



DTIC FILE COPY

AD-A223 857

Hispanic and Anglo Males in the Navy's Blue-collar Civilian Work Force: A Comparison of New Hirees

DTIC
ELECTE
JUL 09 1990
S D CS D

Jack E. Edwards
Paul Rosenfeld
Patricia J. Thomas

**Hispanic and Anglo Males in the Navy's Blue-collar Civilian Work Force:
A Comparison of New Hirees**

Jack E. Edwards
Paul Rosenfeld
Patricia J. Thomas

Reviewed by
Marie D. Thomas

Approved and released by
Jules Borack
Director, Personnel Systems Department

Approved for public release;
distribution is unlimited.

Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, CA, 92152-6800

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE June 1990	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Technical Note--Apr 87-Sep 88	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Hispanic and Anglo Males in the Navy's Blue-collar Civilian Work Force: A Comparison of New Hires		5. FUNDING NUMBERS Program Element 0603707N, Work Unit 0603707N-R1770.MP012	
6. AUTHOR(S) Jack E. Edwards, Paul Rosenfeld, Patricia J. Thomas		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NPRDC-TN-90-24	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Navy Personnel Research and Development Center San Diego, California 92152-6800			
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Chief of Naval Operations (OP-14) Washington, DC 20350-2000		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) This study examined potential differences between newly hired Hispanic and Anglo blue-collar Navy civilian employees. Thirty-one Navy activities were identified for participation in this phase of a 4-year Equal Employment Enhancement project. Each male Hispanic who entered a Department of the Navy Occupational Level (DONOL) Code 8 or 9 semi-skilled or journey person job at one of those activities was to be administered a questionnaire during the first week of his employment. A comparison Anglo male entering a similar job was surveyed whenever his accession followed the accession of an Hispanic. Usable surveys were obtained from 76 Hispanics and 75 Anglos. Few statistically significant differences were detected among the groups. However, two areas of differences were found: the need for role clarity in the job and the belief that Hispanics are suspicious of the government. In both cases, less acculturated Hispanics (LAH) and Anglos differed. LAHs needed significantly more role clarity in their work and disagreed more strongly with statements suggesting that Hispanics do not trust the government. It is recommended that more formal methods of recruitment for DONOL Code 8 and 9 jobs be used to alleviate the Navy's Hispanic underrepresentation. Second, the relatively higher need for clarity of LAHs may be accommodated through training of supervisors. <i>Keyman to</i>			
14. SUBJECT TERMS Hispanic, equal employment opportunity, surveys. <i>(Study)</i>		15. NUMBER OF PAGES 48	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED		16. PRICE CODE	
		20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UNLIMITED	
18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED		19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	

FOREWORD

The research study described in this report is the sixth published work performed within advanced development Program Element 0603707N, Work Unit 06037007N-R1770.MP012, Equal Employment Opportunity Enhancement. The present study examined potential differences between newly hired Hispanic and Anglo blue-collar Navy employees. It was part of a larger effort investigating the underrepresentation of Hispanics and women in the Navy's blue-collar work force under the sponsorship of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-14).

The authors acknowledge the following individuals who supplied valuable assistance in the conduct of the project or provided useful comments to earlier versions of this report: Luis Joseph, Jerome Bower, Stephen Knouse, Kent Suarez, Paul Magnusson, and Hal Rosen.



JULES BORACK
Director, Personnel Systems Department

PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED WORKS OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT ENHANCEMENT RESEARCH PROJECT

Thomas, P. J. (1987). *Hispanic underrepresentation in the Navy's civilian work force: Defining the problem* (NPRDC-TN-87-31). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

Edwards, J. E. (1988). *Work outcomes as predicted by attitudes and demographics of Hispanics and non-Hispanics: A literature review* (NPRDC-TN-88-23). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

Lunneborg, P. W., Kellman-Vowell, K., & Srebnik, D. S. (1988). *Turnover of women in the nontraditional skilled crafts: A literature review* (NPRDC-TN-88-42) San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

Edwards, J. E., Thomas, P. J., & Bower, J. L. (1989). *Moving for employment: Are Hispanics less geographically mobile than Anglos and Blacks?* (NPRDC-TN-89-11) San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

Edwards, J. E., & Thomas, P. J. (1989). Hispanics: When has equal employment been achieved? *Personnel Journal*, 68(6), 144, 147-149.



Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification _____	
By _____	
Distribution / _____	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail. and/or Special
A-1	

SUMMARY

Problem

Hispanics are the fastest growing racial/ethnic group in the U.S. labor market. Census Bureau projections indicate that Hispanics will replace Blacks as the largest U.S. minority group in the next century. Hispanic representation in Navy's civilian work force has not increased proportionately to their dramatic gains in the civilian labor force. Underutilization has persisted despite the fact that federal programs designed to identify and correct barriers encountered by members of minority groups have been in effect for over a decade. Organizational, social/cultural, and individual difference factors, or a combination of these influences, may be contributing to the persistence of this problem.

Objectives

This study examined potential differences between Hispanic and Anglo new hires. Employee characteristics that were present when the new hires began their first day of employment in blue-collar jobs and recruitment practices present at Navy activities were investigated. The research was designed to (1) identify unnecessary barriers related to ethnic-group status and, thereby, (2) make Navy blue-collar jobs more accessible to people who are either qualified or qualifiable. Additionally, the acculturation level of Hispanics (i. e., the degree to which they have adapted to mainstream American culture) was examined to determine if the Navy was attracting primarily those Hispanics who were indistinguishable from Anglos and the degree to which acculturated and less acculturated Hispanics were different from one another or from Anglos.

Procedure

Thirty-one Navy activities located throughout the continental United States were identified for participation in this phase of a 4-year Equal Employment Enhancement project. Each male Hispanic who entered a Department of the Navy Occupational Level (DONOL) Code 8 or 9 semi-skilled or journey person job at one of those activities was to be administered a questionnaire during the first week of his employment. To investigate potential ethnic-group differences, a comparison Anglo male entering a similar job was surveyed whenever his accession followed the accession of an Hispanic. After 18 months of data gathering, usable surveys had been obtained from 76 Hispanics and 75 Anglos.

Findings

Few statistically significant differences were detected among the three groups. The demographic characteristics of the Anglos, high acculturation Hispanics (HAHs), and low acculturation Hispanics (LAHs) were very similar. These groups also responded similarly with regard to (1) the importance of the various outcomes (e. g., pay, benefits, and job security) to be derived from employment by the Navy, (2) perceptions about the degree to which government practices restrict Hispanic representation at their activities, (3) the job-search process, (4) disagreement with negative attributions about Hispanics and their lack of employment parity, (5) questions of geographic location considerations and work-group preferences, (6) organizational commitment, (7) methods of recruitment whereby employment with the Navy was obtained, and

(8) work-related psychological needs. Two areas of differences were detected: the need for role clarity in the job and the belief that Hispanics are suspicious of the government. In both cases, LAHs and Anglos differed. LAHs needed significantly more role clarity in their work and disagreed more strongly with statements suggesting that Hispanics do not trust the government.

Recommendations

Interventions are suggested for dealing with problems caused by current methods of recruitment and the relatively higher need for clarity expressed by less acculturated Hispanics.

1. It is recommended that more formal methods of recruitment for DONOL Code 8 and 9 jobs be used to alleviate the Navy's current Hispanic under-representation. More Hispanic hiring today likely will lead to perceptions in tomorrow's Hispanic community that the Navy is an organization in which Hispanics can get ahead. In order to be successful, Hispanic recruitment programs should include accountability, rewards, and evaluation. If nothing is done, this study's findings on recruitment suggest that the Navy could continue to experience non-parity for Hispanics.

2. Second, the relatively higher need for clarity of less acculturated Hispanics may be accommodated through training of supervisors. The required vehicle for implementing such training already exists. In Equal Employment Opportunity training sessions, supervisors could be presented with (a) methods for structuring tasks and duties and (b) the processes used in mentoring. While these interventions may be specifically designed to aid less acculturated Hispanics, they also can help employees from other ethnic and racial groups.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Problem.....	1
Purpose.....	3
METHOD	3
Sample	3
Target Jobs	3
Target Activities.....	3
Selecting Respondents	5
Respondents	5
Survey Instrument.....	5
Acculturation	6
Psychological Needs	6
Organizational Commitment.....	7
Factors Considered When Taking a Job.....	7
Employment Practices and Job-search Activities.....	7
Attributions for Hispanic Under-representation	8
Procedure	8
Defining Hispanic Acculturation Groups	8
Analyses.....	8
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	9
Demographics	9
Acculturation	9
Psychological Needs	12
Need for Clarity	12
Achievement, Affiliation, Autonomy, and Dominance Needs	12
Organizational Commitment.....	14
Potential Factors to be Considered When Taking a Job	15
Importance of Job-related Factors	15
Geographic Location Considerations.....	15
Work-group Composition	15
Other	17
Employment Practices and Job-search Activities.....	17
Recruitment.....	17
Government Practices Restricting Hispanic Representation	19
Disagreement with Negative Characteristics Sometimes Attributed to Hispanics.....	20
Lack of Knowledge, Skills, or Abilities (Ksas).....	20
Suspicion of the Government	21
Lack of Career Orientation	21
Miscellaneous Negative Attributions.....	21
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	22

REFERENCES	23
APPENDIX A--DONOL 8 CODES AND COMPARABLE OPM OCCUPATIONAL SERIES	A-0
APPENDIX B--DONOL 9 CODES AND COMPARABLE OPM OCCUPATIONAL SERIES	B-0
APPENDIX C--SURVEY OF BLUE-COLLAR WORKERS (FORM H)	C-0
DISTRIBUTION LIST	

LIST OF TABLES

1. Projected and Actual Entries into DONOL Codes 8 and 9 Semi-skilled and Journey Person Positions	4
2. Demographics	10
3. Acculturation	11
4. Psychological Needs	13
5. Organizational Commitment.....	14
6. Potential Factors to be Considered When Taking a Job	16
7. Employment Practices and Job-search Activities.....	18
8. Disagreement with Negative Characteristics Sometimes Attributed to Hispanics.....	20

INTRODUCTION

Background and Problem

The 1964 Civil Rights Act, Title VII mandated equal employment opportunity (EEO) for all persons regardless of race, color, creed, national origin, and gender. Congress amended the Civil Rights Act in 1972 to require most federal agencies to have programs that would help implement EEO policies (United States General Accounting Office, January 30, 1989). During the quarter of a century since the passage of the Civil Rights Act, Blacks, as a group, have made significant inroads into both previously segregated organizations and segregated jobs within integrated organizations. Hispanics ("individuals whose own origin or ancestral origin is a Spanish-speaking country," Chiswick, 1988, p. 32), however, have not been as successful in attaining employment opportunities.

Many employers have failed to realize that continued underutilization of Hispanics may place their organizations at a disadvantage as Hispanics become a larger portion of the U.S. civilian labor force (CLF). Based on current projections, the number of Hispanics in the CLF will increase by 74 percent by the year 2000 (Cattan, 1988). Thus, an increased effort to employ Hispanics is not just a moral and legal obligation; it also makes good business sense in terms of future economic realities. The slowed growth of Anglos in the CLF will increase the need to employ Hispanic workers (Koretz, 1989).

The Department of the Navy has been unable to attract Hispanics in proportion to their representation in the U.S. labor force. In 1980, Hispanic representation in the civilian Navy work force was 3.2 percent compared to 6.4 percent in the total U.S. CLF. Since 1980, the Navy's civilian Hispanic representation has increased by only 0.3 percentage points to 3.5 percent while Hispanics in the CLF have increased 1.8 percentage points to 8.2 percent (Secretary of the Navy, memorandum of 16 May 1989). According to the Secretary of the Navy, the Navy's Hispanic under-representation has become "critical" due to this disparity and to indications that Hispanics are leaving the civilian Navy work force in greater numbers than they are being hired and in greater proportions than the overall civilian Hispanic attrition rate. Presently, the Navy's 3.5 percent rate of Hispanic employment in civilian positions lags behind Hispanic representation rates of the Air Force (9.5%), Army (5.0%), and other federal agencies (5.2%) (Secretary of the Navy, memorandum of 16 May 1989). Given projections that by the year 2000 Hispanics will constitute nearly 11 percent of the total U.S. population (Koretz, 1989) and soon after surpass Blacks to become the largest ethnic/racial minority in the U.S., it is clear that the Navy needs to "intensify efforts to increase the number of Hispanics in the civilian work force" (Secretary of the Navy, memorandum of 16 May 1989).

Actions taken to increase Hispanic representation will yield a number of positive outcomes both in the civilian Navy work force and in the Navy as a whole. First, the Navy will avail itself of a currently underutilized resource at civilian facilities that support active-duty personnel (e.g., shipyards). Second, steps taken now to correct imbalances will likely save the Navy litigation expenses and the accompanying adverse publicity. Third, greater employment opportunities for Hispanics in civilian Navy jobs will result in better acceptance of the Navy in the Hispanic community and should lead to proportionally more Hispanics seeking active duty Navy service.

Last, findings that result in the removal of barriers faced by civilian Hispanic employees may suggest specific interventions to reduce under-representation of Hispanics in uniformed service.

The underutilization of Hispanics, the projections of dramatic Hispanic population growth, and the potential benefits to the Navy of greater Hispanic representation attest to the need for focused research on the Hispanic under-representation problem. An initial step toward the better utilization of this valuable human resource is to identify the cultural, individual-difference, and organizational barriers that have prevented Hispanics from obtaining parity in the work place. Toward this end, the Navy instituted a 4-year Equal Employment Enhancement research project to increase Hispanics' opportunities for employment parity (as well as to look at the utilization of women in the Navy's blue-collar work force). Previous project work has focused on the difficulties of accurately defining the Hispanic under-representation problem (Edwards & Thomas, 1989; Thomas, 1987), a literature review on the relationships of attitudes and demographics to work outcomes (Edwards, 1988), and the geographic mobility of Hispanics for employment (Edwards, Thomas, & Bowers, 1989). One task in the second phase of the EEO Enhancement Research Project is to identify any racial/ethnic-group differences that might exist between newly hired Hispanic and Anglo civilian employees. Edwards' (1988) summary of the literature on work outcomes as predicted by attitudes and demographics of Hispanics and non-Hispanics found few lines of consistent research. Furthermore, most of the critiqued studies contained experimental design concerns that were severe enough to warrant caution when generalizing the findings from one situation to another.

One intensive research effort that was concerned with the barriers faced by Hispanic Navy recruits was, however, identified (cf., Triandis, 1985). In a summary report of more than 30 Navy-funded studies, Triandis (1985) noted that he and his colleagues had found more similarities than differences in comparisons among Hispanic, Black, and Anglo recruits.

Triandis suggested that Hispanic Navy recruits of the early 1980s were not typical of Hispanics in the general population. In several reports, Triandis and colleagues argued that their research participants were so *acculturated* as to be indistinguishable from the mainstream of American culture. Acculturation is a process of change whereby exposure to mainstream cultural patterns results in an ethnic group modifying their values, norms, attitudes, and behavior to reflect those of the mainstream (Marin, Sabogal, Marin, Otero-Sabogal, & Perez-Stable, 1987). It is useful to distinguish acculturation from the related concepts of immigration and assimilation. While immigration involves physical movement to a new place, acculturation is related to psychological and social adaption to the culture of that new location. Assimilation is more extreme; it involves becoming completely absorbed in the new culture (Burnam, Telles, Karno, Hough, & Escobar, 1987).

The issue of Hispanic acculturation has received much research attention. For example, the June 1987 issue of *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* was devoted to acculturation research. An important job-related component of acculturation is the ability to communicate in English. The National Commission on Employment Policy (1982) noted that poor English skills and lack of education are two major reasons for Hispanic labor-market difficulties. Applying acculturation in a different manner, Segal and Sosa (1983) suggested that determining the acculturation level of Hispanics would lead to better segmentation of the target market and, hence, more effective marketing.

Although the conceptual definition of acculturation is more readily agreed upon than are the operational or measurement definitions (e.g., Segal and Sosa use three categories of acculturation while Triandis and his colleagues use four classes), acculturation should be considered when determining whether Navy Hispanic civilian employees are different from their Anglo peers. Consideration of acculturation is also important in determining whether the Navy is recruiting from the full Hispanic population or only from an acculturated portion as Triandis (1985) suggested. The research summarized by Triandis indicates that the Navy has been more successful recruiting acculturated Hispanics for the military than it has in recruiting Hispanics who do not reflect the values, attitudes, and behaviors of the mainstream. The need exists, therefore, to determine whether there are differences among the Navy's acculturated Hispanics, less acculturated Hispanics, and Anglo majority group. Identifying such differences is an initial step to understanding the needs and preferences of potential employees. Once that step has been completed, interventions that are necessary to provide increased opportunities for employment parity for Hispanics may be designed.

Purpose

This study sought to investigate differences among groups of acculturated Hispanics, less acculturated Hispanics, and Anglos who had been recently hired for blue-collar civilian positions at large Navy activities located throughout the U.S. Potential differences were investigated for three types of variables: demographics, experiences with employment practices encountered in obtaining the new position, and attitudes and opinions.

METHOD

Sample

Target Jobs

Navy jobs are categorized into 10 families using Department of Navy Occupational Level (DONOL) Codes. This research sample was selected from newly hired men in the semi-skilled and journey person jobs included in DONOL Code 8: Craftsmen and Mechanics, and Code 9: Operatives and Service Workers. Appendices A and B, respectively, contain complete lists of the DONOL Code 8 and 9 job titles and lists of comparable Office of Personnel Management (OPM) job titles. Codes 8 and 9 were targeted because they (1) contain many jobs requiring few, if any, prerequisite knowledge, skills, and abilities; (2) represent families of jobs in which a relatively large number of hirings can be expected to occur each year; and (3) were the target jobs in a parallel study of barriers faced by women entering blue-collar/nontraditional jobs.

Target Activities

Activity selection for Phase II of the EEO enhancement project followed a multi-step process, which is summarized in Table 1. The number of persons entering DONOL Code 8 and 9 semi-skilled and journey person jobs during 1985 and 1986 was obtained from Form NAVSO 12713/20-U and averaged for each continental U.S. Navy activity. Those averages represented the

Table 1
**Projected and Actual Entries into DONOL Codes 8 and 9 Semi-skilled
and Journey Person Positions**

	A	B	C	D	E
1. Philadelphia Naval Shipyard	2.6	191.5	5	10	13
2. Mare Island Naval Shipyard	10.8	167.5	18	9	19
3. Long Beach Naval Shipyard	21.0	190.0	40	11	8
4. Puget Sound Naval Shipyard	2.1	216.5	5	3	3
*5. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard				1	0
*6. Norfolk Naval Shipyard					
*7. Charleston Naval Shipyard					
*8. Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown					
9. Naval Weapons Station, Concord	11.7	43	5		
*10. Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head				1 white control	
*11. Naval Undersea Warfare Eng. Station, Keyport					
*12. Naval Weapons Support Center, Crane					
13. Naval Air Rework Facility, San Diego	13.3	165	22	17	7
*14. Naval Aviation Depot, Pensacola				4	1
15. Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk					
16. Naval Air Rework Facility, Jacksonville					
*17. Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point					
*18. Naval Avionics Center, Indianapolis					
19. Pacific Missile Test Center, Pt. Mugu	9.9	43	4	12	11
20. Navy Public Works Center, San Diego	13.3	81	11	1	9
*21. Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk				2	2
22. Naval Supply Center, San Diego	13.3	26.5	4		
23. Naval Weapons Center, China Lake	18.9	34	6		
*24. Naval Underwater Systems Center, New London					
25. Military Sealift Command, Pacific, Oakland	16.2	52.5	9		
26. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi	58.2	n/a	6	0	3
*27. Naval Air Station, Lemoore	26.8	15	4	3	3
*28. Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island					
*29. Naval Air Station, North Island	13.3	58	8		
*30. Naval Submarine Base, New London				1 white control	
31. Navy Public Works Center, SF Bay	11.9	36	4		

KEY:

A: Percent of citizen Hispanics in Eligible Labor Force (ELF) 8 and 9.

B: Projected entries for 6 month total.

C: Projected Hispanic entries for 6 month total.

D: Actual Anglo surveys returned.

E: Actual Hispanic surveys returned.

*This activity was added because it was concomitantly participating in a similar study of women entering into nontraditional jobs.

Notes.

1. ELF figures are based on 1980 Census data. ELF figures for Florida were increased by 25 percent to reflect the influx of Cubans in 1980 after the Census enumeration.

2. Projected entries are from NAVSO 12713/20 for 1985 and 1986.

number of civilian hiring opportunities projected for each location for fiscal year 1987. The percentage of male Hispanics who were available for employment in DONOL Codes 8 and 9 in the local labor market was determined by examining the U.S. Census' eligible labor force extraction from its CLF. If the resulting representation percentage was at least 2 percent, the activity passed the first criterion for inclusion. The product of the projected hiring times the available percentage was used to determine the number of Hispanics an activity should hire annually within DONOL Codes 8 and 9 if representative hiring were occurring. A 6-month hiring estimate was then determined by dividing the yearly goal by 2. If the 6-month estimate was at least four Hispanics entering targeted jobs, the activity became part of the sample. Fifteen activities met that criterion; 12 of which were in California. Another 16 activities were included because they were participating in a simultaneously conducted study of women's entry into blue-collar jobs.

Selecting Respondents

Each Hispanic male who entered one of the previously described jobs was asked to voluntarily complete a questionnaire during his first week of work. In order to investigate potential ethnic-group differences, a comparison Anglo male was also surveyed whenever his entry into a DONOL Code 8 or 9 job at the same activity followed the entry of a surveyed Hispanic male. To avoid over-sampling from a limited number of activities, commands were asked to submit data from no more than 20 entering Hispanic or Anglo males.

When the initial 6-month data-gathering period did not yield an adequate sample, the period was extended to a total of 18 months. Data gathering difficulties included (1) temporary hiring freezes, (2) problems encountered when administering the survey to some union members, and (3) turnover among the personnel who were supposed to administer the survey at the activities. Table 1 also contains the number of usable surveys submitted from each location.

Respondents

Six of the 160 completed questionnaires were discarded because the persons who identified themselves as Hispanic indicated that either (1) their primary language was something other than Spanish (Hawaiian, Tagalog, or Pangasinan) or (2) their country of origin (Philippines or Lebanon) was not such that findings from those individuals would generalize to persons from more commonly identified Hispanic lands. The surveys for three additional Hispanics could not be used because they did not supply responses to the acculturation index. As a result, 76 Hispanic and 75 Anglo surveys were analyzed.

Survey Instrument

Appendix C contains the survey that was administered to both Hispanic and Anglo respondents. The questionnaire was developed following a review of the Hispanic work-related literature (Edwards, 1988). The questionnaire contained 111 items, with some items having more than one part. A pre-test of the survey determined that it could be completed in less than 30 minutes. The average readability of the questionnaire was below the sixth grade reading level.

The content of the survey was limited by the fact that respondents would be taking the questionnaire within their first week of employment. Therefore, questions were not asked

regarding the work place, co-workers, or supervisors, because the respondents would not have had adequate time to form opinions. Also, no archival information regarding knowledge, skills, and abilities was available on the respondents. The effort to gather job-related education and experience information (items 24-39) proved unsuccessful. Only a small fraction of the respondents provided the requested data.

The remainder of the information requested on the questionnaire fell into seven broad categories: demographics, measures of acculturation, psychological need scales, an organizational commitment index, factors considered when taking a job, employment practices and job-search activities, and agreement or disagreement with presumed causes of Hispanic under-representation in the work force.

Acculturation

The primary acculturation scale (items 68-71) was patterned after Kuvlesky and Patella's (1971) five-item ethnic-identification scale. For that index, respondents indicated how frequently they used a language other than English when they talked to family members, talked to friends, read a newspaper, or listened to a radio or TV. The anchors for the rating scale were *never* (1), *almost never* (2), *sometimes* (3), *usually* (4), and *always* (5). The coefficient alpha, internal-consistency estimate for the four-item scale was .90. This high level of reliability suggests that either Spanish or English was used to a similar degree across the four situations described in the acculturation items.

The other three acculturation indices were one-item scales: the degree to which Spanish was used in the home when the respondent was a child (item 13), the number of years of education taken in a language other than English (item 55), and the proportion of neighbors within a four block area who shared the respondent's race or ethnic status (item 54).

Psychological Needs

Five psychological needs were assessed.

Lyon's (1971) four-item need-for-clarity index (items 50-53) asks respondents how important it is to know in detail: what is to be done, how the job is supposed to be done, the limits of the respondent's authority, and how well the respondent is doing. Respondents completed the need-for-clarity items using the following rating format: *not important* (1), *neither unimportant nor important* (2), *somewhat important* (3), *important* (4), and *very important* (5). Respondents were also given the option of indicating that the item is *not true* (0); such answers were treated as missing data. The coefficient alpha estimate of internal consistency for the current data was .76.

A modified version of Steers and Braunstein's (1976) manifest needs questionnaire was used to measure need for achievement (nAch), need for affiliation (nAff), need for autonomy (nAut), and need for dominance (nDom). For each dimension, four items were selected. Some responses to the 16 statements (items 72-87) use the 5-point scale described in the acculturation section. The reliability estimates obtained for these four needs were very low: nAch, .31; nAff, .19; nAut, .29; and nDom, .23. They indicate that the content of the scales are too heterogeneous to warrant

considering any of the four indices in a composite manner. Because of the low levels of reliability, the four needs were analyzed at the item-level rather than at a scale-level.

Organizational Commitment

An important variable in understanding and explaining work behaviors such as absenteeism and turnover is *organizational commitment*, the degree to which a person identifies with and is involved in a particular organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Four items (88-91) from a 15-item organizational commitment scale (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974) were selected. As with other scales, the number of items was decreased to save administration time. Also, in the case of the organizational commitment index, numerous items were deleted because they would have asked the respondents about their attitudes and beliefs regarding information that could have been obtained only after they had been in the organization for some time. The items use a 5-point rating format: *strongly disagree* (1), *disagree* (2), *neither disagree nor agree* (3), *agree* (4), and *strongly agree* (5). The coefficient alpha reliability for the four-item scale was .69.

Factors Considered When Taking a Job

Four types of factors were investigated: importance of job-related factors, geographic location considerations, work-group size preferences, and a single item that asked the respondent how many people he knew at the command before taking the job.

Items 40 through 49 required that respondents indicate how important each of 10 aspects of their new employment was for choosing to take their jobs. The importance scale is the same as that used to measure need for clarity.

The five geographic location considerations probed how many round-trip miles employees had to travel to and from work (item 62), how many miles they would be willing to commute to continue employment with Navy if their current jobs were eliminated (item 63), how many years that they had lived within 50 miles of their current home (item 64), and the degree to which they agree with two items: willingness to move to a Navy activity 200 miles away in order to receive a promotion (item 92) and that bus service to the new job is poor (item 97). The latter two items were answered with the rating scale employed to measure organizational commitment.

The two items measuring work-group size preferences focused on the ideal number of persons within a work group (item 65) and the ideal number of co-workers in a 10 person work group who would share race and ethnic-group status.

Employment Practices and Job-search Activities

The items included in this category were divided among three categories: sources of recruitment, job-search activities, and government practices potentially restricting Hispanic representation. For the nine sources of recruitment (items 15-23), respondents are asked to place an "X" beside any item(s) that indicated how they found out about the job for which they were hired.

Two of the five job-search items asked time-related questions: the number of months between the final day of the last full-time job and the start of the new job (item 57) and the number of months between filing an application for the current job and the first day of work (item 58). The other three job-search items asked for the number of times that the respondents: checked federal job listings during the 3 months before starting the new job (item 59), applied for federal government jobs during the year prior to employment (item 60), and applied for other jobs during the past year (item 61).

The seven government practices commonly believed to restrict Hispanic representation (items 93-96; 98-100) were taken from Thomas' (1987) survey. In Phase I of the Equal Employment Opportunity Enhancement Research Project, Thomas developed a survey for first-line supervisors of Hispanics working in blue-collar jobs. Respondents answered the items using the 5-point Likert disagreement-agreement scale described in the organizational commitment section. The coefficient alpha for the current data was .66.

Attributions for Hispanic Under-representation

The 11 attributions were also taken from Thomas' (1987) study and answered with the 5-point Likert disagreement-agreement scale. The negative attributions that had been suggested as potential reasons for Hispanic under-representation were divided into four clusters: lack of knowledge, skills, or abilities (item 101-103); suspicion of the government (items 104-106); lack of career orientation (items 107-109); and a category with two miscellaneous statements (items 110 and 111). The coefficient alphas for the first three scales were, respectively, .89, .73, and .88.

Procedure

Defining Hispanic Acculturation Groups

The Hispanic respondents were grouped into high ($N = 35$) and low ($N = 41$) acculturation groups based upon their responses to the 4-item scale. For all analyses, respondents whose mean acculturation scores were 2.00 or less (i.e., the respondents who never or almost never used Spanish) were classified as high acculturation Hispanics (HAHs); the remainder of the Hispanic respondents were classified as low acculturation Hispanics (LAHs).

Analyses

Whenever percentages are shown in a table, a chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine whether a relationship existed between group membership (Anglos, HAH, and LAH) and responses to an item or a composite. Whenever means are shown, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed, with group membership as the independent variable and an item response or a composite as the dependent variable. A significant ANOVA result was followed by a Scheffe post hoc test to determine the source(s) of the difference. For all primary and secondary analyses, the probability level was set at .01. This stringent level was chosen as a balance for three considerations: the exploratory nature of the research, the large number of contrasts performed, and the already low statistical power caused by the small sample sizes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographics

Table 2 presents mean values and percentages for Anglos, HAHs, and LAHs on a variety of demographic characteristics. In general, the Anglo and Hispanic groups were very similar. All three groups averaged about 34 years of age, more than 12 years of education, and approximately 17 years of working for pay. Almost all of the respondents reported that they had been employed previously on a full-time basis and that they were not currently members of a union. The members of each group averaged similar amounts of time (between 4.50 and 6.75 years) in their last full-time job.

The only statistically significant difference among the three groups pertained to the average number of people in the household. The LAHs had significantly more persons in their households than did Anglos; no difference was found between either of those two groups and the HAHs. According to the Census Bureau (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1985), the average sizes of Hispanic and non-Hispanic families are, respectively, 3.88 and 3.18 persons. In part, the difference detected in this study was the result of more LAHs than Anglos being married. Two other interesting but non-significant differences were observed. Compared to both Anglos and HAHs, a larger proportion of the LAHs reported having worked in other civilian Navy jobs. Second, 65.7 percent of the HAHs were veterans. That proportion is higher than either the 60.0 percent for Anglos or the 51.2 percent for the LAHs.

The overall similarity of the three groups with regard to demographics weakens alternative explanations whenever a subsequent difference was found among the groups. For example, the similarity with regard to veteran status lessens the possibility that the additional points awarded to veterans would differently affect the time between application and employment for one or more groups. Still, *caution must be exercised* in the interpretation of these and subsequent findings. One reason for caution is the atypicality of the Hispanics in this sample with regard to education. The level of education for the Hispanics in this study was much higher than that found in the Hispanic population. The Census Bureau (U.S. Department of Commerce, September 7, 1988) reported that 51 percent of all Hispanics aged 25 and above had completed high school and/or college during 1987 and 1988. Although this is an all time high for Hispanics, it is still markedly lower than the 78 percent completion rate for non-Hispanics. Therefore, even though the three groups in this study are similar in terms of education, this study's Hispanic sample is different from the Hispanic population. Finally, conclusions are tenuous because of the very small sample and low statistical power (i.e., the ability to detect a difference as being due to a non-chance factor when, in fact, a difference truly exists).

Acculturation

Table 3 shows the results obtained for the acculturation measures. The four-item composite correlated .34 ($p = .002$) with item 13 and .46 ($p = .001$) with item 55. Hispanic respondents who used more Spanish than their Hispanic peers also reported having had relatively more Spanish spoken in their home when they were growing up and more years of education in a language other than English. Other intercorrelations among the four acculturation indices were not significant.

Table 2
Demographics

Anglo	Hispanic		Item
	H ^a Acc	L Acc	
34.81	33.60	34.00	4. Age (Mean number of years).
12.60	12.54	12.28	5. What is the highest grade you completed in school or college? Count a GED as 12 years.
17.92	16.69	17.16	6. Since you became 16, how many years have you worked for pay?
1.4%	2.9%	10.0%	56. Is this your first full-time job? (Answered "Yes").
6.64	4.59	6.66	If "No" how long were you employed full time in your last job?
2.82 ^a	2.91	3.90	7. How many people are there in your household?
			8. Current marital status.
41.3%	54.3%	58.5%	Married.
37.3%	25.7%	22.0%	Single, never married.
21.3%	20.0%	19.5%	Divorced/separated/widowed.
			9. Is anyone else in your household working outside the home?
46.7%	48.6%	43.9%	No.
9.3%	8.6%	19.5%	Yes, someone works part-time.
44.0%	42.9%	36.6%	Yes, someone works full-time.
			10. Are you a veteran?
40.0%	34.3%	48.8%	No.
			Yes, I was in the _____.
26.7%	11.4%	7.3%	Navy.
13.3%	28.6%	29.3%	Army.
6.7%	14.3%	7.3%	Marines.
10.7%	11.4%	7.3%	Air Force.
2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	Coast Guard.
9.1%	16.7%	16.7%	11. Are you a member of a union? (Answered "Yes").
20.0%	22.9%	37.5%	12. Have you worked for the Navy in some other civilian jobs? (Answered "Yes").

^aThe mean is significantly less ($p < .01$) than the mean for low acculturation Hispanics.

Table 3
Acculturation

Anglo	Hispanic		Item
	H Acc	L ^a Acc	
1.26 ^a	1.28 ^a	3.13	Mean dimension score for items 68, 69, 70, and 71 ($r_{xx} = .90$).
1.22 ^a	1.60 ^a	3.85	68. How often do you use a language other than English when talking to family members?
1.31 ^a	1.35 ^a	3.46	69. How often do you use a language other than English when talking to friends?
1.17 ^a	1.00 ^a	2.46	70. How often do you use a language other than English when reading a newspaper?
1.28 ^a	1.20 ^a	2.75	71. How often do you use a language other than English when listening to a radio or TV program?
			13. What language was spoken in you home when you were a child?
86.5%	29.4%	12.2%	Only English.
12.2%	52.9%	39.0%	Mostly English, but also _____.
1.4%	11.8%	29.3%	Some English, but mostly _____.
0.0%	5.9%	19.5%	Only _____.
1.01 ^a	1.34	3.61	55. How many years of your education were taken in schools where you were taught in a language other than English?
3.43	1.85 ^b	2.50 ^b	54. How many of your neighbors who live within 4 blocks of your home share your race or ethnic status. Place an "X" beside the most correct answer.
14.1%	51.4%	30.0%	None or almost none (0% to 15%) of neighbors.
8.5%	22.9%	30.0%	A few (16% to 35%) of my neighbors.
25.4%	20.0%	15.0%	About half (36% to 65%) of my neighbors.
23.9%	0.0%	10.0%	Most (66% to 85%) of my neighbors.
28.2%	5.7%	15.0%	All or nearly all (86% to 100%) of neighbors.

^aThe mean is significantly less ($p < .01$) than the mean for low acculturation Hispanics.

^bThe mean is significantly less ($p < .01$) than the mean for the Anglo group.

Psychological Needs

Need for Clarity

Table 4 shows that all three groups indicated a very high need for clarity, with LAHs indicating a significantly greater need than Anglos. Although none of the ratings for the four items indicated a significant difference among the groups, LAHs reported that each of the four need-for-clarity components was more important than did the other two groups. The situation in the Hispanic population may be more extreme than implied by that small difference. The lower education level of the Hispanic population, in comparison with the sample participating in the present study, may result in yet more need for clarity by less-educated Hispanics. Hypothetically, these individuals may have a lower ability to define ambiguous situations and to generalize from one situation to another.

The present results support literature cited in Edwards' (1988) review, which suggested that Hispanics have a high need for clarity. For instance, Gould (1982, p. 97) cited several studies that have shown that "Mexican-Americans do not tolerate ambiguity and uncertainty well." The strong authoritarian role of fathers and emphases on sex roles and discipline in such families were suggested as possible reasons for the findings. In his study of 111 Mexican-American college graduates from 15 organizations, Gould found that as tolerance for ambiguity increased, a participant's career progression (operationally defined as annual salary adjusted for tenure with an organization) also increased.

The significant need-for-clarity difference found in this study also supports Ash, Levine, and Edgell's (1979) finding that when given a chance to choose tasks, Hispanic (more so than Black or Anglo) job applicants disproportionately indicated a preference for jobs in which others would tell them what to do next. The present study's small but reliable difference between LAHs and Anglos suggests that Anglos and Hispanics may not share equal rates of progression in their careers. Gould (1982) noted that jobs become less structured as an organizational hierarchy is ascended. If Hispanics prefer to avoid situations of uncertainty, organizational efforts to achieve employment parity (not just the opportunity for employment parity) throughout the organizational hierarchy may be difficult to achieve. Discrimination and other barriers may also play a part. Hispanics' very high need for clarity may explain Becker's (1980) findings. Using EEO Commission data on the racial/compositions of organizations, Becker found that there was a strong relationship between the racial/ethnic composition at one organizational level and the composition at other levels. That is, as organizational level became higher, proportionately fewer Hispanics were found. Factors such as low tolerance of ambiguous situations may combine with education and other job-related variables to limit the upward progression of Hispanics in organizations.

Achievement, Affiliation, Autonomy, and Dominance Needs

Only 2 of the 16 sets of item means were significantly different in comparisons across groups (see Table 4). This is the number that would be expected by chance, given the large number (16) of comparisons performed at the .01 probability level. (The probability of finding at least one significant difference is $.16 = .01 \times 16$. A smaller significance level was not chosen because it would have decreased statistical power even more.) Table 4 shows that all three groups indicated that they performed the nAch behaviors more frequently than they did most other behaviors. Items

Table 4
Psychological Needs

Anglo	Hispanic		Item
	H ^a Acc	L ^b Acc	
4.33 ^b	4.49	4.72	Mean dimension score for Need for Clarity ($r_{xx} = .76$).
4.52	4.44	4.84	50. How important is it to you to know <u>in detail, what</u> you have to do on a job?
4.45	4.55	4.76	51. How important is it to you to know <u>in detail, how</u> you are supposed to do a job?
4.11	4.23	4.55	52. How important is it to you to know <u>in detail</u> , what the limits of your authority on a job are?
4.26	4.73	4.73	53. How important is it to you to know how well you are doing?
3.85	3.83	3.89	Mean dimension score for Need for Achievement ($r_{xx} = .31$)
4.16	4.11	4.19	72. I do my best work when my job assignments are fairly difficult.
4.66	4.71	4.68	76. I try hard to improve my past performance at work.
2.56	2.51	2.75	80. I take moderate risks and stick my neck out to get ahead at work.
2.00	1.96	2.09	*84. I try to avoid any added responsibilities on my job.
3.09	3.19	3.27	Mean dimension score for Need for Affiliation ($r_{xx} = .19$)
2.93	3.17	3.24	73. When I have a choice, I try to work in a group instead of by myself.
4.39	4.22	4.60	77. I pay a good deal of attention to the feelings of others at work.
3.51	3.54	3.65	*81. I prefer to do my own work and let others do theirs.
3.43	3.08	3.09	*85. I express my disagreements with others openly.
2.33	2.29	2.05	Mean dimension score for Need for Autonomy ($r_{xx} = .29$)
3.40	3.05	3.31	74. In my work assignments, I try to be my own boss.
2.64	3.20	2.09 ^a	78. I go my own way at work, regardless of the opinions of others.
1.62	1.39	1.56	82. I disregard rules and regulations that hamper my personal freedom.
4.33	4.54	4.75	*86. I consider myself a "team player" at work.
3.07	3.15	3.15	Mean dimension score for Need for Dominance ($r_{xx} = .23$)
3.37	3.22	3.36	75. I seek an active role in the leadership of a group.
2.95	2.71	2.90	*79. I avoid trying to influence those around me to see things my way.
2.37	2.31	2.51	83. I find myself organizing and directing the activities of others.
3.51	3.80	3.65	87. I strive to gain more control over the events around me at work.

^aThe mean is significantly less ($p < .01$) than the mean for high acculturation Hispanics.

^bThe mean is significantly less ($p < .01$) than the mean for low acculturation Hispanics.

*To compute the dimension mean, the item was reverse scored (i.e., "6 - X").

72, 76, and 84 (after reverse scoring) had means in excess of 4.00. Item 77 from the nAff dimension was the only other statement with a frequency rating above 4.00. Thus, it appears that all of the groups' achievement needs were higher than their other psychological needs. The psychological need with the lowest item ratings was nAut. This finding is not surprising, given that the jobs for which the respondents were hired require little autonomous behavior or decision making.

The low reliabilities and statistical power prevent the drawing of any other conclusions from these findings. Future studies, however, may benefit by incorporating psychological needs in their searches for differences between Hispanics and other groups of employees.

Organizational Commitment

No significant difference in organizational commitment was found among the three groups (see Table 5). An examination of the items within the organizational commitment scale shows that particularly strong opinions were expressed by all three groups for two of the four statements. Respondents agreed that they were proud to tell others that they worked for the government/Navy, and disagreed that the government/Navy was not an organization in which they had much to gain through continued employment.

Table 5
Organizational Commitment

Anglo	Hispanic		Item
	H Acc	L Acc	
4.02	4.34	4.19	Mean dimension score for Organizational Commitment ($r_{xx} = .69$).
3.62	3.85	3.87	88. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
4.56	4.71	4.65	89. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
1.93	1.51	1.72	90.* There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.
3.82	4.28	3.97	91. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.

*To compute the dimension mean, the item was reverse scored (i.e., "6 - X").

Organizational commitment data provided little insight at this time into Hispanic-Anglo employment differences. Data to be gathered from respondents one year after they completed their entry surveys and analyzed with the current data may provide information to explain potential group differences in work-related behavior and attitudes that develop over time.

Potential Factors to be Considered When Taking a Job

Importance of Job-related Factors

Table 6 shows the mean ratings for each group for each of the 10 factors. No difference was found among the three groups with regard to their average importance rating for any factor. In addition to all three groups evaluating each factor at essentially the same level of importance, the average ratings for the factors showed the same pattern across the three groups. The 10 Anglo means correlated .93 ($p < .001$) with the 10 corresponding HAH means and .94 ($p < .001$) with the 10 LAH means. The Pearson product-moment correlation between the 10 pairs of means for the HAH and LAH groups was .84 ($p < .001$). The most important factor for Anglos and HAHs, and nearly the most important factor for LAHs, was the job security provided by the government. Interestingly, Anglos, like their Hispanic counterparts, rated equal employment opportunity as an important reason for taking jobs at their Navy activities. Furthermore, the results did not indicate any perception of reverse discrimination among the Anglo group. Another noteworthy finding was that having friends or relatives working at the activity was the least important factor for all three groups in considering employment. In summary, these findings show that all three groups valued the same rewards and outcomes and that the average value placed on any factor did not vary when ethnicity and acculturation were examined.

Geographic Location Considerations

All three groups traveled an average of about 30 miles to and from work each day, and each group indicated that they would travel an average distance of nearly twice their current round trip to their jobs to continue working for the Navy if their current positions were terminated (see Table 6). Anglos and the two Hispanic groups did not differ for these items. All three groups also reported having lived within 50 miles of their current home for a number of years. The lowest mean time was about 14 years for Anglos, the highest mean was over 19 years for LAHs. This difference was not statistically significant.

While LAHs reported more willingness to move for a promotion than did their HAH and Anglo peers, this difference did not achieve statistical significance. This non-significant finding supports Edwards, Thomas, and Bower's (1989) finding that Hispanics, Anglos, and Blacks reported no difference in their willingness to move for a job that offered training for advancement. For the last item included in this survey, Anglos, HAHs, and LAHs were equally positive about bus service to the activities.

Work-group Composition

The average desired number of persons sharing the respondent's race/ethnicity was the same across the three groups (see Table 6). Because each respondent was asked to indicate the desired number of persons out of a work group of 10 people, the means for item 66 can be easily translated to proportions. On average, the Anglos desired to work in groups that were 46.4 percent Anglos; HAHs, 31.5 percent Hispanics; and LAHs, 40.8 percent Hispanics.

Table 6
Potential Factors to be Considered When Taking a Job

Anglo	Hispanic		Item
	H Acc	L Acc	
Importance of Job-Related Factors			
4.00	4.48	4.33	41. Working for the government provides a lot of job security.
3.98	4.00	4.12	48. I think the job will be interesting or challenging.
3.97	4.23	4.37	46. The government provides EEO for promotions, training, etc.
3.93	4.29	4.38	45. Benefits (time off, health ins., etc.) are good.
3.83	4.20	4.22	42. The pay is good.
3.75	3.65	4.28	43. The hours of my work schedule are good.
3.74	4.12	4.23	40. I badly need a job.
3.65	4.03	4.17	47. I can learn a new skill.
2.93	3.48	3.05	44. I don't have to drive too far or can take a bus.
2.33	2.24	3.04	49. I have friends or relatives working here.
Geographic Location Considerations			
32.73	28.00	26.65	62. How many miles do you travel to and from your job each day?
58.15	49.25	47.87	63. If your job were eliminated at this activity, how many miles would you be willing to travel each day for a similar job at another Navy activity?
13.94	14.37	19.28	64. How many years have you lived within 50 miles of where you live today?

3.40	3.31	3.72	92. I would be willing to move to another Navy activity 200 miles away to receive a promotion.
2.88	2.27	2.44	97. Bus service to the activity is poor.
Work-Group Size Preferences			
13.78	12.51	14.24	65. What size group would you like to work in? That is, how many people, counting yourself, would you like your boss to supervise?
4.64	3.15	4.08	66. Imagine you were working with 10 other people everyday. How many of those people would you like to be of your race and ethnic group?
Other			
9.35	3.63	5.68	67. How many people did you know at this command before you got this job?

Given that about 10 percent of the current U.S. population is Hispanic, the average desirable composition of the work groups for Hispanics may be unobtainable (even in locations such as those in this study that exceeded the current national average).

No difference was detected for item 65: the desired number of persons in one's work group.

Other

Although there is wide variation among the three means for the number of persons known at the activities before the respondents took their jobs, no significant difference was found (see Table 6). In addition to the low statistical power that has plagued other analyses, detection of a difference was hampered by much variability within the groups. Answers varied from 0 persons known to greater than 99 for both Anglos and LAHs. For the HAHs, the answers varied from 0 to 20.

Another set of analyses was run to determine the correlations among the three items that deal with familiarity with the activity (item 67: number of people known before getting the job, item 49: the importance of having friends and relatives working at the activity, and item 17: whether or not the respondent found out about the job opening from a friend or relative). None of the six pair-wise correlations was significant. (The correlations were computed on the total sample because no significant difference had been found among the three groups for any of the three items.)

Employment Practices and Job-search Activities

Recruitment

Table 7 presents information concerning employment practices and job-search activities. Nine chi-square tests of independence found no significant relationship between group membership and method of recruitment. Despite the absence of a statistically significant findings, the percentages for items 17, 20, and 22 merit attention. Nearly half of all the respondents indicated that they found their jobs through a friend or relative. Although no relationship was found between group membership and whether or not a friend or relative had told the newly hired employee about the job opening, the Navy may need to reevaluate its heavy reliance upon that method of recruitment. Because there are proportionally a great many more Anglos than members of other ethnic/racial groups working for the Navy and because the Navy already suffers from Hispanic under-representation, continued reliance on this recruitment method will perpetuate the current representation problems.

Few persons were recruited by employment and EEO offices. Affirmative action recruitment did not appear to be a significant recruitment source. The answers written-in for the "Other" methods of recruitment provided no more evidence for the effectiveness of active recruiting efforts. They included four explanations involving unsolicited walk-ins and two word-of-mouth recruitments--from a rehabilitation counselor and from a friend.

Another concern regarding recruitment cannot be investigated until longitudinal data from a 1-year follow-up survey are gathered. Later analyses will examine whether one method of recruitment leads to higher retention rates than other methods. Decker and Cornelius (1979), like earlier researchers (Gannon, 1971; Reid, 1972), found that persons recruited by friends and

Table 7
Employment Practices and Job-search Activities

Anglo	Hispanic		Item
	H Acc	L Acc	
Recruitment: How did you find out about this job? (Place an "X" by as many answers as apply and write in the information asked.)			
Percent Indicating Source^a			
48.6%	42.9%	56.1%	17. From a friend or relative.
21.6%	22.9%	12.2%	16. Federal job listing.
12.2%	11.4%	14.6%	15. Newspaper ad.
10.8%	11.4%	14.6%	22. Employment office or program.
10.8%	17.1%	12.2%	23. Other.
2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	21. School counselor or training program.
2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	19. I was a trainee or intern for this job.
1.4%	0.0%	7.3%	18. From the union.
1.4%	2.9%	12.2%	20. EEO office.
Job Search			
3.22	2.21	3.31	57. How many months passed between the final day of work on your last full-time job and your first day at work on this Navy job?
5.02	3.60	4.23	58. How many months did it take from the time you filed your application for this job and your first day of work.
2.44	4.00	3.89	59. How many times during the last 3 months did you check the Federal government job listings?
1.35	1.45	1.97	60. During the last 12 months, how many Federal government jobs did you apply for?
4.47	3.26	4.02	61. During the last 12 months, how many other jobs did you apply for?
2.62	2.45	2.67	Mean dimension score for Government Practices Restricting Hispanic Representation ($r_{xx} = .66$).
3.21	2.77	3.15	95. Getting a job with the Navy takes too long.
2.78	2.66	2.78	98. Job ads do not reach Hispanics.
2.72	2.75	3.21	100. There are few Hispanics at this activity to support newly hired Hispanics.
2.58	2.37	2.22	94. The Federal government's job qualifications are not appropriate.
2.46	2.05	2.32	96. I had difficulty completing the SF-171 application form.
2.29	2.51	2.80	93. The Federal government's job qualifications are too high.
2.15	1.96	2.40	99. The Navy's pay scale is too low to attract good Hispanic workers.

^aThe totals for the Recruitment columns are greater than 100 percent because respondents could indicate more than one source.

relatives were more likely to stay with an organization than were individuals who were recruited with more formal methods such as advertisements. If this situation holds for the Navy, it may be another reason for the non-parity. More specifically, equal use of informal recruiting by Anglos and Hispanics not only perpetuates current unequal opportunities for employment in an activity that has not reached parity, it also may result in a continuing disproportionate work force in the future if similar termination rates are found for Hispanics and Anglos.

The "Job Search" section of Table 7 shows group means for the months spent getting the current job and the activeness with which the newly hired employees were pursuing employment opportunities. The short time between leaving a previous full-time job and obtaining employment with the Navy suggests that many of the newly hired employees from all three groups were working elsewhere until the time that they were hired by the Navy. Additionally, both Hispanic groups were, on average, marginally faster than Anglos in obtaining their new jobs. Together, these time-based questions seem to indicate that Hispanics and Anglos are being treated equally during the hiring phase when they have similar job-related demographic characteristics such as education and veteran's preference.

No ethnic or acculturation difference was detected for the three items measuring how actively the respondents were seeking their jobs. All three groups tended to be equally selective in applying for jobs. During the year prior to completion of the survey, the average number of jobs applied for was 6.00 or less for all three groups.

Government Practices Restricting Hispanic Representation

The low, nonsignificantly different dimension means for government practices restricting Hispanic representation indicate that none of the groups perceived the employment practices to be a source of the under-representation problem (see Table 7). Upon closer examination, the item means show that only two statements had at least one group's average rating above the neutral rating of "3" (neither disagree nor agree). In both of those cases, the averages were only slightly toward the "4" (agree) rating. Therefore, the seven employment practices listed in this section were apparently believed to have no different effect on Hispanics than they have on the employment of other groups. These findings agreed with Thomas' (1987) findings. In her study, less than half of the supervisors perceived that any of the practices affected Hispanic representation. The one exception was "getting federal jobs takes too long"; 57 percent of Thomas' supervisors indicated that that issue was "important" or "very important."

Caution should be used in attempting to generalize the Hispanic findings from this subsection to perceptions of the Hispanic population of government employment practices. The fact that the Hispanics in this research sample were able to obtain jobs with the government may make them view these practices more favorably than peers in the Hispanic population.

Disagreement with Negative Characteristics Sometimes Attributed to Hispanics

Lack of Knowledge, Skills, or Abilities (KSAs)

All three groups shared a somewhat neutral opinion regarding the relative KSAs of Hispanics (see Table 8). Despite the lack of a significant difference among the composite KSA mean scores, one significant item difference was found. Thus, HAHs rejected the attribution that the lack of fluency in English is a barrier to Hispanic employment. Angelos, on the other hand, had a mean response that indicated some agreement with that attribution. The overall neutrality on these items expressed by this study's respondents is in sharp contrast to the opinions of Thomas' (1987) supervisors. In the earlier study, 73 percent, 81 percent, and 65 percent of the supervisors answered items 102, 103, and 101 (respectively) with ratings of either "important" or "very important".

Table 8
Disagreement with Negative Characteristics Sometimes
Attributed to Hispanics

Anglo	Hispanic		Item	
	H Acc	L Acc		
3.03	2.54	2.78		Mean dimension score for Lack of Knowledge, Skills, or Abilities ($t_{xx} = .89$).
3.17	2.39 ^a	2.77	102.	Many Hispanics do not speak English very well.
2.94	2.60	2.69	103.	Many Hispanics have poor reading, spelling, and math skills.
2.92	2.63	2.88	101.	Many Hispanics lack a high school diploma.
2.79	2.37	2.18 ^a		Mean dimension score for Suspicion of Government ($t_{xx} = .73$).
2.84	2.45	2.08 ^a	106.	Many Hispanics do not identify themselves as Hispanics on the applications that they file.
2.82	2.57	2.55	104.	Many Hispanics do not wish to answer personal questions during an interview.
2.70	2.09	1.97 ^a	105.	Many Hispanics do not trust the Federal government as their employer.
2.81	2.32	2.28		Mean dimension score for Lack of Career Orientation ($t_{xx} = .88$).
2.86	2.48	2.52	108.	Many Hispanics lack direction in following goals.
2.82	2.45	2.38	107.	Many Hispanics lack career goals.
2.74	2.03	1.94 ^a	109.	Many Hispanic youths do not desire permanent employment.
				Miscellaneous Negative Attributions.
2.98	2.69	2.97	110.	Many Hispanics need a job immediately and cannot wait the time it takes to be hired by the government.
2.90	3.15	2.70	111.	Many Hispanics are reluctant to move to a new location for a job.

^aThe mean is significantly less ($p < .01$) than the mean for Anglos.

The DONOL Code 8 and 9 jobs examined in this study do not require high school diplomas; however, some confusion exists as to whether a diploma is necessary for employment. This confusion combined with the high average education levels of the three groups may indicate that some activities are routinely excluding non-graduates. Alternatively, these newly hired employees may have earned jobs as a result of the greater KSAs that were partially obtained via higher than average education levels. Formerly, the Navy's available labor force estimate for these DONOL codes was based on high school graduates even though no such hiring requirement exists for these jobs (e.g., see Atwater, Bres, Niehaus, & Sheridan, 1983).

Suspicion of the Government

Table 8 also shows that significant differences emerged between LAHs and Anglos on the dimension score for suspicion of the government, but no difference was found between the HAHs and either of the other two groups. Analyses of the items showed that the LAHs disagreed with the attributions that Hispanics are under-represented because they (1) do not trust the Federal government and (2) do not identify themselves as Hispanics on their applications. Anglos, on the other hand, were more neutral than LAHs in their opinions about those two statements.

Thomas (1987) similarly reported that no more than one-third of her supervisors believed that any of these attributions were important factors contributing to Hispanic under-representation at their Navy activities.

Lack of Career Orientation

For this dimension mean, HAHs, LAHs, and Anglos responded with the same pattern as was found in the composite for suspicion of the government (see Table 8). That is, LAHs disagreed most strongly with the attribution; Anglos were neutral in their opinions; and HAHs' beliefs were between the other two groups. Much of the nonsignificant difference found in the composite may be explained by responses to the statement that many Hispanic youths do not desire permanent employment. Those items elicited the most extreme responses of any attribution in Table 8 from both the HAHs and LAHs. "Young [Hispanic] people don't want permanent jobs" received "important" or "very important" ratings from 47 percent of Thomas' (1987) sample, suggesting that supervisors hold a misperception on this attribute.

Miscellaneous Negative Attributions

No difference was found for either of the two one-item attributions shown in Table 8. All groups were fairly neutral in their opinions about whether Hispanics required an immediate job and whether Hispanics would move for employment. Earlier in the report, it was noted that about 4 months passed between the time that Hispanics applied for their new job and their first days of work. The quickness with which that group received employment may not be generalizable to other Hispanics especially those who are less educated and harder to employ.

The neutral responses for the reluctance-to-move item underscores a previous finding of the Equal Employment Enhancement project (Edwards et al., 1989). In that earlier study, Hispanics indicated a self-reported willingness to move that was equal to that of Blacks and Anglos whenever the new locations had relatively high concentrations of Hispanics. Hispanics, however, reported significantly less likelihood than Anglos of moving to 12 states that did not have large concentrations of Hispanics.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A goal of the present study was to identify factors among newly hired personnel that might help explain the reasons for Hispanic under-representation in the Navy's blue-collar civilian work force. Overall, the results indicate that both high and low acculturated Hispanics were more similar to Anglos than they were different. These similarities were obtained for demographic variables, experiences with employment practices encountered in obtaining the new position, and attitudes and opinions. Thus, it appears that Navy is attracting Hispanics into its blue-collar work force who are comparable on a variety of psychological and organizational dimensions with the majority Anglo group.

This investigation did reveal, however, one organizational practice (recruitment) and one individual-difference variable (need for clarity) that could be contributing to the lack of parity for Hispanics. The following interventions are suggested for dealing with problems caused by current methods of recruitment and the relatively higher need for work clarity expressed by less acculturated Hispanics.

1. **Use more formal methods of recruitment for DONOL Code 8 and 9 jobs to alleviate the Navy's current Hispanic under-representation.** An investment in formal recruitment (e.g., advertisements and job fairs designed especially for Hispanic communities) could ease future recruitment costs as Hispanic numbers continue to increase. Increased Hispanic hiring today will likely foster perceptions in the Hispanic community that the Navy is an organization in which Hispanics can get ahead. If no change in recruitment procedure occurs, these findings suggest that the Navy may continue to experience non-parity for Hispanics.

2. **Enhance training of supervisors to accommodate less acculturated Hispanics' relatively higher need for work clarity.** The Navy already has the required vehicle for implementing such training in the form of supervisory EEO training sessions. Supervisors could be presented with (a) methods for structuring tasks and duties and (b) the processes used in mentoring. Such mentoring typically involves a new employee identifying with a more senior worker in order to learn organizational practices, where to find resources and how to get things done. While these interventions may be specifically designed to aid less acculturated Hispanics, they also can help employees from other ethnic and racial groups.

Increased formal recruitment of Hispanics and better training of managers should be implemented in a package that includes accountability, rewards, and evaluation.

REFERENCES

- Ash, R. A., Levine, E. L., & Edgell, S. L. (1979). Exploratory study of a matching approach to personnel selection: The impact of ethnicity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 35-41.
- Atwater, D. M., Bres, E. S., III, Niehaus, R. J., & Sheridan, J. A. (1983). *Navy EEO labor market availability data for the 1980's* (OPNAV P16-3-83, Research Rep. No. 43). Washington, DC: Office of Chief of Naval Operations (OP-16H).
- Becker, H. J. (1980). Racial segregation among places of employment. *Social Forces, 58*, 761-776.
- Burnam, M. A., Telles, C. A., Karno, M., Hough R. L., & Escobar, J. I. (1987). Measurement of acculturation in a community population of Mexican Americans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 105-130.
- Cattan, P. (1988). The growing presence of Hispanics in the U.S. work force. *Monthly Labor Review, 111*, 9-14.
- Chiswick, B. R. (1988). Hispanic men: Divergent paths in the U.S. Labor Market. *Monthly Labor Review, 111*, 32-34.
- Decker, P. J., & Cornelius, E. T., III. (1979). A note on recruiting sources and job survival rates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64*, 463-464.
- Edwards, J. E. (1988). *Work outcomes as predicted by attitudes and demographics of Hispanics and non-Hispanics: A literature review* (NPRDC-TN-88-23). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- Edwards, J. E., & Thomas, P. J. (1989). Hispanics: When has equal employment been achieved? *Personnel Journal, 68*(6), 144, 147-149.
- Edwards, J. E., Thomas, P. J., & Bower, J. L. (1989). *Moving for employment: Are Hispanics less geographically mobile than Anglos and Blacks?* (NPRDC-TN-89-11) San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- Gannon, M. J. (1971). Sources of referral and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 55*, 226-228.
- Gould, S. (1982). Correlates of career progression among Mexican-American college graduates. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 20*, 93-110.
- Koretz, G. (February 20, 1989) How the Hispanic population boom will hit the work force. *Business Week*, p. 21.
- Kuvlesky, W. P., & Patella, V. M. (1971). Degree of ethnicity and aspirations for upward social mobility among Mexican American youth. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1*, 231-244.

- Marin, G., Sabogal, F., Marin, B. V., Otero-Sabogal, R., & Perez-Stable, E. J. (1987). Development of a short acculturation scale for Hispanics. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 183-205.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment*. New York: Academic Press.
- National Commission on Employment Policy. (1982). *Hispanics and jobs: Barriers to programs*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Reid, G. L. (1972). Job search and the effectiveness of job finding methods. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 25, 479-495.
- Secretary of the Navy. Memo of 16 May 1989, *Civilian Hispanic Employment*.
- Segal, M. N., & Sosa, L. (1983). Marketing to the Hispanic community. *California Management Review*, 26, 120-134.
- Steers, R. M., & Braunstein, D. N. (1976). A behaviorally-based measure of manifest needs in work settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 9, 251-266.
- Thomas, P. J. (1987). *Hispanic underrepresentation in the Navy's civilian work force: Defining the problem* (NPRDC-TN-87-31). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- Triandis, H. C. (1985). *An examination of Hispanic and general population perceptions of organizational environments: Final report to the Office of Naval Research*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Department of Psychology.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, (September 7, 1988). *Hispanic educational attainment highest ever, Census Bureau Reports*. Press Release from United States Department of Commerce News, Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (March 1985). *Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States* (Advance Report). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States General Accounting Office (January 30, 1989). *Report to the Chairman, Select Committee on Aging, House of Representatives: Social Security Administration: Employment of and service to Hispanics* (GAO/HRD 89-35).

APPENDIX A
DONOL 8 CODES AND COMPARABLE OPM
OCCUPATIONAL SERIES

CRAFTSMEN and MECHANICS

DONOL 8 CODES

OPM OCCUPATIONAL SERIES

<u>80XX</u>	<u>Electronics Mechanics</u>		
8002	Instrument Mechanic	2602	Electronic Measurement Equipment Mechanic
8044	Electronics Mechanic	2601	**Electronic Alarm System Mechanic (**Automatic Test Equipment Operator)
		2604	Electronics Mechanic
		2606	Electronic Industrial Controls Mechanic
		2608	**Digital Computer Mechanic
		2610	Electronic Integrated Systems Mechanic
		2614	Electronics Mechanic
		2650	Electronic Integrated Systems Mechanic
		2690	Digital Computer Mechanic
8007	Electronic Mechanic NEC*	26--	Same
<u>81XX</u>	<u>Electricians</u>		
8109	Electrician	2854	Electrical Equipment Repairer
8111	High Voltage Electrician	2805	Same
8112	Aircraft Electrician	2810	Electrician (High Voltage)
8113	Electrician NEC*	2892	**Aircraft Electrician
		28--	Same
<u>82XX</u>	<u>Machine Tool Craftsmen</u>		
8219	Machinist	3414	Same
8220	Toolmaker	3416	Same
8221	Machine Tool Operator NEC*	3401	**Aircraft Jig and Fixture Builder
		3447	**Tool and Cutter Grinder
		3428	Diesinker
<u>83XX</u>	<u>Metal Processors</u>		
8323	Welder	3703	Same
8325	Electroplater	3711	Same
8326	Molder	4373	**Foundry Molder
8327	Metal Processor NEC*	3741	Melter
		3706	**Metalizing Equipment Operator
		3716	**Shielding Installer
<u>84XX</u>	<u>Metal Mechanics</u>		
8429	Sheet Metal Mechanic	3801	**Metal Fabricator (**Sheet & Plate Metal Worker) (**Ships Tank Tester)
		3804	Coppersmith
		3806	Same
8430	Boilermaker	3808	Same
8432	Shipfitter	3820	Same
8434	Metal Mechanic NEC*	3802	**Forger (Drop)
		3807	**Flange Turner (**Structural Iron Worker)

*Not elsewhere classified

**Navy Ratings Title

		3809	Mobile Equipment Metal Mechanic
		3815	**Pneumatic Tool Operator (*Pneumatic Tools Operator (Ship Structures))
		3816	Engraver
		3817	Locksmith
		3830	**Anglesmith (*Blacksmith) (*Forger)
		3869	*Forming Press Operator (*Sheet Metal Forming Machine Operator) (*Drop Hammer Operator)
		4812	**Sawsmith (*Saw Filer)
85XX	<u>Aircraft Mechanics</u>		
8583	Fluid Systems Mechanic	8201	**Aircraft Oxygen Equipment Repairer (*Fire Extinguisher Service)
		8255	Pneudralic Systems Mechanic
		8268	Aircraft Pneumatic Systems Mechanic
8584	Aircraft Propeller Mechanic	8807	**Aircraft Propeller Mechanic
8585	Aircraft and Rocket Engine Mechanic	8602	Aircraft Engine Mechanic
8586	Aircraft Overhaul	8852	Aircraft Mechanic
86XX	<u>Pipe Fitting Craftsmen</u>		
8640	Pipe Coverer and Installer	3610	Insulator
8641	Pipe Fitter	4204	Same
		4255	Fuel Distribution System Mechanic
8642	Plumber	4206	Same
87XX	<u>Woodworkers</u>		
8748	Wood Craftworkers	4605	Wood Crafter
8750	Carpenter	4607	Same
8751	Shipwright	5220	Same
8752	Patternmaker	4616	Same
8753	Woodmaker NEC*	4601	**Wood and Plastics Installer (Ships)
		4603	Boat Builder
		4604	Woodmaker
		4618	**Milling Worker
		4639	**Wharf Builder
		4654	**Form Block Maker
		4717	**Boat Builder
88XX	<u>Painters</u>		
8837	Painter	4101	Graphics Arts Mechanic
		4102	Painter
		4104	Sign Painter

*Not elsewhere classified
**Navy Ratings Title

89XX	Miscellaneous Craftsmen		
8901	Telephone Installer and Repairman	2502	Telephone Mechanic
		2504	**Cable Splicer (Communications)
		2508	**Communications Line Installer
8915	Fabric and Leather Mechanic	3101	**Aircraft Fabric and Rubber Repairer
		3105	Fabric Worker
		3106	Upholsterer
8917	Instrument Mechanic General	3306	Optical Instrument Repairer
		3309	**Watch Repairer
			(**Watchmaker)
		3314	Instrument Maker
		3315	Nuclear Reactor Instrument Systems Mechanic
		3341	Scale Repairer
		3359	Instrument Mechanic
		5382	Test Reactor Control and Instrumentation Specialist
8922	Mason, Plaster, and Roofer	3602	Cement Finisher
		3603	Mason
		3604	**Tile and Plates Setter
		3605	Plasterer
		3606	Roofer
		3609	**Floor Coverer
8944	Plastics Craftsman	4351	**Plastic Molder
		4352	Plastic Fabricator
		4371	**Aircraft Plaster Patternmaker
8943	Printing Craftsman	4400	Supervisor Printing Worker
		4401	Miscellaneous Printing and Reproduction
		4402	Bindery Machine Operator
		4403	Hand Composing
		4405	Film Assembler-Stripper
		4406	Letterpress Operating
		4407	Linotype Machine Operating
		4413	Negative Engraver
		4414	Offset Photographer
		4416	Platemaker
		4417	Offset Press Operator (Offset Duplicating Press Operator)
		4442	Lithographic and Printing Worker
8954	Facilities Maintenance	4737	General Equipment Mechanic
		4746	Superintendent Ground Structures
		4749	Maintenance Mechanic
		4742	Utility Systems Repairer-Operator
8955	Indoor Equipment Mechanic	4805	Medical Equipment Repairer
		4806	Office Appliance Repairer
		4845	Orthopedic Mechanic
8956	Air Condition Equipment Mechanic	5306	Air Conditioning Equipment Mechanic
8959	Fixed Equipment Repair, NEC*	5309	Heating and Boiler Plant Equipment Mechanic
		5310	Kitchen/Bakery Equipment Repairing
		5313	Elevator Mechanic

*Not elsewhere classified

**Navy Ratings Title

8964	Heavy Duty Equipment	5301	Aircraft Launching and Arresting Devices Mechanic (**Gas Appliance Repairer) (**Test Plant Operating Mechanic) (**Aircraft Ground Equipment Specialist)
		5330	Printing Equipment Repairer
		5334	Marine Machinery Mechanic
		5350	Production Machinery Mechanic
		5352	Industrial Equipment Mechanic
		5378	Powered Support Systems Mechanic
8965	Automotive Mechanic	5823	Same
8966	Mobile Equipment Repair, NEC*	5803	Heavy Mobile Equipment
		5851	Superintendent Transport Maintenance
		5876	**Electromotive Equipment Mechanic
8974	Weapons Mechanic and Repair	6605	Artillery Repairer
		6610	Small Arms Repairer
		6641	Ordnance Equipment Mechanic
		6652	Aircraft Ordnance
		6656	**Special Weapons Mechanic
		6910	Materials Expediter Systems Mechanic
8975	Production Expediter	7009	Same
8982	Equipment Cleaner	4714	Model Maker
8987	Misc. Craftsmen and Mechanics, NEC*	4746	Experimental Mechanical Equipment Repairer
		4801	Misc. General Equipment Maintenance (**Tool and Gauge Checker)
		5210	Rigger
		5221	**Lofter

*Not elsewhere classified
**Navy Ratings Title

APPENDIX B
DONOL 9 CODES AND COMPARABLE OPM
OCCUPATIONAL SERIES

OPERATIVES and SERVICE WORKERS

DONOL 9 CODES

OPM OCCUPATIONAL SERIES

<u>90XX</u>	<u>Miscellaneous Operatives and Service Workers</u>		
9035	Motion Picture Worker	3911	**Sound Recording Equipment Operator
		3910	Motion Picture Projectionist
9060	Electric Power Controlling	5407	Electric Power Controller
9061	Fixed Equipment Operative NEC*	4741	General Equipment Operator
		5401	Misc. Fixed Industrial Equipment Operator (**Pumping Equipment Operator)
		5402	Boiler Plant Operator
		5403	**Incinerator Operator
		5406	Utility Systems Operator
		5409	Water Treatment Plant Operator
		5412	**Coal Handling Equipment Operator
		5413	Fuel Distribution System Operator
		5419	**Air Compressor Plant Operator (**Engine & Pump Operator)
		5423	Sandblaster
		5427	**Chemical Plant Operator (Silver Recovery)
		5433	**Gas Plant Operator (**Gas Plant Operator (Air)Separation)
		5438	Elevator Operator
		5439	**Environmental Test Equipment Operator (**Gas Cylinder Test Plant Operator)
		5451	Utilities Operation Supervisor
		5473	**Oil Reclamation Equipment Operator
		5478	**Portable Equipment Operator
		5479	**Dredge Operator
		5485	**Aircraft Weight and Balance Specialist
		5486	**Swimming Pool Operator
9063	Mobile Equipment Operative	5701	**Mobile Equipment Dispatcher (**Railroad Dispatcher)
		5702	Amphibian Truck Operator
		5703	Motor Vehicle Operator
		5704	Fork Lift Operator
		5705	Tractor Operator
		5706	**Industrial Sweeper Operator (**Road Sweeper Operator)
		5707	**Tracked Vehicle Driver
		5716	Engineering Equipment Operator
		5725	Crane Operator
		5736	Braker-Switcher/Conductor
		5737	Locomotive Engineer
		5738	Railroad Maintenance Vehicle Operator
		5762	Materials Handler
		5767	**Aircraft Clearing Equipment Operator

*Not elsewhere classified

**Navy Rating Title

9067	Ship Operators	3507	Deckhand
		5723	Motor Boat Operator (or Captain)
		9809-9826	Various Maritime
		9831-9888	Non-Officer Vessel Jobs
		9893-9895	Non-Officer Vessel Jobs
		9897	Non-Officer Vessel Jobs
9073	Ammunition and Explosives Worker	6501	**Industrial Chemicals Handler
		6502	Explosives Operator
		6505	Munitions Destroyer
		6517	Explosives Test Operator
9076	Warehouse Worker	6907	Same
		6901	**Fitter (Clothing Issue)
			(**Linen Control Worker)
			(Warehouse Console Operator)
		6904	Protective and Safety Equipment Attendants
		6912	Materials Sorter
		6958	Aircraft Freight Loader
9077	Packing and Processing	7002	Packer
		7010	Parachute Packer
9078	Launderer and Dry Cleaner	7304	Laundry Worker
		7305	Laundry Machine Operator
		7306	Presser
		7307	**Dry Cleaner
			(**Spotter)
		7351	Laundry Operator
9079	Food Service Worker	7401	Commissary Worker
		7402	Baker
		7404	Cook
		7405	Bartender
		7407	Meatcutter
		7408	Food Service Worker
		7420	Waiter
9081	Store Worker/Personal Services	6914	Store Worker
		7601	**Resident Attendant
		7603	Barber
		7641	Beautician
9083	Preservation Packing	7004	Preservation Packager
		7005	Preservation Servicer
9087	Miscellaneous Operator and Service Worker, NEC*	3111	**Sewing Machine Operator
		3422	**Metal Sawing Machine Operator
		3431	Machine Tool Operator
		3501	**Ward Attendant
			(**Marina Attendant)
			(**Recreational Groundskeeper)
		3502	Laborer
		3506	Summer Aide/Student Aide
		3511	Laboratory Worker
		3515	Laboratory Support Worker
		3566	Custodial Worker
		3611	**Glazier
		3653	**Asphalt Worker

*Not elsewhere classified

**Navy Rating Title

3701	**Ship Propeller Finisher
3702	Flame Cutter
3708	**Foundry Worker
3712	**Heat Treating Worker (**Heat Treater & Temperer)
3725	**Storage Battery Repairer (**Buffer & Polisher)
3735	**Engraver Plate Maker
3736	**Etched Circuit Maker (**Microelectronic Circuit Maker) (**Engraved Circuit Maker)
3769	**Shot Peening Machine Operator
3812	**Puncher and Shearer
3858	**Radiator Repairer
4157	**Dial Painter
4301	**Electronic Equipment Encapsulator
4360	**Rubber Worker (**Rubber Stamp Maker)
4361	Rubber Equipment Repairer
4419	**Silk Screen Process Worker
4601	**Floor Finisher
4602	Blocker and Bracer
4701	**Ship Maintenance Worker
4716	**Railroad Car Repairer
4819	Bowling Equipment Repairer
4840	**Toolroom Mechanic
4841	**Venetian Blind Repairer
4844	**Bicycle Repairer
4848	**Mechanic Parts Assembler
4850	**Bearing Reconditioning
4855	**Domestic Appliance Repairer
4819	Bowling Equipment Repairer
4851	Reclamation Worker
5001	**Greenskeeper
5003	Gardener
5026	Pest Controller
5048	**Animal Caretaker
5201	Laboratory Crafts Aide
5205	**Gas Detection Monitor
5317	**Laundry Equipment Repairer
5323	**Oiler
5364	**Door Closer Repairer
5801	**Service Station Operator (**Tire Repairer (Heavy))
8862	**Aircraft Refueller
8863	**Aircraft Tire Mounter
9003	**Film Library Worker (**Film Cleaning Machine Operator)
9004	Motion Picture Film Processing
9055	Chemical Mixing

* Not elsewhere classified

** Navy Rating Title

APPENDIX C
SURVEY OF BLUE-COLLAR WORKERS (FORM H)

ID#

SURVEY OF BLUE COLLAR WORKERS (FORM H)

Privacy Act Information

This information is collected under the authority of 5 USC 301 Departmental Regulations, for use as described in the Federal Register, N68221, Vol. 44, No. 243, Monday, December 17, 1979, page 74657. Taking this survey is voluntary. Nothing will happen to you if you choose not to participate in this research effort. By answering these questions and those in the later survey, however, you will help the Navy find and keep good workers.

Purpose and Use of Survey

The purpose of the survey is to gather information and measure the attitudes of people entering blue-collar jobs. Such information is needed to help the Navy recruit and keep workers in these jobs. After 1 year, you will be given another survey to find out how you feel about the job. For this reason, we ask for your name and social security number in the survey. Your answers to questions in this survey will be used by the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California, for research purposes only.

Instructions

Carefully read each question on the pages that follow before answering. Mark your answer by printing the number of your response on the line to the left of the number of the question; or, fill in the blank with the information asked for. If you do not understand a question, skip it and go on the next question. You may, however, write in an answer if none of the ones that is provided is right for you.

Report Control Symbol 5354-2

1. Name: _____
2. Social Security Number: _____ - _____ - _____ Date: _____
3. Name of job hired for: _____ Grade: _____
4. Age: _____
5. What is the highest grade you completed in school or college? Count a GED as 12 Years. _____
6. Since you became 16, how many years have you worked for pay? _____
7. How many people are there in your household? _____

For questions 8 through 14, choose the best answer for each question. Place an "X" on the line next to that answer. Also, some answers may ask for additional information if you choose that response.

8. Current marital status:
 - Married
 - Single, never married
 - Divorced/separated/widowed
9. Is anyone else in your household working outside the home?
 - No
 - Yes, someone works part time.
 - Yes, someone works full time.
10. Are you a veteran?
 - No
 - Yes, I was in the _____ as a _____ (job title)
11. Are you a member of a union?
 - No
 - Yes
12. Have you worked for the Navy in some other civilian job?
 - No
 - Yes Name of other job: _____ Grade: _____
13. What language was spoken in your home when you were a child?
 - Only English
 - Mostly English, but also _____ (name the language)
 - Some English, but mostly _____ (name the language)
 - Only _____ (name the language)
14. When did your parents become U.S. citizens?
 - Both were born in this country or were citizens at birth
 - Neither is a U.S. citizen. Country of citizenship _____ (name of country)
 - Mother was a _____ citizen but became a U.S. citizen at age _____.
 - Father was a _____ citizen but became a U.S. citizen at age _____.

How did you find out about this job? (Place and "X" by as many answers as apply and write in the information asked for.)

- 15. Newspaper ad in _____ (name of newspaper)
- 16. Federal job listing at _____ (where)
- 17. From a friend or relative
- 18. From the union
- 19. I was a trainee or intern for this job.
- 20. EEO office _____ (where)
- 21. School counselor or training program
- 22. Employment office or program _____ (which)
- 23. Other _____ (name)

What classroom courses, training, or experience have you had that may have prepared you for this job? Print the name of the course or activity on the blank line and how many months it involved.

	High School Class	Trade School or College	On-job Experience	In Military
Course/Experience	Months	Months	Months	Months
24. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
25. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
26. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
27. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
28. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____
29. _____	_____	_____	_____	_____

What jobs have you held, either full time or part time? Print how long you worked at each on the line or leave blank if you have never done this as a paying job. Write in other jobs at the bottom.

	Years Worked	
	Full time	or part time
30. Office work	_____	_____
31. Sales or store	_____	_____
32. Restaurant	_____	_____
33. Janitor or cleaning	_____	_____
34. Construction _____ (what job)	_____	_____
35. Manufacturing _____ (what)	_____	_____
36. Repair _____ (what)	_____	_____
37. Other _____ (what)	_____	_____
38. Other _____ (what)	_____	_____
39. Other _____ (what)	_____	_____

Please use the following importance scale to answer Questions 40 through 53. Print a number in the blank before each statement or question to tell how important that factor was to you.

<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Not True	Not Important	Neither Unimportant nor Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important

On a scale of 0 to 5, how important were the following factors when you chose this job?

- 40. I badly needed a job.
- 41. Working for the government provides a lot of job security.
- 42. The pay is good.
- 43. The hours of my work schedule are good.
- 44. I don't have to drive too far or can take a bus.
- 45. Benefits (time off, health insurance, etc.) are good.
- 46. The government provides equal opportunity for promotions, training, etc.
- 47. I can learn a new skill.
- 48. I think the job will be interesting or challenging.
- 49. I have friends or relatives working here.

On a scale of 0 to 5, how important is it to you to know:

- 50. in detail, what you have to do on a job?
- 51. in detail, how you are supposed to do a job?
- 52. in detail, what the limits of your authority on a job are?
- 53. how well you are doing?
- 54. How many of your neighbors who live within 4 blocks of your home share your race or ethnic status. Place an "X" beside the most correct answer.
 - None or almost none (0 to 15%) of my neighbors
 - A few (16% to 35%) of my neighbors
 - About half (36% to 65%) of my neighbors
 - Most (66% to 85%) of my neighbors
 - All or nearly all (86% to 100%) of my neighbors
- 55. How many years of your education were taken in schools where you were taught in a language other than English?
- 56. Is this your first full-time job? Yes No.
If no, how long were you employed full-time in your last job?
 years and months
- 57. How many months passed between the final day of work on your last full-time job and your first day at work on this Navy job? (Put "0" in the blank if you left a full-time job for your current job.) months

58. How many months did it take from the time you filed your application for this job and your first day of work. _____ months
59. How many times during the last 3 months did you check the Federal government job listings? _____
60. During the last 12 months, how many Federal government jobs did you apply for? _____
61. During the last 12 months, how many other jobs did you apply for? _____
62. How many miles do you travel to and from your job each day? _____ miles round trip
63. If your job were eliminated at this activity, how many miles would you be willing to travel each day for a similar job at another Navy activity. _____ miles round trip.
64. How many years have you lived within 50 miles of where you live today? _____
65. What size group would you like to work in? That is, how many people, counting yourself, would you like your boss to supervise? _____.
66. Imagine you were working with 10 other people everyday. How many of those people would you like to be of your race or ethnic group? _____
67. How many people did you know at this command before you got this job? _____

Please use the following frequency scale to answer Questions 68 through 87. Print a number in the blank before each statement to tell how frequently each statement is true.

<u> 1 </u>	<u> 2 </u>	<u> 3 </u>	<u> 4 </u>	<u> 5 </u>
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always

How often do you use a language other than English when:

68. _____ talking to family members?
69. _____ talking to friends?
70. _____ reading a newspaper?
71. _____ listening to a radio or TV program?

Based on past job experiences, how often do you expect each of the items below to be true? Place a number from "1" to "5" beside each statement.

72. _____ I do my best work when my job assignments are fairly difficult.
73. _____ When I have a choice, I try to work in a group instead of by myself.
74. _____ In my work assignments, I try to be my own boss.
75. _____ I seek an active role in the leadership of a group.
76. _____ I try hard to improve my past performance at work.
77. _____ I pay a good deal of attention to the feelings of others at work.
78. _____ I go my own way at work, regardless of the opinions of others.
79. _____ I avoid trying to influence those around me to see things my way.
80. _____ I take moderate risks and stick my neck out to get ahead at work.
81. _____ I prefer to do my own work and let others do theirs.
82. _____ I disregard rules and regulations that hamper my personal freedom.
83. _____ I find myself organizing and directing the activities of others.
84. _____ I try to avoid any added responsibilities on my job.
85. _____ I express my disagreements with others openly.
86. _____ I consider myself a "team player" at work.
87. _____ I strive to gain more control over the events around me at work.

Please indicate if you agree or disagree with Statements 88 through 111. Use the following scale to decide which number reflects your opinion.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

- 88. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
- 89. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
- 90. There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.
- 91. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.
- 92. I would be willing to move to another Navy activity 200 miles away to receive a promotion.
- 93. The Federal government's job qualifications are too high.
- 94. The Federal government's job qualifications are not appropriate.
- 95. Getting a job with the Navy takes too long.
- 96. I had difficulty completing the SF-171 application form.

In some activities the Navy may be hiring too few Hispanic workers. Use the same scale as you used for Statements 88 through 96 to tell how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about why too few Hispanics may be working for the Navy at this activity.

- 97. Bus service to the activity is poor.
- 98. Job advertisements do not reach Hispanics.
- 99. The Navy's pay scale is too low to attract good Hispanic workers.
- 100. There are few Hispanics at this activity to support newly hired Hispanics.
- 101. Many Hispanics lack a high school diploma.
- 102. Many Hispanics do not speak English very well.
- 103. Many Hispanics have poor reading, spelling, and math skills.
- 104. Many Hispanics do not wish to answer personal questions during an interview.
- 105. Many Hispanics do not trust the Federal government as their employer.
- 106. Many Hispanics do not identify themselves as Hispanics on the applications that they file.
- 107. Many Hispanics lack career goals.
- 108. Many Hispanics lack direction in following goals.
- 109. Many Hispanic youths do not desire permanent employment.
- 110. Many Hispanics need a job immediately and cannot wait the time it takes to be hired by the government.
- 111. Many Hispanics are reluctant to move to a new location for a job.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Distribution:

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Equal Opportunity) (OASD) (M, RA&L)

Director, Civilian Personnel Programs (OP-14)

Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) (2)

Copy to:

Director, Human Resources Management (OP-15)

Director, MPN Financial Management Department (NMPC-7)

Director, Equal Opportunity Management Institute, Patrick Air Force Base, FL (EOMI)