University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Communication Studies Faculty Publications   Communication Studies

1990

"Moving Up" on Campus : A Qualitative Examination of Organizational Socialization

Betsy Wackernagel Bach
University of Montana - Missoula, betsy.bach@umontana.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/communications_pubs

Part of the Communication Commons

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

"MOVING UP" ON CAMPUS:
A Qualitative Examination
of Organizational Socialization

Betsy Wackernagel Bach
University of Montana

As a newcomer enters an organization, s/he selects, organizes, and makes inferences about the organization and the role s/he is to play. This process of making sense out of one's role, socialization, occurs each time an individual moves to a new organization. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) claim that in its most general sense socialization is the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role. They assert that socialization is a cultural matter which involves the transmission of information and values, specifically long.standing rules of thumb, a somewhat special language, shared standards of relevance, matter of fact prejudices, models for social etiquette, customs and rituals, and just plain "horse sense" regarding what is appropriate and smart behavior within the organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). In short, organizational socialization processes perform the function of informing the newcomer.

As newcomers are given information about how to function within the organization, they are expected to demonstrate "a readiness to select certain events for attention over others, stylized stance towards one's routine activities, some ideas as to how one's various behavioral responses to recurrent situations are viewed by others,

and so forth" (Van Maanen & Schein, 1978, 212).

Newcomers must document their socialization to their more experienced colleagues. New members are taught to see the world from a perspective similar to that of their colleagues if the traditions of the organization are to survive (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Enactment of socialization serves to validate organizational tradition. Socialization of a newcomer insures that the organization's values and traditions will remain intact.

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) point to certain regularities or similarities in the process of organizational socialization. It can be seen in their discussion, however, that these are formal and functional similarities. Their discussion also indicates that the specific contents of these processes will vary across organizational settings. As such, each organization has its own character. Louis (1980, p. 233) claims that newcomers need "situation or culture specific interpretation schemes in order to make sense of happenings in the setting and to respond with meaningful and appropriate actions." Thus, when newcomers are "learning the ropes" of the new organization they are also being exposed to and learning its culture. Louis states that the questions, "how we do things and what matters around here" (1980, p. 232) are conveyed by an organizations' personality or culture.

The socialization process has relevance to communication research. The role of communication in the process of socialization is important to the discovery of what is expected for "appropriate" socialization. Values, attitudes, and norms of the organization are transmitted to the newcomer through communication (Wilson, 1984). Newcomers, in turn, use communication to demonstrate that they understand and can enact organizational values, attitudes, and norms. Hence, newcomers use communication to express their social knowledge of the organization. Social knowledge of a particular culture or organization consists of "a transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which women communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward

life" (Geertz, 1973, p. 89). Therefore, communication through talk (e.g., symbolic interaction) is one necessary way to demonstrate a newcomer's socialization into a particular organization or culture.

The purpose of this study is twofold. The primary goal is to describe the cultural meaning of one organization by assessing the rules, norms, and values of the organization as manifested in the socialization of its members. This will provide a datum or case for answering a more general question, what are ways in which newcomers enact their socialization through their talk? That is, a single case will be presented and used as a basis for generating insight into the general process of socialization of which this case is an instance.

A descriptive, theoretic, framework of the socialization process prescribed by Louis (1980) was a guide for responses to the research question. Louis' framework was developed to understand the processes by which newcomers cope with entry and socialization experiences. She proposes that change, contrast, and surprise constitute major features of the entry experience (1980). Philipsen (1982) claims that a descriptive framework provides an investigator a delineative tool for understanding and describing any given case. Here the adequacy of Louis' framework is tested. As Philipsen (1977, p. 48) asserts, "a descriptive framework is used heuristically. One purpose of ethnographic study is to refine that framework ... and to anticipate that at some point the framework will itself become the object of study." Therefore, the secondary purpose of this study is to test Louis' framework. Louis' framework of the newcomer socialization experience is examined and evaluated here in light of a single case study.

Method

The data for this inquiry were gathered during the course of several months of fieldwork directed toward discovering a process for enacting socialization. Sigma, a sorority house of a large north-western university, was the site of observation. Field materials

were collected (a) during observation of Sigma executive board members, (b) by conducting informant interviews with executive board members, and (c) participating in and observing weekly formal and informal events at the Sigma house.

All data collected, including field notes of socialization behavior and spontaneous (and solicited) informant statements, were analyzed using a descriptive framework of the socialization "experience" described by Louis (1980). An additional analysis using the constant comparative method of qualitative inquiry (Glaser, 1965, 1978; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was conducted to test the relevance of Louis' framework to the data gathered. Several sources of data were subjected to two different analyses to develop description and support hypotheses. Both methods of analysis were utilized to amplify and extend the theory of socialization "experiences" dictated by Louis.

Data Analysis

Analysis of data utilizing the constant comparative method (Glaser, 1965; 1978), a type of grounded theory, aided in the creation of the fourth dimension described above. The constant comparative method aids the researcher in generating theory by continually comparing data with that data already categorized and coded (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Data collected during observations were analyzed by comparing to one of Louis' three features of socialization. As materials were collected they were coded against each of three (e.g., change, contrast, surprise) categories. That is, each datum was compared with previous incidents coded in the same category. During coding, it was apparent there would be several deviant cases. After coding was complete, the deviant data were analyzed, using the constant comparative method, to see if they showed a common property. These cases became the basis for the fourth category. All deviant cases were outcome manifestations of the socialization processes, as opposed to the data coded in Louis'

categories, which appeared to repr esent process components of socialization. That is, deviant cases seemed to indicate a product or consequence of socialization.

The Women of Sigma

Sigma is comprised of over 100 women, all of whom are university students and predominantly of middle class background. The women claim they cannot be "typecast" and strive to maintain their individuality as a group in the campus Greek system. Members claim to be "individuals living in a house with the same name." They do see themselves as "sisters," however, and work to promote and maintain a shared commitment to the organization. They are governed by a ten member executive board. The board serves a dual function as Sigma's governing body and promoter of sisterhood.

Sigma members are divided into two categories: active, initiated members and pledges, who have yet to be initiated. Pledges are asked unofficially to join the organization approximately four months prior to their formal initiation. They are required to live in the Sigma house and participate in all sorority activities. During this four months, pledges who demonstrate "successful" training are initiated and achieve member status.

Activities at Sigma center around "chapter day," a weekly event which serves to unite the members and promote a feeling of "support, loyalty, and sisterhood." Respect and loyalty to the house and its members is demonstrated on chapter day. Respect is demonstrated by "dressing up"; loyalty by the wearing of a sorority pin. Members are brought together three times on chapter day. They attend an all house meeting of sorority activities, eat a formal dinner together, and attend a secret, ritualized meeting called "chapter," open only to initiated members.

An attitude which prevails among Sigma sisters is that a good organization has actively involved members. Attempts are made by the executive board to increase member involvement with many in-house and

outside activities. Sign-up sheets for various house events are placed in a central location and members are encouraged to participate in as many events as possible. It is interesting to note the implicit notion for encouraging participation -- the desire of Sigma members to "move up on campus." The women of Sigma place themselves in the "top of the middle six" and desire to "move up into the top six." That is, members wish to increase their status within the Greek system by being recognized as a top house. This desire for upward mobility by "moving up" is treated almost as a mission, a way for members to get ahead.

Change, Contrast, and Surprise as Vehicles of Socialization.

Louis (1980) asserts that in order to understand the proesses by which newcomers cope with entry and socialization experiences one must first understand that experience. She identifies three key features of the socialization experience and labels them change, contrast, and surprise.

Change

Change is defined by Louis (1980, p. 235) as "an objective difference in a major feature between the new and old settings." Louis claims it is the newness of the "changed to" situation that requires adjustment by the individual, even though the new situation is an improvement over the old. Change is the most predictable of Louis' features because it can be anticipated. As individuals move from one organization to another they can predict a period of transition, and that there will likely be a change in status, role, or atmosphere.

Schein (1971) makes specific the types of changes experienced by a newcomer and labels these changes as functional change, inclusionary change, and hierarchical change. These changes are evident because information access from a previous situation can seldom be transferred to a new situation (Louis, 1980). The newcomer

is on the periphery of organizational information until s/he can demonstrate knowledge of organizational norms. First, the newcomer must be able to perform a functional set of tasks; to demonstrate knowledge of *how* certain organizational functions are enacted. Newcomers must also adopt a position in the organizational hierarchy, and be aware of their status within that hierarchy. Finally, newcomers must be aware of the influence (or lack of it) that they possess in the new organization. Where they might have once been included in the "in group" in a former organization, newcomers must be aware of "factors such as personality, seniority, and willingness to play a certain kind of political game to become a member of the "inner circle" of the new organization (Schein, 1971, 406). Newcomers are not immediately influential in the organizational structure and remain on the outside until they can demonstrate their socialization by verbalizing rules, norms, and beliefs that are shared by the organization.

Expressions and demonstrations of change are evident in Sigma. The changes a newcomer experiences when making a transition into an organization are both minimized and maximized in the Sigma organization. Change is "minimized" before a newcomer formally "pledges" a house. Efforts are made to ease the newcomer into the new situation. Once a newcomer has decided to make an official commitment to the house, the change is maximized; newcomers are set apart and differences between the newcomer and other "active" group members are emphasized.

Although newcomers experience an initial change, they report this change to be minimal. As one informant stated, "This is nothing more than an extension of high school." This statement is emphasized by the fact that many women decide to align themselves with organizations or "join the same houses" where former high school friends now live. As one informant explained, "If you come from a (local) school, you probably have an idea of where you want to go (what house you want to join). You're influenced by the girls from your high school who are in a house already... You can be influenced by the cheerleaders in your high school or those you formerly looked up to

and say, "Wow, I wish I could be like her!" You go to their house and see where they are."

Unfortunately, a newcomer's desire to minimize the effect of transition can have negative effects. The woman described below attempted to make her change from high school to college a smooth one. The change was more dramatic than she anticipated, however.

> I had a friend whose sister went Delta, and she eventually went Delta. A lot of my good friends from high school went Delta and I thought wow, I wish I could go Delta, too. After tours, I got dropped by them and had to look at other houses."

Louis states that an individual's status changes upon entering a new organization. This is clearly illustrated in the Sigma house and is most evident immediately after rush. Rush is an event where all women planning to become members of the Greek system have the opportunity to visit and select the "house" where they would like to live. Members of houses such as Sigma put on their best "face" to attract new members. Change is minimized here. Potential newcomers are courted by the houses who would like to have them as members. An informant noted, "During rush we put a lot into decorating, entertainment and food ... it's a matter of how much b.s. you can pull off to get these girls to think they love you."

Once a woman has made a commitment to a "house," her status changes. She must spend time learning what's expected of her and how she is to function within that particular organization. In Sigma, newcomers are grouped together and labeled "pledges." Pledges are informed of their status and are told that they must perform a series of tasks before they can be formally initiated into the organization. Newcomers receive messages which inform them that they are of lower status and that they must demonstrate their loyalty and support for Sigma to increase their status. This action supports Schein's (1971) concept of inclusionary change: newcomers must demonstrate support for the new organization before they can become "in group" members. Pledges spend approximately four months as lower status

members while they learn about Sigma. An informant explains, "When you pledge, you have pledge meetings at least once a week and go over by-laws and house rules. A lot of that is when you can play your stereo loud, how to dress on chapter days, and so on. A lot is written down. If you follow it (the rules) fine, 'if' you don't get in trouble. It's pretty basic."

The feeling of change, so evident when one makes a transition into a new organization, appears to diminish soon after Sigma's four.month pledge period. At the end of this transition period, a public statement is made about an individual's status; pledges who have demonstrated "successful" socialization are formally invited to become active members of Sigma. The process of making public a woman's affiliation with Sigma is perhaps the most meaningful ritual enacted by Sigma members. Once newcomers become active members, their status within the organization changes. They are entitled to the same privileges awarded to active members. Perhaps the most important element of shared status is the privilege of attending "chapter," the formal, ritualized ceremony open only to active members of the organization. An informant explained, "Initiation makes you feel like you're really in. Up until that point, when you're a pledge, you say you've agreed to look at the house and they've agreed to look at you ... it means they want me and are willing to take a closer look. Once I'm initiated that means, "Yes, I've passed the test!" Everything's worked out!"

The above illustrations of organizational entry suggest that newcomers enter those organizations that offer, at the outset, a way of decreasing uncertainty about the organization by minimizing the amount of change or transition. It is likely, therefore, that an individual may choose to enter that organization which provides her with guidelines for behavior within the organization prior to entry. Information about an organization made available to a newcomer who is about to enter will make the transition process easier, providing the information accurately reflects the organization's philosophy.

Contrast

Louis (1980, p. 236) suggests that the entry experience is evidenced by contrast; a state which is "personally, rather than publicly noticed and is not, for the most part, knowable in advance." Contrast is experienced by a newcomer as she makes note of differences that exist between "old" and "new" settings, and is person.specific rather than indigenous to the organizational transition (Louis, 1980). Each newcomer will experience contrast differently.

The most important component of contrast is that of letting go of former roles. Louis claims that letting go of roles formerly held is a gradual process and that no newcomer transition ritual erases all traces of old roles before a new one is taken on. She states that the "first time a newcomer is involved in almost any activity in the new role, the memory of the corresponding activity in one or more old roles may be brought to mind" (Louis, 1980, p. 236). One informant explicated Louis' notion of contrast. When asked about why she decided to join Sigma, the informant explained, "This was the only house I took my shoes off at. During rush you're always walking and I remember that this was the only place I could take my shoes off. So I took my shoes off and my hostess took hers off too, and I felt real comfortable about that."

This statement suggests that the process of removing one's shoes suggested familiarity. The informant above was performing an action which reminded her of a former role -- being comfortable in her home. Her freedom to remove her shoes is likely to have reminded her of a former role; one she could comfortably enact at Sigma.

A distinct kind of contrast is evident in the larger network of organizations which comprise the Greek system. Status differences or contrasts between various organizations are quite apparent. As such, this contrast or status is in the eye of the beholder. During rush women appear to gravitate to "top" houses: Those organizations that are perceived to have "the best girls."

As Lewis suggests, contrasts, or particular features of these

organizations, emerge when an individual experiences new settings. Two illustrations of this particular feature of contrast are outlined below. Reflecting upon her use of contrast, an informant noted, "Coming in I knew nothing about the Greek system, but quickly learned that some houses have more prestige than others. When I came in I didn't care about any of that and was comfortable here. Then I learned we're in the middle -- I felt a difference between me and girls of a top house. I guess the longer you're in the system, the more you realize how stupid that is so I've come full circle"

Contrast was illustrated during another interview. A Sigma member exclaimed, "You know which houses are the top -- you hear it from friends who were in your high school who are in houses here and you hear it from your boyfriends who rushed during the summer. You want to be in a top house."

The claim has been made that contrasts are apparent as one enters a new setting. Contrasts are less evident as one becomes socialized. A Sigma informant explained, "the more you're in the system, the more you realize the prestige difference is stupid. It really doesn't matter where you are, the girls are all the same." A senior Sigma added, "A lot of the top houses get girls who drop (during "rush"), too. Most girls select themselves. In a way, it seems to work out that most girls go where they should go because after a while you say, 'I can't imagine being anywhere else. You select yourself to where you're put.'"

Hence, after initial evaluation of the new situation, contrasts are noted. But as one becomes socialized, contrasts that once existed begin to diminish until the newcomer feels comfortable and at ease within the organization. Dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) lends credence to this notion of contrast. One might seek to minimize the prestige difference between her house and another to make the decision to join a particular organization as attractive as possible.

Surprise

Surprise, the difference between an individual's expectations and actual experiences, is the third component in Louis' framework of entry experiences. Louis (1980, 237) asserts that surprise "encompasses one's effective reactions to any differences, including contrasts and changes and can be positive and negative." The subject of anticipation, and therefore surprise, can be the job, the organization, or the self. Anticipation can be "conscious, tacit, or emergent" (Louis, 1980; p. 237). Louis identifies five forms of surprise, the first of which occurs when conscious expectations about the organization are not fulfilled. This form is similar to the second, occurring when expectations about oneself are unmet. A third form of surprise arises when undesirable features about the organization surface; additionally, a fourth form of surprise arises from problems anticipating the new experience. Finally, a form of surprise comes from cultural assumptions people make. Surprise is evident when a newcomer relies on cultural assumptions to make inferences about how to behave in a new situation.

Members of Sigma appear to work hard to clarify the organization's expectations to newcomers. After newcomers move into the house they are taken on a pledge retreat and are informed what is expected of them as new members. An informant remembered, "You were told actual rules during our pledge retreat -- a meeting with just pledges, officers and the pledge trainer. They lay down the rules and say here's the rules we expect you to follow them. The class above me was strict in getting us to do our pledge duties. I sensed that if I didn't do them I would get in trouble. They kept a pretty close eye on us and told us what was right and wrong."

It appears that surprise over unmet expectations can be reduced if an organization makes clear to the newcomers its rules and regulations. Dissatisfaction over rules is prevalent in any organization and has not escaped Sigma. There appears to be some discrepancy over the rules which impede the smooth functioning of the organization. Members tend to follow the unwritten, implicit rules

rather than abide by the more formal, written rules. These unwritten rules have recently become a problem to the organization. Conflicts have arisen because of different interpretations of these rules; certain Sigma members choose to abide by the unwritten rules, and encourage others to do so. When asked how these unwritten rules were communicated, an informant explained, "I just watched my older friends in the house and did what they did 'cuz I didn't know any way else as a pledge. You watch the other girls ... how they held themselves and how they reacted. This is always true. One thing is written and you always see people doing something else -- you go for what they do and not what they say. So if you know not to talk in chapter, but everyone else is talking in chapter, I figure that it's not a big deal and people really don't have to follow this (rule)."

Expectations play a large role in the daily activities at Sigma. All members are expected to possess "good member qualities." It is quite likely that questions about commitment are never explicitly asked of a newcomer. Problems arise, however, when an individual's commitment is assumed and not actual. Sigma members encourage commitment and participation. Surprise, and to some extent anger, is expressed when a sister is not committed to the goals and philosophies of the organization. Although implicit, the message about noncommitted members is clear, "If we had known Stacy wasn't totally committed to our organization she wouldn't have been asked to join!"

Hence, surprise, the difference between an individual's expectations and subsequent experiences is an integral part of the socialization experience at Sigma. Newcomers are more likely to express support and commitment for an organization if surprise is minimized. Sigma members who adhere to the rules prescribed by the organization are initiated and are perceived as members "in good standing"; they have met the expectations prescribed for them.

An Extension of the Socialization Framework: Validation

Louis' (1980) model provides an excellent framework for studying individual entry experiences. She posits that newcomers engage in a sense-making process to cope with the change, contrast, and surprise encountered upon organizational entry (Louis, 1980). According to Louis, sense-making is a way for individuals to provide retrospective explanations for their behavior. What is unclear in Louis' model, however, is the enactment of behavior after sense-making occurs. Her model clearly reflects the process of sense-making. She does not, however, explicate the outcome or product of sense-making behavior. While her model clearly describes process, the addition of outcome variables might aid in the evaluation of the sensemaking process. Outcome variables could be introduced to detect signs of successful socialization within the organization. Outcome manifestations of sense-making are evident in the talk of Sigma.

Outcome manifestations of sense-making are documented in the talk of Sigma members, and appear to be a way for members to express successful identification (Cheney, 1983) with the organization. Successful sense-making is reflected by validating the organization and the self as a member of the organization. Validation is a newcomer's way of providing feedback to the organization about her level of identification with the organization's values, beliefs, and goals. Hence, validation emerged as a fourth category describing newcomer socialization.

Two types of validation are evident. First, an individual may express validation of in-group membership. The newcomer enacts behavior the organization finds acceptable. Second, newcomers express validation to outsiders. This type of validation includes making a claim about organizational identification. This claim generally becomes a statement of support and loyalty to the organization and is expressed when an in.group member is present. Thus, validation of group membership to one outside of the group is enacted in the presence of an in-group member. Evidence of validation is explicated below.

Validation of In-Group membership

Validation of in-group membership is expressed only after a newcomer has successfully encountered and adapted to feelings of change, contrast, and surprise. As these experiences are addressed, newcomers become assimilated into the organization. Once newcomers feel socialized, or part of the group, they must express their allegiance to the group by demonstrating they have successfully adopted the values, rules, philosophy to which the organization ascribes.

Sigma members demonstrate their allegiance by showing support for both the "house" as well as its individual members. As one informant noted, "Support, participation and loyalty are expected of all our members." Support for the house is enacted by participating in house activities, by serving on house committees, holding an office, wearing Sigma insignia on chapter day, or, as one informant claimed, "by putting the house first." A well-socialized Sigma member is one who is able to participate in house activities and work for the "good of the house." Sigma members feel insulted or "put down" if their sisters fail to participate or support the house. This action is interpreted as a selfish move. One does not put one's needs first and the house second.

Those members who do not demonstrate support are made to account for their deviant behavior. Nonparticipants are fined for their absences in a futile attempt to "make" them want to participate and show support. They can be "called down" to formally account for their behavior (or lack of it). That is, they must explain their reasons for lack of support to a committee comprised of senior Sigma members and alumnae.

Participation appears essential to express validation. A second way to enact validation is by demonstrating support for tradition. Newcomers must be willing to continue traditions, if only to demonstrate to older members that "sacred" traditions will be carried on. A newcomer shows support for Sigma by always participating in chapter. If one does not participate in chapter, she is showing

disrespect for the house as well as its traditions. It is likely that newcomers who do not attend chapter meetings communicate an unwillingness to enact "sacred" traditions, an act of defiance that threatens those Sigma members who place importance on these weekly rituals. This is validated by the fact that *any* member who cannot attend chapter must have her absence excused prior to the ceremony. Members are encouraged to attend chapter "at all cost."

Validation of in-group membership is also demonstrated by showing support for other members by doing them "favors." These favors range from taking dessert at chapter dinner to give to a sister (even if one doesn't want dessert), to getting class notes for a sister because she is ill.

When support is shown for a member, that is, if she is the recipient of a favor, she publicly expresses her gratitude for the favor. This meta-validation, called a "done good," serves to illustrate that the favor.doer is demonstrating support for Sigma by helping a sister. The sister who received the favor writes an expression of "thanks" to be read aloud at the all.house meeting. A typical "done good" reads, "You 'done good,' Betty, for helping a sister in need. Thanks so much for taking class notes for me when I was sick. You're a sister indeed!".

Thus, to demonstrate socialization or allegiance to the values, norms, and goals of an organization one must validate socialization itself. Validation of in.group membership is expressed by showing support and loyalty for the Sigma house (the organization) as well as for its individual members.

Validation to Outsiders

It has been suggested above that an individual must validate her socialization to members within her organization. A claim about one's socialization must also be made to individuals *outside* of the organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). As a newcomer learns the ropes of a new organization, s/he must demonstrate knowledge of

her organization's rules and regulations. In short, she must validate her socialization experience by demonstrating to outsiders her loyalty and support for the group. The enactment of validation is more potent, however, if it can be demonstrated in the presence of an in-group member.

Sigma members must demonstrate allegiance to the organiza- tion by participating in all-Greek activities. Women who do not "support the house" in outside activities are looked upon unfavorably. Members must demonstrate support for the house in the presence of their sisters to maintain the house "face." Sigma members have a strong commitment to maintaining house "face." Theystrive to maintain face by expressing a "desire to move up," that is, to increase their status in the Greek system. Moving up can only be accomplished by demonstrating in-group togetherness, support, and loyalty to the "house." Sigma members hope that their expression of allegiance will give outsiders cause to believe they're a "top house," which will increase the organization's status.

Moving up is manifested in many ways. It is clear, however, that moving up cannot occur unless Sigma members participate in all-Greek activities. During one meeting I observed, Sigma members expressed dismay over the fact that only a few sisters had participated in a phone-a-thon. One member exclaimed, "how embarrassing," while another expressed dismay, "boy, it sure is hard to move up when people don't participate." During the meeting, the committee decided to speak to those girls who "hadn't shown" to make them accountable for their behavior. These deviants had not expressed "Sigma loyalty" to an outsider. Thus, they did not validate their allegiance to the organization to an outsider in the presence of a Sigma member.

Women of Sigma demonstrate validation when an outsider visits the house. This is perhaps the best opportunity for a Sigma member to demonstrate her support for the organization; there are so many members around to observe a newcomer's demonstration of allegiance. Sigma women are encouraged to make guests feel at home, at all costs. An informant noted, "We need to treat guests as if they were guests in our own home. We do what our guest does so she feels at

home.   If she takes three pieces of cake for dessert and eats them there, you should too."

Conclusion

A model for organizational entry posited by Louis (1980) was tested *in situ* and was found to be useful for describing the socialization processes there.   Upon classification of the data, a fourth dimension, one of validation, emerged as an outcome manifestation of socialization.   It is argued that validation reflects the behavioral outcomes after individual sense-making has occurred.

References

Cheney, G. (1983). "On the various and changing meanings of organisational identification." Communication Monographs, 50, pp. 342-361.

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. New York: Row, Peterson.

Glaser, B. (1978). Theoretical sensitivity. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (1965). "The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis." Social Problems, 12, pp. 436-445.

Glaser, B., and Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research. Adline Publishing Co: Chicago.

Louis, M. (1980). "Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organisational settings." Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, pp. 226-251.

Philipsen, G. (1982). "The qualitative case study as a strategy in communication inquiry." The Communicator, 12, p. 4.

Philipsen, G. (1977). "Linearity of research design in ethnographic studies of speaking." Communication Quarterly, 25, 42-50.

Schein, E. (1971). "The individual, the organisation, and the career: A conceptual scheme." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 7, pp. 401-426.

Schein, E. (1968). "Organisational socialisation and the profession of management." Industrial Management Review, 9, pp. 1-16.

VanMaanen, J., and Schein, E. (1979). "Toward a theory of organisational socialisation." In B. Straw (Ed.), Research in Organisational Behavior. Greenwich, CT: JAL Press.

Wanous, J. (1977). "Organisational entry: Newcomers moving from outside to inside." Psychological Bulletin, 84, pp. 601-618.

Wilson, C. (1984, May). A communication perspective on socialisation in organisations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.