satisfactorily in their job. Unless the individual employee received feedback soon enough to correct his or her perceptions and behaviors and/or gets additional help or training, retention prospects in the organization are poor.

Once an employee has entered an organization and comes to some tentative resolution of adjustment problems in his or her group, he or she needs to resolve two types of conflicts. The first is a conflict between work life and home life (Wanous, 1980). Work and home can come into conflict over the employee's schedule (for example, both the numbers of hours worked and when they are scheduled, vacation time, days off), the demands on the employee's family, and the effect of the job on the quality of home life (for example, amount of worry and pre-occupation associated with work, demands on the family for emotional support, etc.). The second set of conflicts that the employee needs to deal with are conflicts between his or her work group and other work groups in the organization (Wanous, 1980). Different groups in the organization, i.e., other departments or divisions, superiors further up the organization hierarchy, etc. may have very different expectations of the employee from those his or her work group has of him or her.
C. GROUP DYNAMICS

As noted by Alderfer in his recent study, a group in organizations may be defined as a collection of individuals:
(1) who have significantly interdependent relations with each other, (2) who perceive themselves as a group by reliably distinguishing members from non-member, (3) whose group identity is recognized by non-members, (4) who have differentiated roles in the group as a function of expectations from themselves, other group members, and non-members, and (5) who, as group members acting alone or in concert, have significantly interdependent relations with other groups (Alderfer, 1980; 230).

Members of organization groups are assigned similar primary tasks or share equivalent levels of responsibility. On the other hand, identity group members share common biological characteristics, participate in equivalent historical experiences, and, as a result, have similar world views.

From this we see that there are at least two groups with which any member of an organization will be a member: his or her organization group and his or her identity group. It goes almost without saying that each person is simultaneously a member of all of his or her identity groups and at the same time all of her or his organization groups (Louis, 1980). The group he or she represents at any given time depends on the particular inter-group context in which the individual is found. People carry identity group memberships and their consequences
from organization to organization, while organization group membership depends on an individual's relationship to a particular organization.

Every group member is a group representative whenever he or she deals with members of other groups (Rice, 1969). With this in mind, it must be pointed out that the aim of organization socialization is to have the newcomer internalize the local status quo, the perpetuation of which is thus reinforced. Through this process the newcomer passes from foreigner to native in the organization.

Socialization takes place for the most part voluntarily as the new member ideally seeks out others in his or her same position and gets and gives feedback or progress, problems, etc. (Brine, 1968). Thus the truly acculturated or socialized individual internalizes the local culture and reflects the historical image of the organization (Long, 1980a).

Socialization theoretically is a two-way street. But the organization's impact on the newcomer is usually much greater than a new member's impact on the organization. This initial impact on the newcomer tends to set the tone, to color his or her perception of the organization for an extended period and may or may not be a correct perception. The newcomer does not learn the organization culture in a detached way. Rather, the individual immerses in the culture and comes to view the setting through the dominant perspective (Louis, 1980a).
Most orientation programs for new members focus on occupational skills (role-related learning) but are not aimed at socializing the newcomer in the important areas of values and interpersonal behavior (culture learning) (Brim, 1966). As noted, socialization may not only involve adding to roles but may also involve leaving another role. Most programs for newcomers completely neglect this "changing from" aspect (Louis, 1980b). Over 25 years ago, Bakke (1953) described the "fusion" process of matching person and organization as composed of (1) the organization's socialization of newcomers, and (2) the newcomers personalizing of the organization.

D. STAGES OF ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION

In her work in the area of career transitions, Dr. M. Louis suggests that there are three distinct stages of the organizational socialization process as experienced by the newcomer. Dr. Louis' research appears to have taken into account more the phenomenon of group dynamics than was present in Feldman's earlier works.

1. Anticipating Stage

The first stage is anticipating socialization. This stage takes place, as in the Feldman model, prior to actual entry into an organization and is fostered by the newcomer forming in her or his own mind ideas about what the new organization will be like and what her or his role will be. Inputs
to this stage come from a variety of sources including former organization members, those people associated indirectly with the organization and from historical information the newcomer may have about the organization.

2. Entry Stage

This stage is traumatic for all persons. It is extra traumatic for a person reared as an "out group" member whose value system may differ markedly.

a. Change

The second stage of the process is the entry or encounter stage. It is during this most complex stage that a number of phenomena happen to the newcomer. There is the change experience in which the new member begins role-related learning. Here the individual gains an understanding of the critical organizational values in order to identify essential or pivotal role behaviors, those which must be performed to avoid expulsion (Schein, 1978). This element of the entry stage takes place in an objective maneuver and is possibly easiest on the newcomer since many of the things involved here are publicly noticeable and knowable and are often knowable in advance by the newcomer.

b. Contrast

A second element on this entry stage is a subjective one termed contrast. It is this phenomenon which causes the new member to "notice" things he or she had not anticipated noticing. This is a person-specific, subjective
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element and represents the new member's reaction to the new setting. An example of CONTRAST might be the noticing by the new member that he or his new office has no windows and that sitting in such an office makes the new member feel secure.

c. Surprise

The third element of this stage is perhaps most difficult to assess. It is called SURPRISE. This is defined as the difference between what the newcomer anticipated and what he or she actually experienced. Surprise typically stimulates both affective and cognitive reactions requiring that the newcomer update his or her assumptions formulated in the anticipatory stage. Failure to do this updating can have serious effects on the newcomer's psychological field. What must be done here is for the new member to retroactively explain why things did not follow her or his cognitive "map" or "script" of how things should work at the new organization.

d. Sense Making

In making sense of her or his new situation and its environment, the individual relies on a number of inputs including past experiences, predisposition to attribute causality to self, to others, or to fate, her or his identity group-based cultural assumptions or interpretation schemes, and feedback from others.

It would seem that insiders would be a rich source for this feedback. For the member of a subculture denied basic cultural participation except in her/his own group, making
sense requires a harder conceptual effort. As noted by the work of Lawler (1951) and Argyris (1964), unfreezing or letting go is a necessary preliminary step in effecting change at both individual and group levels.

3. Adaption Stage

The final stage of the socialization process is the adaption stage. This stage manifests itself when the newcomer has the feeling of being an insider in the organization. Here a real problem exists. How complete her or his adaption is will depend on the individual, her or his tenure in the organization, the congruence between her or his identity group's culture and the organization's culture (Louis, 1980). No person comes to an organization without a cultural past. Furthermore, probably no person is ever fully aware of more than a small segment of the total culture of his society. From this it is doubtful that any person is at home in all of the adult groupings of her or his society unless that society is quite small (Hall, 1979). Figure 1 below shows the socialization sequence.
E. TYPES OF SOCIALIZATION STRATEGIES

Five "pure" types of socialization strategies have been used, although in any particular organization there is likely to be a "mix" of them. The first is training which may be done on either a full-or-part-time basis. Training refers to the acquisition of skills and/or knowledge related to one's job performance. Schein (1964) has distinguished between two varieties of part-time training, i.e., training-while-working and working-while-training. A specific example would be "A" schools as opposed to "X" division.
A second socialization strategy is to educate newcomers to the various policies, procedures, norms, etc. of the organization. Although the education is often combined with skill training, there are examples where education exists as generalized—without a focus on actual job-skills. Some companies have designed socialization experiences of this type as a means of smoothing the entry of "hard-core unemployed" persons into an active, productive role in the organization, e.g., mental category 4 recruits.

A third type of strategy is apprenticeship, which actually contains equal elements of both training and education. This involves a one-on-one relationship between the newcomer and an insider who has the responsibility both to train and to educate the newcomer. The example of a New England bank studied by both Argyris (1954) and Alderfer (1971) is a good one in which all new management trainees were assigned a "big brother" for the 33 weeks of their development program and the objective being not only to develop their accounting skills but to also learn the importance of customer relations through example.

A fourth category is called debasement experience. The purpose here is to "unfreeze" or "unhinge" the newcomer from previously held beliefs and values, and to humble the person so that a new self-image can be developed by the organization. Typical of this process is military "boot camp". Schein (1964) has identified two types of debasement experiences—"sink-or-swim" and the "expanding experience". The "sink-or-swim" ploy is
designed to humble the newcomer by assigning a job to be done, then giving very little definition to the task or the amount of authority the newcomer has, and giving relatively little support. The up-ending experience is designed to alter the newcomer's expectations and self-image in a dramatic way. This can take one of two forms: (1) put the newcomer in a situation in which early failure is guaranteed, or (2) put the newcomer in a position of very menial responsibility. In either case the confidence of the newcomer is shaken, so that the organization is in a better position to exert influence.

The fifth, and final, type is much more subtle than a de-basement experience; it is the attempt to socialize the newcomer via cooptation or seduction. Cooptation is a two-step strategy. First, the newcomer is admitted to the organization, and then is "absorbed" into it. Cooptation works best when newcomers enter singly, rather than in a group. Organization "seduction" of newcomers is a slightly different version of subtle socialization. The crux of the seduction process is to present the newcomer with a number of "tempting choices". The illusion of a choice is maintained, but in fact one alternative is more attractive than the others (Lewick, 1978). The post choice rationalization process (Areoneau, 1972; Festinger, 1957) thus favors the organization's viewpoint, as the newcomer rationalizes the wisdom of the decisions made. For example, new Ph.D.'s working as assistant professors often feel tension between commitment to the university or to their
chosen profession because they are constantly having to make choices about how they spend their time. Universities rarely confront assistant professors with such explicit choices. Rather, they influence the professor's decision via the reward structure, e.g., curtailing funds for travel, but providing released time from teaching to develop new courses. By influencing decisions in this way, universities create the illusion that assistant professors control their own destinies.

What John Wanous and others describe as socialization strategies may be all well and good. Frequently in designing a socialization program the question is raised, what do I as a manager do? What are the specific practices and policies that organizations can follow at each stage of socialization to make the process easier, quicker, and more effective for employees? The research done by Daniel Feldman provides some tentative ideas about ways in which socialization can be made more effective.

Stage 1: "Getting In". Give prospective employees information not only on particular job duties, but also on the work group, promotion and transfer opportunities, and so on. Design selection and placement programs that:

1. Make more realistic assumptions about the relationships between personal characteristics and job performance.

2. Consider the needs and desire of job applicants as well as the demands of the organization.

3. Allow for more flexibility and growth in career paths.
Stage 2: "Breaking In". Carefully design orientation programs that:

1. Allow opportunity for new recruits to meet the rest of the employees upon, or soon after their arrival.

2. Choose the key people included in the orientation for their social skills as well as their technical skills.

3. Give the people in charge of the orientation extra time to spend with new recruits for informal talk learning and social talk.

4. Do not put new recruits in the position of having to choose sides or be labeled as a participant in interpersonal or intergroup conflicts.

Structure a training program that:

1. Identifies job-relevant skills and provides training geared to those skills.

2. Provides frequent feedback to employees on how they are performing.

3. Integrates formal training with informal training and orientation programs.

Provide a performance evaluation system that:

1. Allows face-to-face meetings between employees and supervisors.

2. Has performance criteria that are as objective as possible.

3. Trains supervisors in how to give feedback.

Use the addition of new staff members as an opportunity to:

1. Reallocate tasks as much along individual preferences as possible.

2. Consider work design projects.
Stage 3: "Settling In". Provide counseling for employees to help them deal with work and home conflicts. Be as flexible as possible in scheduling work for employees with particularly difficult outside life conflicts and in adjusting the work assignments of employees with particularly bad conflicts at work. Recognizing and deal with structural or interpersonal problems that generate conflicts at work.

F. SUMMARY

A general description of Organization Development has been presented and a heuristic argument presented which would link ideology or choice of change strategy to supporting structure and policy of organizations. The Socialization process is put forth as a reasonable avenue of all organizations to affect the individual's perceptive of success or failure in an organization. A three stage step process is presented to describe basically what happens to an individual as they progress from an outsider only anticipating entry to the organization to a productive and contributing organizational member.

Individuals will often express the need for an identification in two types of groups: an identity group and an organizational group. Members of organizational groups are assigned similar primary tasks or share equivalent levels of responsibility. On the other hand, identity group members share common biological characteristics, participate in equivalent historical experiences, and, as a result, have similar world views.
This does not suggest that all Blacks or all Whites are alike or share in the same value set as much as it suggests a source of origin.

Even though the impact of the organization on the individual is given as a point of reference in the socialization process, most authors agree that it is more likely a two-way street. In her work in the area of career transactions, Dr. M. Louis suggests that there are three distinct stages of the organizational socialization process as experienced by the newcomer. Various strategies are explored as a point of departure in regard to establishing a socialization program in a particular organization. Although five distinct or "pure" strategies are presented in all likelihood there is likely to be a mix.

Finally the author addresses that information or treatment which regardless of the strategy selected appears to be of primary importance of the individual given his or her stage of socialization.
III. **DETERMINATION OF IDEOLOGY/STRUCTURE**

A. **METHODOLOGY**

The approach to the information collection process consisted of extensive interviewing of E.O. Program Branch heads, HRMSS Program administrators and Civilian Deputy EEO officers. The respondents were asked to describe their basic philosophy concerning Equal Opportunity, who benefits, a determination of the appropriate level of resources devoted to it, and to outline a series of steps to get there. The information pertaining to philosophy was subjectively placed in one of three categories: Alpha, which represents basic phase one of the Navy's approach; Meta, which reflects individual Command initiatives, and one which emphasizes care and treatment of all hands regardless of race and sex distinctions; Beta which was viewed as a transition state between the former two.

Prior to the interviews, each participant was informed that his response would remain anonymous. The interviews were conducted in private, and with the exception of one case, in one-on-one situations. Each interview lasted from 30 to 90 minutes. All interviews were conducted between 20 March 1980 and 2 April 1980. All interviews were conducted in person, and with the researcher in uniform. During preliminary discussions with each respondent the author's background was explained and how the data being collected would be used.
Honesty and candor on the part of the respondent in answering the questions was encouraged.

B. THE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

This study was done with the use of five basic open-ended questions developed by the researcher. As the respondents answered each basic question, that reply was then used to ask additional questions around the primary issue of ideology for the Navy's program as it relates to effectiveness and operational readiness. Actual survey instrument is found in Appendix A.

C. ANALYSIS

A content analysis was conducted on the interview data and representative responses pertaining to Equal Opportunity program ideology was recorded and grouped under three categories: Alpha, Beta and Meta. The Alpha represents initial program philosophy of getting minority groups into the system and essentially some system of monitoring and control of E.O. related grievances.

Meta is representative of an emerging program philosophy which focuses on the positive benefits of effective socialization efforts, and has as its major premise that positive self-image and high esteem of organizational members are requisites of an effective organization.

Beta was added as a third category to capture those responses which contained elements of the other two. Information
pertaining to program structure and experience of the respondents was considered carefully. In virtually all cases, respondents have had previous program experience and essentially of the same duration. Little descriptive difference could be found either in regard to level of responsibility or preparatory training.

D. SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION

The subjective evaluation of the sample with regards to program ideology is listed in Table I below.

Table 1

Description of Personal Program Ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Ideology Type</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Numbers don't mean much, the real issue is how do people feel?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We've come a long way aside from discrepancy of numbers, need is for greater concern for career path.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not much has been accomplished, the need is for a better discrimination complaint system.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We've turned the corner with respect to E.O. complaints, where do we go from here?</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Equal Opportunity is there for everyone, what is needed is more effective monitoring of the complaint process mechanism.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The new Program Structure will necessitate a new vision and program focus.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The author warns that this data represents collapsed statements of the interview data, and that some interpretation of meaning was essential to information aggregation. Individual responses convey a much richer meaning to the idea of an E.O. program ideology. An assistant branch head in the Bureau of Navy Personnel was quoted as saying, "Equal Opportunity is a matter of numbers from which minority groups derive influence and power." One interview in the Pentagon revealed yet another point of view: "E.O. is having qualified minorities in all segments of our organization." Perhaps in a bit of contrast to the previous two was this description of program ideology by a senior systems manager in BuPers: "If E.O. is to achieve its true objective and meaning in the sense of equal work experience, equal personal gratification and accomplishment, then there should be that kind of focus in the way programs are designed."

E. SUMMARY OF SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION

1. Value of Change

Clearly the majority of respondents verbalized a program ideology of change and departure from what it had been in the initial phases of program considerations. Most striking in the responses was an absence of concern for numerical goals for minority recruitment. Only three respondents indicated a lack of progress in regards to treatment of minority personal in the Navy. Still another issue is how these various
ideologies get translated into a program structure and processes. While it is not suggested that largeness of numbers has a direct correlation to the formulation of a strategy which will lead to structure, the author contends that prevailing program philosophy does directly impact on the support for program structure and processes once in place.

2. Program Structure

The responses indicated a lack of need for, except in rare instances, the use of workshops as the primary vehicle to forward E.O. program objectives. The use of EOQI's, Equal Opportunity Quality indicators, was not given very much relevance with regard to maintaining a proactive stance, at the unit or individual Command level. Rather EOQI's were viewed as means to collect and make statistical inferences on a Navy wide basis. There appeared to be a heavy reliance on what has been decided as the way to go with regard to E.O. program structure. Although not fully implemented as yet, this new structure, Command Managed Equal Opportunity, relies heavily on individual Command resources and imagination to ensure equitable treatment and a healthy Command climate. Inferences can be drawn that attention might very well be given to entry considerations and individual needs with respect to training and assignment. It is this author's conclusion that Equal Opportunity as viewed by the respondents is in need of renewal.

"Equal Opportunity isn't dead, there is so much confusion what with the woman's issues and the like that we simply can't afford to continue to divide an ever decreasing pie."
"My hope is that the day will come when we can speak of such programs without having to whisper."

"When there were incidents there was concern, now it's business as usual."

Knowing where one stands in regards to basic program ideology is a very wise investment.

3. Other Approaches to E.O./Socialization, the Assessment

This author has identified several other approaches to assessing this topic. The thrust in all has been to focus the study on "the victim". Socialization of Black Naval Officers, concludes that individual satisfaction is a valid measure of the effectiveness of the Socialization effort. The value of that study to the current effort is, that it serves to point out the significance of self esteem to a decision to remain on active duty. More important this research performed by Jerry Ford suggests adaptive behaviors of Blacks and other minorities that provide for them satisfaction of basic identifier needs that the system is ill fitted to provide. More imperative measure is taken in this study to determine to what degree or to what extent these adoptive behaviors are performed. In another study by Robert Chapin, effort is made to assess the impact of Race Relations training on the racial attitudes of White Naval Officers. Chapin's Research goes a long way in rejecting this phase one approach to the subject of Equal Opportunity, wherein he concludes no significant changes on the attitudes of Whites as a result of UPWARD (Understanding Personal Worth and Racial Dignity) seminars.
James Schwale and Charles Hayes in a follow on, the study performed by Robert Chapin, conclude that as a result of UPWARDS, a list of Do's and Don't's in regard to race relations should be passed on to the new recruit as part of his or her socialization process. This study has taken a step further than that performed by Chapin in recognizing some key output as a result of UPWARDS which tend to focus more on the sensitivities of such groups in the Navy toward racial and or sexual epithets. All the studies mentioned are limiting in regards to providing a structure or basis on which to base considerations for an effective socialization program.
IV. SOCIALIZATION AND STRUCTURE OF WORK

A. DISCUSSION

Work organizations offer a person far more than merely a job. Indeed, from the time individuals first enter a work place to the time they leave their membership behind, they experience and often commit themselves to a distinct way of life complete with its own rhythms, rewards, relationships, demands, and potentials (Van Mannen, 1979). To be sure, the differences to be found within and between organizations range from the barely describable to the starkly dramatic. But social research has yet to discover a work setting which leaves people unmarked by their participation.

By and large, studies of work behavior have, to date, focused primarily upon the historical or "here and now" behavior and attitudes assumed by individual members of an organization that are associated with various institutional, group, interactional, and situational attributes. Relatively less attention has been given to the manner in which these responses are thought to arise. In particular, the question of how it is that only certain patterns of thought and action are passed from one generation of organizational members to the next has been neglected. Since such a process of socialization necessarily involves the transmission of information and values, it is fundamentally a cultural matter.
Any organizational culture consists broadly of long-standing rules of thumb, a somewhat special language, an ideology that helps edit a member's everyday experience, shared standards of relevance as to the critical aspects of the work that is being accomplished, matter-of-fact prejudices, models for social etiquette and demeanor, certain customs and rituals suggestive of how members are to relate to colleagues, subordinates, superiors, and outsiders, and a sort of residual category of some rather plain "horse sense", regarding what is appropriate and "smart", behavior within the organization and what is not. All of these cultural modes of thinking, feeling, and doing are, of course, fragmented to some degree, giving rise within large organizations, to various "subcultures", or "organizational segments" (Schein, 1979).

Such cultural forms are so rooted in the recurrent problems and common experiences of the membership in an organizational segment that once learned they become normal by insiders as perfectly "natural" responses to the world of work they inhabit. This is merely to say that organizational cultures arise and are maintained as a way of coping with and making sense of a given problematic environment. That organizations survive the lifetimes of their founders suggest that the culture established by the original membership displays at least some stability through time. Metaphorically, just as biologists sometimes agree that "gene paelo", exploit individual in the
interest of their own survival, organizations, as socio-cultural forms, do the same. Thus, the devout believers is the Church's way of ensuring the survival of the Church; the loyal citizen is the State's way of ensuring the survival of the State; the scientific apprentice is physics' way of ensuring the survival of physics; and the productive employee is the corporation's way of ensuring the survival of the corporation.

This is not to say, however, that the transfer of a particular work culture from generation to generation of organizational participants occurs smoothly, quickly, and without evolutionary difficulty. New members always bring with them at least the potential for change. They may, for example, question old assumptions about how the work is to be performed, be ignorant of some rather sacred interpersonal conventions that define authority relationships within the work place, or fail to properly appreciate the work ideology or organizational mandate shared by the more experienced members present on the scene. Novices bring with them different backgrounds, faulty preconceptions of the jobs to be performed within the setting, including their own, and perhaps values and ends that are at odds with those of the working membership.

The more experienced members must therefore find ways to insure that the newcomer does not disrupt the outgoing activity on the scene, embarrass or cast a disparaging light on others, or question too many of the established cultural solutions.
worked out previously. Put bluntly, new members must be taught to see the organizational world as do their more experienced colleagues if the traditions of the organization are to survive. The manner in which this teaching/learning occurs is referred to here as the "organizational socialization process".

Insofar as the individual is concerned, the results of an organizational socialization process include, for instance, a readiness to select certain events for attention over others, a stylized stance toward one's routine activities, some ideas as to how one's various behavioral responses to recurrent situations are viewed by others, and so forth. In short, socialization entails the learning of a cultural perspective that can be brought to bear on both commonplace and unusual matters going on in the workplace.

To come to know an organizational situation and act within it implies that a person has developed some commonsensical beliefs, principles, and understandings, or in shorthand notation, a perspective for interpreting one's experiences in a given sphere of the work world. It provides the individual with an ordered view of the work life that runs ahead and guides experience, orders and shapes personal relationships in the work setting, and provides the ground rules under which everyday conduct is to be managed. Once developed, a perspective provides a person with the conventional wisdom that governs a particular context as to the typical features of everyday life.
To illustrate this highly contingent and contextual process, consider the following hypothetical but completely plausible exchange between an experienced patrolman and a colleague in a police department. When asked about what happened to him on a given shift, the veteran officer might well respond by saying, "We didn't do any police work, just wrote a couple of tickets and brought in a body, a stand-up you know." The raw recruit could hardly know of such things for the description given clearly presumes a special kind of knowledge shared by experienced organizational members as to the typical features of their work and how such knowledge is used when going about and talking about their job. The rookie must learn of these understandings and eventually come to make use of them in an entirely matter-of-fact way if he is to continue as a member of the organization. At root, this is the cultural material with which organizational socialization is concerned (Schein, 1979).

At this point, however, it is important to note that not all organizational socialization can be assumed to be functional for either the individual or the organization. Organizations are created and sustained by people often for other people and are also embedded deeply within a larger and continually changing environment. They invent as well as provide the means by which individual and collective needs are fulfilled. Whereas learning the organizational culture may always be immediately adjusitive for an individual in that such
learning will reduce the tension associated with entering an unfamiliar situation. Such learning, in the long run, may not always be adaptive, since certain cultural forms may persist long after they have ceased to be of individual value. Consider, for example, the pervasive practice in many relatively stable organizations of encouraging most lower and middle-managerial employees to aspire to high positions within the organization despite the fact that there will be very few positions open at these levels. Perhaps the discontent of the so-called "plateaueral manager" can then be seen as a result of a socialization practice that has outlived its usefulness.

Consider also that what may be adjustive for the individual may not be adaptive for the organization (Becker, 1970). Situations in which the careless assignment of an eager and talented newcomer to an indifferent, disgruntled, or abrasively cantankerous supervisor may represent such a case wherein the adjustive solution seized upon by the new member is to leave the organization as soon as employment elsewhere has been secured. Socialization practices must not therefore be taken for granted or, worse, ignored on the basis that all cultural learning is fundamentally functional. Historians use their own filter or sieve in collecting data. The sieve that is history operates in often capricious and accidental ways and there is little reason to believe that all aspects of a culture that are manufactured and passed on by members of an organization to
other incoming members are necessarily useful at either the individual or collective levels.

We must note also that the problems of organizational socialization refer to any and all passages traveled by members of an organization. From beginning to end, a person's career within an organization represents a potential series of transitions which may be few in number or many. They may entail upward, downward, or lateral movement, and demand relatively mild to severe adjustments on the part of the individual. Of course, the intensity, importance, and visibility of a given passage will vary across a person's career. It is probably perhaps least obvious when an experienced member of an organization undergoes a simple change assignment, shift, or job location. Nevertheless, a period of socialization accompanies each passage. From this standpoint, organizational socialization is ubiquitous, persistent, and forever problematic.

B. THE ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING: SEGMENTS AND BOUNDARIES

Perhaps the best way to view an organization follows the anthropological line suggesting that any group of people who interact regularly over an extended period of time will develop a sort of unexplicated or tacit mandate concerning what is correct and proper for a member of the group to undertake as well as what is the correct and proper way to go about such an undertaking. At a high level of abstraction, then, members
of ongoing business organizations, for example, orient their efforts toward "making money", in socially prescribed ways just as members of governmental agencies orient their efforts toward "doing public service" in socially prescribed ways. More concretely, however, organizations are made up of people each following ends that are to some degree unique. But, since these people interact with one another and share information, purposes, and approaches to the various everyday problems they face, organizations can be viewed as areas in which an almost infinite series of negotiated situations arise over who will do what, when, where, and in what fashion. Over time, these negotiations result in an emerging set of organizationally defined roles for people to fill (Becker, 1964). These roles may or may not be formalized and fully sanctioned throughout the organization, yet they nonetheless appear to have some rather stable properties associated with them which tend to be passed on from role taker to role taker. Of course, these organizationally defined roles hardly cause each role taker to perform in identical ways. Certainly, whenever a novel problem arises, people come together acting within their roles to confront and make sense of the shared event. Such events, if serious enough, give rise to altered definitions of both the organizational role and the organizational situation in which the role is carried out. From this standpoint, an organization is little more than a situated activity space in which various individuals come together and base their efforts
upon a somewhat shared, but continually problematic, version of what it is they are to do, both collectively and individually (Becker, 1961).

The problem concerns the manner in which these versions of what people are to do (organizational defined roles) are passed on and interpreted from one role occupant to the next. To do so, however, requires a model of the organization such that members can be distinguished from one another and from outsiders on the basis of as few organizational variables as possible. Furthermore, we need a model that is flexible enough to allow for as much descriptive validity as possible across a wide variety of organizational contexts.

Schein has developed a model of the organization that provides a quite useful description of an organizationally defined role in terms of three dimensions that are discernible empirically. The first dimension is a functional one and refers to the various tasks performed by members of an organization. Thus most organizations have departmental structures, which for enterprises located in the business sector of the economy, might include the functions of marketing, finance, production, administrative staff, personnel, research and development, and so forth. In the public sector, an organization such as a police department might have functional divisions corresponding to patrol, investigations, communication, planning, records, custody and the like. In the Navy various departments of a ship would serve as examples. Visually, we
can map the functional domains of an organization along departmental and subdepartmental or program lines as if each function and subfunction occupied a part of a circle or pie-shaped figure. Each function then covers a particular portion of the circumference of the circle depending upon its proportionate size within the organization.

Consider, for example, the XYZ Widget Company as depicted in Figure 2. Each slice in the figurative representation is a functional division with relatively distinct boundaries such that most persons in the organization could easily locate themselves and others within a slice of the circle (Schein 1971).

[diagram of functional domains of XYZ Widget Company]

Figure 2.
Functional Domains of Organizations.
Clearly, no two organizations would be precisely the same, because even if the department and subdepartment structures were identical, the numbers of people contained within each slice would no doubt differ.

The second dimension identified by Schein concerns the hierarchical distribution of rank within an organization. This is essentially a matter of who, on paper, is responsible for the actions of whom. It reflects the official lines of supervisory authority within an organization, but does not presume that such authority carries with it the power to direct the behavior of underlings.

According to the model, very decentralized organizations will have, for example, relatively few hierarchical distinctions, whereas very centralized organizations will have many. Mapping this dimension on paper it would typically make a triangular shape (the traditional organizational pyramid) wherein the highest ranks are held by relatively few people located at the apex. For example, Figure 3 illustrates the hierarchical dimension in full by pathetical, but possible, organizations.

As Figure 3 suggests, a vast number of hierarchical possibilities exist. The XYZ Widget Company (3-A) is perhaps the most typical in that it fits textbook models of a management structure wherein increasing rank is assumed by decreasing numbers of people in a relatively smooth way. The Metropolitan Police Department (3-B) is representative of a
A. XYZ Widget Co.  
B. Metro. Police Dept.  
C. Zipper Sales Inc.  
D. Zero Research Inst.  
E. Stuffed Mattress Corp.

Figure 3.
Hierarchical Domains of Organizations.

large number of service bureaucracies. These agencies have been tagged "street level" organizations, because, in part, most of their membership occupies positions that carry low rank. To wit, over 75 percent of the employees in most police organizations work as patrolmen or investigators, the lowest ranked position in these organizations. Zipper Sales, Inc. (3-C) illustrates an organization with a very steep authority structure within which each rank supervises relatively few people but there are many ranks. Pyramid sales organizations and peacetime armies are good examples in this regard. The Zero Research Institute (3-D) displays what a relatively flat hierarchical structure looks like in this scheme. Here there
are few ranks for members to seek to ascend. Finally, the Stuffed Mattress Corporation (3-E) is included here to demonstrate something of the range of possibilities available to describe the hierarchical spread which potentially can characterize an organization. As can be seen, the Stuffed Mattress Company has a bulging number of middle-managers. In fact, there are more managers than workers in this hypothetical firm.

The third dimension in Schein's model is the most difficult to conceptualize and concerns the social fabric or interpersonal domain of organizational life. This is fundamentally an interactional dimension and refers to a person's inclusion within the organization. It can be depicted as if it were a radial dimension extending from the membership edge of a slice of organizational members in toward the middle of the functional circle. As Figure 4 indicates, movement along this dimension implies that a member's relationship with others in some segment of the organization changes. One moves toward the "center of things" as away toward the "periphery".

When examining this dimension, the question must be asked how important to others in the immediate sense is a given member's role in the workings of a particular group, department, or organization? Thus, this radial dimension must involve the social rules, norms, and values through which a person's worthiness to a group is judged by members of that group. It concerns in part, then, the shared notions of what the "real work" of any organizational segment is at any given time. To
move along this dimension is to become accepted by others as a central and working member of the particular organizational segment and this can normally not be accomplished unless the member-in-transition demonstrates that he or she too shares the same assumptions as others in the setting as to what is organizationally important and what is not.

Figure 4.
Inclusionary Domains of Organizations
Newcomers to most hierarchical levels and functional areas in virtually all organizations inevitably remain "on the edge" of organizational affairs for some time after entrance for a host of reasons. They may not yet be deemed trustworthy by others on the scene. They may not yet have had time to develop and present the sort of affable, cynical, easygoing, or hard driving front maintained and expected by critical others in the setting which marks membership in the particular segment of the organization to which the newcomer has been assigned. Or, quite typically, newcomers must first be tested either informally or formally as to their abilities, motives, and values before being granted inclusionary rights which then permit them: (1) to share organizational secrets, (2) to separate the presentational rhetoric used on outsiders to speak of what goes on in the setting from the operational rhetoric used by insiders to communicate with one another as to the matters-at-hand, and/or (3) to understand the unofficial yet recognized norms associated with the actual work going on and the moral conduct expected of people in the particular organizational segment.

In other words, movement along the inclusionary dimension is analogous to the entrance of a stranger to any group. If things go well, the stranger is granted more say in the group's activities and is given more opportunity to display his or her particular skills, thus becoming in the process more central and perhaps valuable to the group as a whole. In short, to
cross inclusionary boundaries means that one becomes an insider with all the rights and privileges that go with such a position. To illustrate, given a particular function and hierarchical level, passing along the inclusionary dimension can be characterized as going from an outsider to a marginally accepted novice group member, to a confederate of sorts who assists other members on certain selected matters, to a confidant or intimate of others who fully shares in all the social, cultural, and task related affairs of the group. In certain educational institutions, the granting of university tenure represents the formal recognition of crossing a major inclusionary boundary, as well as the more obvious hierarchical passage.

Where the three dimensions (functional, hierarchical, and inclusionary) are combined, the model of the organization becomes analytically most useful and interesting. From a Weberian, ideal-type perspective, organizations are conical in shape and contain within them three generic types of boundaries across which a member may pass (see Figure 5-A). And, as Schein suggests, these boundaries will differ within and between organizations as to both their number and permeability, (i.e., the ease or difficulty associated with a boundary passage). Relatively tall organizations (5-B) may have, for example, many hierarchical boundaries yet relatively few functional and inclusionary boundaries across which a member may pass. By implication, members moving up or down in such organizations must orient themselves more
to rank and level distinction among the membership than to
the distinctions which result from either functional special-
ization of social status within a given rank. Military
organizations and the elaborate pageantry that surrounds the
hierarchical realms within them are unusually good examples
of this type. On the other hand, flat organizations (5-C) such
as some consulting firms have few hierarchical boundaries but
many functional and inclusionary ones. Indeed, in such firms,
turnover is high and few members are allowed (or necessarily
desire) to pass across the relatively stringent radial dimen-
sions to become central and permanent fixtures within the
organization. Prestigious universities represent another good
illustration in which functional boundaries are exceedingly
difficult to rotate through and inclusionary boundaries are
guarded by the most rigorous of tenuring policies.

Figure 5.
Weberian Model: With Variations
Organizations also differ in the sorts of filtering processes they use to screen, select, and process these members who pass across particular boundaries. Hierarchical boundaries crossed by persons moving upward are associated usually with filtering processes carrying notions of merit, potential, and judged past performance, although are and length of service are often utilized as surrogate measures of "readiness" to move upward in an organization. Functional boundaries usually filter people on the basis of their demonstrated skill or assumed aptitude to handle a particular task. However, when functional boundaries are relatively permeable, as they often are, the filtering process may operate on the premise that there are people in the organization who "need" or "wish" to broaden their work experience.

Finally, inclusionary filters, in the main represent evaluations made by others on the scene as to another's "fitness" for membership. Of course, such evaluations may be formal, informal or both. Consider the new patrolman in a large urban police department who must not only serve out a period of official probation successfully, but also must pass a number of unofficial colleague initiated tests on the street before others in the department will view him as a desirable member of the patrol division (and assigned squad within that division) within the organization (Van Maanen, 1973).

Given this model, some key postulates about the socialization process in organization can be stated:
First, socialization, although continuous throughout one's career within an organization, is no doubt more intense and problematic for a member (and others) just before and just after a particular boundary passage. That is, an individual's anxiety and hence vulnerability to organizational influence are likely to be highest during the anticipatory and initiation phases of an organizational boundary passage. Similarly, the more boundaries that are crossed by a person at any one time, the more profound the experience is likely to be for the person. This is one reason why the outsider-to-insider passage in which an individual crosses over all three organizational boundaries at once is so often marked by dramatic changes in a person, changes of a sort that are rarely matched again during other internal passages of the individual's career (Glaser, 1968).

Second, a person is likely to have the most impact upon others in the organization—what Porter, Lawler, and Hackman call the "individualization" process and what Schein refers to as the "innovation" process, at points furthest from any boundary crossing. In other words, the influence of the organization upon the individual peaks during passage, whereas the individual's influence upon the organization peaks well after and well before any further movement.

Third, because of the conical shape typically displayed by organizations, socialization along the inclusionary dimension is likely to be more critical to lower-placed members than higher-placed members since, according to the model, to move up in the organization indicates that some, perhaps considerable movement has already occurred inwardly.

This presumes, however, an ideal-type, symmetrically shaped organization in which central members from the top to the
bottom of the organization all share roughly the same norms and values. In face, as (Figure 6-A) shows, organizations may be nonsymmetrically skewed, thus, hierarchically favoring the movement up of only those persons coming from a particular functional or inclusionary location. Consider, for example, those business concerns whose top executives invariably come from only certain functional areas of the organization. Similarly, organizations may also be tipped radically to the side (Figure 6-B).

A. Non-Symmetric, Skewed
B. Non-Symmetric, Tilted

Figure 6. Weberian Variations II.

In such cases, certain inclusionary prerequisites for career movements and their associated boundary passages have been more or less altered because "insiders" at one level are "outsiders" at another. Nor are "insiders" in a favorable position to move upward in the organization, as might be the case in more symmetrically shaped firms where certain key values are shared by all "insiders" regardless of level. To take an example, certain organizations headed by reform minded
top officials may make "mountain climbers" out of some members who literally scale the vertical dimension of the organization from an outsider's or noninclusionary position. Yet, it is probably also true that during such a climb the climber has little effect upon any of the various groups in which he or she may have claimed membership, since the climber will never have developed a persuasive or influential position within these organizational segments (Bell, 1975).

C. INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO SOCIALIZATION: ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE COMPONENTS, KNOWLEDGE, STRATEGY, AND MISSION

Any organizationally defined role includes what Hughes called a "bundle of tasks". Whether one is a lathe operator, dentist, beauty operator, or computer programmer, each role includes many specific actions and tasks to be performed, ranging from perhaps sweeping the floor to mediating disputes between colleagues, or, from filling in for an absent co-worker to utilizing one's own somewhat special and unique skills in the performance of a given task. In general, then a role is merely the set of often diverse behaviors that are more or less expected of persons who occupy a certain defined position within a particular social system, in this case, an organization. Moreover, it usually follows that if these expectations are met or exceeded, certain organizational rights and rewards are passed on to the person performing the role. If not, however, it usually follows that certain remedial actions are taken or punishments meted out.
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All roles which are created, sustained, and transmitted by people include both content characteristics, (i.e., what it is people should do) and process characteristics, (i.e., how it is they should do it). The control of a particular role can be depicted both in terms of a general, almost ideological, mandate that goes with it and in terms of the general set of mandate fulfilling actions that are supposed to be performed by the role occupant. Thus, doctors are thought to "heal the sick" by prescribing available "cures" to be found somewhere within the vast catalogue of "medical-knowledge". Similarly, the process associated with the performance of a role also has associated with it general strategies and specific practices. The doctor "does diagnosis" by taking a patient's blood pressure, eliciting a history, reading an X-ray, and so forth.

Finally, linked to all these concerns are social norms and rules which suggest, for example, the appropriate mannerisms, attitudes, and social rituals to be displayed when performing various parts of the "bundle of tasks" called a role. Doctors to continue the illustration have "bedside manners", often assume a pose of distance or remoteness toward certain emotionally trying events in the lives of their patients, and take a characteristically "all knowing" stance toward most of the nursing personnel with whom they come into contact.

Putting these conceptual matters together, organizationally defined roles can be seen to possess, first, a content or
knowledge base which, if accepted by the role occupant, indicates the range of existing solutions to the given problems encountered regularly on the job. Engineers know, for instance, the heat limits to which certain metals can be exposed before the molecules of the materials rearrange themselves.

Second, an organizationally defined role includes a strategic base, which suggests the ground rules for the choosing of particular solutions. Hence, the engineers may be out to "cut costs" or "beat the competition" in some organizations when designing a particular product or piece of machinery.

Third, organizationally defined roles are invested historically with something of an explicit and implicit mission, purpose, or mandate which is, in part, traceable to the knowledge and strategy bases of the roles, but also is grounded in the total organizational mission and in the relationships that a particular role has with other roles within and outside the organization. Engineering roles, to wit, are defined and supported by other managerial technical support, and sales roles in both organizational and client contexts, and hence are influenced by their relative position in the overall scheme of things.

While the professionaliation of a particular occupational role can be viewed as an attempt to reduce such dependencies
through the claim made by role practitioners to have an autonomous and special knowledge base, such professionalization in an organizational society such as ours is very incomplete (Berlew, 1966). At any rate, the missions associated with organizationally defined roles serve to legitimate, justify, and define the ends pursued by role occupants and, thus, support to some degree the various strategies and norms followed by those presently performing the role.

These three features of an organizationally defined role, knowledge base, strategy, and mission and the norms that surround them are, of course, highly intertwined. A change in the knowledge bases of a given role may alter the means and ends followed by practitioners. Indeed, the recognized failure to achieve a given end may provoke the development of new knowledge. Strategic failures are not unknown either and may lead to disenchantment and change in the mission and knowledge bases of a particular role. Nevertheless, given the situation in which a newcomer is asked to take on an organizationally defined role, that newcomer must respond in some fashion to these three elements.

D. CUSTODIANSHIP, CONTENT INNOVATION, AND ROLE INNOVATION

Perhaps the easiest or most expedient response of a newcomer to a given role is to assume a custodial or caretaker stance toward the knowledge, strategies, and mission associated with the role (Schein, 1971b). Taking such a stance, the
newcomer does not question but accepts the status quo. Certainly, there are powerful reasons for adapting such a custodial or conforming orientation. First and foremost among them is the plain fact that the inherited past assumed by the newcomer may have much to recommend it in terms of functional achievement. If the enterprise has been successful, why "rock the boat"? One simply learns the substantive requirements of the job and the customary strategies that have been developed to meet these requirements (and the norms of use that surround them) and the successful accomplishment of the mission is assured.

On the other hand, as a newcomer one may feel for a variety of reasons somewhat impatient with or uneasy about the knowledge base of a particular organizational role that is transmitted and, hence, be unwilling to limit oneself to the use of such knowledge in the performance of the role. A newly promoted marketing manager may, for instance, take issue with the quality of some of the regional reports used by his predecessor to inform his decision making. The new manager may then aggressively seek out other information in which to base his decision. As a result, new strategies and perhaps even new objectives may eventually develop in this department. Similarly, tactical alternatives as to the means to certain ends may be sought out by individuals after assuming a new role. The new marketing manager may decide to involve more salesmen and
engineers in group meetings devoted to developing new product lines instead of relying only on his or her marketing people.

Schein refers to this response as "content innovation". It is marked by the development of substantive improvements or changes in the knowledge base or strategic practices of a particular role (Schein, 1948). The "reformer" in public service agencies, for example, rarely seeks to change the stated objectives of the agency mission, but rather seeks to improve, make more efficient or less corrupt the existing practices by which given ends are collectively sought. In such cases, traditional ends and norms of practice are accepted by the newcomer, but the person is troubled by the existing strategies or technologies in use for the achievement of these ends and perhaps is troubled, too, by the degree to which the traditional norms are circumvented in practice.

Pushing the analysis one more step, an individual may seek to redefine one's entire role by attacking and attempting to change the mission associated traditionally with that role. This response is characterized by a complete rejection of most of the norms governing the conduct and performance of a particular role. The "Rebel" or "Guerrila" are popular tags we attach to and associate with such responses. Take, for example, Ralph Nader's attempts within certain communities of lawyers who work for the Federal Government to create and sustain an organizationally defined role of consumer advocate, industrial safety proponent, or even whistle blower.
Also note the recent questioning raised by health care officials as to the appropriate aims of medical practice. Some doctors have in fact argued rigorously in both words and deeds for professional roles that are proactive and preventive-centered rather than the historically fixed reactive and treatment-centered roles. Schein has called this response "role innovation" in that a genuine attempt is made by a role holder to redefine the ends to which the role functions.

E. WORK EXPERIENCES AND THE SELF CONCEPT

There is a voluminous literature on the self concept and widespread recognition of its importance for adequate personality functioning. Self esteem, an important dimension of the self-image, has been found to be related to socioeconomic status, self-direction in work and occupational stress. However, the relative importance of selection and socialization processes in producing these relationships is not known (Mortimer, 1971).

In favor of the "selection hypothesis", high adolescent self-esteem is associated with high occupational aspirations and expectations of success in attaining one's goals. Moreover, it is widely assumed that a positive self-image promotes occupational achievement. Hall (1971), for example, hypothesizes that high self-esteem and confidence engender information search and risk-taking, activities that facilitate the mastery of occupational tasks. Andrisani and Nestel's (1976) panel
study of locus of control provides more direct evidence for the selection hypothesis. Individuals with an initially high sense of internal control, when studied two years later, had achieved higher status and income than those with a more external control locus. The authors attribute the advantages of the "internals" to their confidence, frequent exploratory behavior, and propensity to take risks. Where as the benefits of a positive self-image for subsequent occupational achievement are well recognized, the sources of change in the self-concept over time have been given relatively little attention.

The generalization model would lead one to expect that a central psychological orientation, like the self-concept, would be influenced by previous adaptation to occupational requirements and tasks. In support of this expectation, Bachman and his colleagues report that occupational prestige is associated with increases in self-esteem during the early post-high-school period, and Cohn (1978) has demonstrated changes in self-esteem in response to unemployment and reemployment. Several investigators have emphasized the importance of work autonomy in fostering a sense of competence and high self-esteem. According to Rosenberg (1979:146) "...someone who sees the visible outcomes of his efforts, the products of his own decisions, would feel greater respect for himself than someone who...cannot attribute the results to himself." He goes on to distinguish "inner self-esteem", dependent on "ones own
competent actions, and the rewards stemming from such actions", from "outer self-esteem", dependent upon the approval of significant others. Consistent with these conceptualizations, Kohn and Schooler's 1964 data (1973:103) showed that occupational conditions indicative of self-direction were significantly related to self-esteem, even after education and several other facets of work had been controlled.

In order to contribute to a healthy organizational state, O.D. practitioners and managers must clearly understand the implications of their own E.O. ideology upon their choice of remedies and individual self-esteem derived from work experiences. More importantly there should be application of basic skills and knowledge in regard to conflict management, adult learning theory, and interpersonal communication. They should also encourage the group development skills necessary for a "mature" group behavior at every level in the organization.

In summary, it is generally true that recruits representing the first class will set the tone for the classes to follow. It is not suggested that those who follow are sheep-like followers but simply that for those to come, it is easier to learn from others already on hand than it is to learn on their own as originators. Severity of initiation does affect the learning process. As long as there are others available in the socialization setting whom the newcomers consider to be
"like them", these others will act as guides, passing on conceptual solutions to the typical problems faced by a recruit.

F. SEVERITY AND PLEASANTNESS OF INITIATION ON ATTRACTION TO A GROUP

If severe, rather than mild, initiations are used, persons will more positively rate a group they are joining (Areoneau, 1958). Most studies have relied on dissonance theory to explain the effect and have utilized an uninteresting group for the study subject to evaluate. Hendrick and Jones suggest interesting groups may produce the effect as well. Only severe and mild initiations have been compared, and questions remain about the effect of pleasant initiations. In a study performed by Finer, Hautaluoina, and Bloom three levels of initiation: severe, mild, and pleasant were manipulated, and Ss rated their attraction to either uninteresting or interesting groups. The Ss were 30 male and 30 female introductory psychology students who wanted to join a study group as part of their research requirement. Each was randomly assigned to one of six initiation conditions. The introduction to the initiation stated that the groups were experimental and that assignment would be based on some screening tasks. The tasks for all the initiation had similar content and length. For the severe initiation condition, the reading comprehension task required the Ss to read aloud a difficult journal article while hearing their own voices delayed one-fourth second after they spoke, which is
usually unnerving. Next, they memorized 15 negative mood induction statements. They then were attached to a psyciograph and told they would be shocked. In truth, no shocks were given. The mild initiation had Ss read a passage from a psychology textbook without auditory feedback, memorized neutral self-statements, and just sit attached to the physiograph without the threat of shock. The pleasant condition had the Ss read a recent popular article and do the "creative problem solving" exercises which accompanied it, memorize positive self-referring statements, and relax while attached to the physiograph. After the initiation, half of each initiation group saw a videotape portraying an interesting study group and half saw a boring group. (A pilot study had shown these tapes to be interesting and boring).

On the internal validity measures, there was a significant main effect due to the type of initiation according to self-report \( F(2,54) = 4.6, p < .05 \) and finger pulse volume measures \( F(2.54) = 4.8, p < .05 \). A Newman-Keuls analysis indicated that the severe initiation conditions was rated more negatively than the mild initiation \( (p < .05) \) and produced significantly lower pulse volumes than either of the other two conditions \( (p < .05) \).

Despite the differences in perceived severity, the severe conditions did not have attraction ratings different from other initiations, even for the dull group. This contradicts other
laboratory results. The only significant finding was that all the Ss liked discussions \[ F (1, 48) = 103.4, p < .01 \] and the members \[ F (1, 48) = 142.5, p < .01 \] of the interesting group more than those of the boring group. The findings suggest that attitude formation about initiation may be more complex than originally conceptualized (Hendrick & Jones, 1972).

G. SUMMARY

Thus, there are two poles toward which a newcomer's response to an organizationally defined role can gravitate. At one extreme is the caretaking response, marked by an acceptance of the role as presented and traditionally practiced by role occupants. The label this response and the various forms it can take is "custodial". At the other extreme lies the group responses of an "innovative" nature. Perhaps most extreme are those responses which display a rejection and redefinition of the major premises concerning missions and strategies followed by the majority of the role occupants to both practice and justify their present role. This is "role innovation".

Less extreme, but perhaps equally as innovative in some cases, are those responses indicative of an effort to locate new knowledge on which to base the organizationally defined role or improved means to perform it, "content innovation". Of course such new knowledge, if discovered, may lead only to a further rationalization of the present practices and goals, but
nevertheless, the search itself, to differing degrees, represents something of an innovative response.

For purposes here, then, those individuals who after assuming a given role seek actively to alter its knowledge base, strategic practices, or historically established ends display a generic response type identified as "innovative", which can be further broken down into role innovation and content innovation (Schein, 1971).
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The author has presented in this paper a definition and description of the socialization process. The author has identified the socialization process as being an OD intervention strategy with high payoff vis-a-vis equal opportunity. Analysis of five different dimensions of the socialization process can be thought of as distinct "tactics" which managers (agents) can employ when socializing new recruits into the organization or at various boundary passages. The author developed several prepositions about the likelihood of any given tactic leading to custodial, content innovative, or role-innovative responses. Finally, the author proposed a combination of tactics which would be most likely to produce each of the desired specific organizational responses.

This is not a completed theory. There is not yet enough empirical evidence to determine in a more tightly 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. It is felt, however, that the five analytically distinct dimensions of the socialization process represents a first and important step in this direction. Some theory can now be tested empirically.

It is felt that the specification of the dimensions themselves at least opens up both for researchers and managers in
organizations an analytic framework for considering the actual processes by which people are brought into new roles in the work place.

Indeed, it is time to become more conscious of the choices and consequences of the ways in which we "process people". Uninspired custodianship, recalcitrance, and even organizational stagnation are often the direct result of how employees are processed into the organization. Role innovation and ultimately organizational revitalizers, at the other extreme, can also be a direct result of how people were processed. From this perspective, organizational results are not simply the consequences of the work accomplished by people brought into the organization; rather, they are the consequences of the work these people accomplish after the organization itself has completed its work on them.

A. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

When viewed in terms of its impact on organizational members, the socialization process encompasses not only issues of equity and fair treatment, it also addresses the quality of member experience, effectiveness and efficiency of the organization itself. Direct measure of that impact can be made by:

1. Longitudinal studies of acculturation and performance.

2. Evaluation of the processes by which organizational members move through various role acquisition points within the organization.
3. A more complete study in the area of Command managed E.O. programs in regards to their content orientation and how they affect, if at all, the socialization process.

4. Continue research into the area of cross-cultural interactions.

5. Examination of the role of HRMSS Program Specialist in Command Managed Equal Opportunity programs.

6. Finally, of extreme benefit would be to examine the desired results of any E.O. related initiative, in regards to its affects on organizational mission overall. An organizational focus should be provided which includes considerations of individual needs as well as mission objectives. These considerations should be directed not only upon entry into the organizations but along critical passages as well.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

I. Pre-interview

We are going to talk for about an hour about the Navy's Equal Opportunity Program. My interest is in your philosophy on Equal Opportunity in general, and that which you feel are appropriate action steps to get there.

Are there any questions?

Your responses during this interview will be held in strict confidence.

A. Introduce self and give some background.

B. Ground rules.

1. Honest/candid answers.
2. Responses will be confidential.

C. Respond to any questions.

1. Conduct interview.
2. Past interview.

   a. Review confidentiality of responses.
   b. Answer questions.
   c. Thank responder.

D. Basic questions for the interview:

1. Describe your experiences in Equal Opportunity Programs.
2. What assessment would you make of E.O. program objectives?
3. What is your basic philosophy in regard to E.O.?
4. What do you see as action steps to get there?
5. How would you assess success for your initiatives or action steps?
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