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This study investigated middle managers' perceptions concerning factors and conditions necessary to implement and adapt a career development system within an organization. More specifically, this study drew implications regarding the vital role played by middle managers in the initiation, implementation, and adaption of a career development system in a large industrial organization.

Five research questions dealing with the role of middle managers in implementation of career development systems were investigated by means of an interview schedule developed by the researcher adapted from instruments developed by the American Management Association (Walker & Gutteridge, 1979) and Burack and Mathys (1980). The survey instrument was administered to 32 middle managers in a large Fortune 500 company with a 95% response rate.

Findings from the present study include:

1. Middle managers in the company studied were generally supportive of career development as a part of their responsibilities (90.7%).

2. Respondents in the present study reported a high degree of awareness of two of the four components of career development in
their company, namely, performance appraisal and career discussion.

3. A high percentage of the respondents in the present study (96.9%) believed it was important for the corporation to assist employees in their career plans and indicated that they believed that the implementation of a career development system was a joint responsibility between management and employees.

4. Respondents viewed top management as serving an active participatory role in career development and reported the role of middle management as that of initiating, implementing, and administering the career development program.

5. Of the 13 factors considered by the middle managers having "considerable" or "great" importance in influencing career development systems, the four reported by most respondents as of "great" importance were top management commitment, middle management commitment, individual employee responsibility, and employee initiative.

Generally, results of the present investigation indicated that in the company studied middle managers play a vital role in the implementation of career development of employees. Middle managers in this company appear to be linking change agents who interpret organizational goals as well as individual employee goals to further the development of employee careers.
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CHAPTER I

RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF STUDY

Change is recognized as an inevitable fact of life in what has become a highly complex, evolutionary society. The inherent human characteristic of resistance is an associated complicating factor in effectively attempting to deal with change (Bennis, Benne, & Chin, 1969). The individual's reluctance to adapt to change, when viewed from the organizational standpoint of corporations, universities, communities, government, and other institutions, has a restrictive effect on the developmental potential of the individual which consequently impedes the growth and development of the organization as a whole. It is this hesitancy, resistance, and reluctance to adapt to change that often creates a haphazard, unplanned organizational response to inevitable change where a definitive system or planned process for adaptation to change is lacking.

Some organizations have recognized the importance of the individual in the acknowledgment of change. Corporations, such as American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T), General Electric (GE), and International Business Machines (IBM), have focused their attention on the human element within the organization as it relates to change; namely, the realization that any change in an organization implies a perceived change in the career of an individual (Gutteridge, 1976b; Hall, 1976; Watson, 1963). This line of innovative thinking stimulated a serious exchange of ideas and included an examination of the
respective roles of top management, middle management, and the employee in acknowledging and adapting to change. AT&T, GE, and IBM applied a comprehensive framework for responsibly including individuals in the initiation and implementation of change and found that, when management exerts a conscious effort to adapt to change by increasing the employee's opportunities for involvement through a career development system, employees are more satisfied, flexible, and productive, therefore, contributing constructively to the organizational goals. As the concept of what was at stake became apparent, AT&T, GE, and IBM moved to conform to the creative uses of human resources available within the organization.

The focus of career development has two distinct, yet closely interrelated, dimensions: The individual's prime concern is to plan (manage) and develop his/her own career. Career planning, as defined by Gutteridge (1976b), is "the personal (individual) process of planning out the routes along which one's career will follow—including such decisions as occupational and organizational choice, selection of job assignment and work activities to be performed and programs for self-development" (p. 2). The responsibility and effort rests solely with the individual, who must assume an active participatory role in his/her career development. The organization can provide opportunity for individual growth, however, such planning is "cast within the context of organizational possibilities and plans" (Burack & Mathys, 1980, p. 1).

The organizational dimension, career management, is a "process whereby the company endeavors to match individual interest and
capabilities with organizational opportunities through a planned program encompassing such activities as the design of effective internal systems, employee career counseling, job rotation opportunities, and a blend of positional experiences with on-and-off-the job training assignments" (Gutteridge, 1976b, p. 2).

In this process of career development there is an interworking of the individual's career planning with the organization's career management for the individual. Career development, then, is a "systematic approach for guiding the entry and movement of human resources through the various layers of an organization" (Gutteridge, 1976b, p. 2).

Career development systems are, in a way, both a reaction to the increasingly rapid rate of change as well as a vehicle for proactively and deliberately causing change to occur. These systems are a "response to change, a complex educational strategy intended to change beliefs, attitudes, and structures of organizations, so they can better adapt to new technologies, markets, and challenges, and the dizzying rate of change, itself" (Bennis, 1969, p. 2). This is to say, a career development system is a planned process for increasing organizational needs as well as individuals' needs.

As a planned process, career development systems effect change primarily because there is a concerted effort by the organization to account for individual needs. Through these efforts, the individual develops a sense of ownership within the organization thus experiencing increased self-esteem which subsequently creates a feeling of
being an integral member of the organizational force. Also, where career development systems are successfully implemented, the individual employs a conscious choice concerning his/her career opportunities. Career advancement options may not be the choice of a proportionate number of employees who, through career development systems, have experienced renewed interest, involvement, and satisfaction within their current positions. Career development systems lead to greater employee job satisfaction and a more intense commitment to organizational goals (Leider, 1976).

Storey (cited in Gutteridge, 1976a) describes organizations' attempts to deal with member needs in terms of the employee's experience of increased satisfaction, achievement, personal growth, and self-esteem. It is further evidenced that practical benefits accrue to most organizations committed to career development systems including increased employee loyalty, motivation, and productivity, as well as stability, competitiveness, and lower turnover rate (Burack & Mathys, 1980). In contrast, management that does not exert a conscious effort to assist the employee adapt to change is often reduced to reactive manipulation as a response to unavoidable and constant change.

With the desire to play a more viable role in the organization, the employee realizes that personal goals may need to be altered to mesh with the organizational goals. With this realization, the employee becomes a company person. This approach to change, referred to by Gardner (cited in Bennis, 1969) as a "department of continuous renewal" (p. 2), is critical as a means of increasing
organizational effectiveness. The concept of career development systems, as a change process, emphasizes the importance of linking the human resources with other elements of the organization. Career systems are concerned with the active task of simultaneously changing the organizational needs as well as the individual needs. The mood of today's organizations is one of realizing the fact that improvement of human capital within the organization will "facilitate growth, change, and adaptation to new environmental challenges and opportunities" (Shepard, 1975, p. 3). Career development systems increase organizational health and effectiveness through primary focus on the individual's career effectiveness as a contributing factor toward organizational effectiveness (Hall, 1976).

Effective adaptation to career development systems is brought about by a clear perception of the system's internal and external environment (Rogers & Rogers, 1976). Adaptability becomes evident within all levels of the organization through a definitive strategy of planned change. Once adaptability is attained, the system functions more effectively and efficiently. According to Hall (1976): "The adaptability of the organization is clearly related to the adaptability of its employees; both indicate an ability to respond quickly and appropriately to changes in the demands, opportunities, and constraints imposed by the environment" (p. 96). Hall recognizes that adaptability, one of the most important aspects, is yet an underdeveloped dimension of career systems effectiveness.

A career development system is concerned with assisting individuals within the organization to better adapt to change.
Organizational adaptability is enhanced by an essential element of member cohesiveness within the internal structure which is developed through career development systems' refinement of the human capital.

Obviously, not all organizations will be equally effective in the implementation of a career system, the major reason being the variance in each organization's commitment to the career system philosophy.

A necessary, if not absolutely essential, element in the implementation of a career development system is the significant aspect of commitment throughout the entire organization. The whole organization, from top management through all levels of the lower management echelon, must be participants in the career development system process. The commitment of top management is essential to the success of a career development system, but to be truly effective, middle management must continually reaffirm, through active involvement, the position and commitment of top management. Unfortunately, in many organizations, a comprehensive career development system is endorsed by top level management without accompanying commitment of middle management who is ultimately responsible and the central consideration for the successful initiation, implementation, and adaptation of a career development system. Middle management's acceptance of a career development philosophy is critical in view of their inherent responsibility to develop subordinates by providing opportunity for individual growth. The fact that an uncompromising commitment to the career development philosophy is vital to its success is convincingly supported by Thomas Watson, Jr., President of IBM,
by his statement that the individual employee is singularly dependent upon middle management as the source of direction in personal career opportunity within the organization (Watson, 1963). It follows, then, that the attitude of middle managers toward efforts to help employees adapt to change through such interventions as career development strategies will be a determining factor in the success of such efforts. Further, middle managers' awareness and acceptance of their role as well as their commitment and ability to carry out their role is essential to the successful initiation, implementation, and adaptation of career development systems.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of middle management concerning the factors and conditions necessary for adapting career development systems to their organizations, to identify barriers to the implementation of career development systems, and to make recommendations regarding the role of middle managers for the initiation, implementation, and adaptation of a career development system within an organization.

The introduction of a more sophisticated method of career development within the organization studied is warranted. The next section reviews the results of the organization's plan to implement career development programs.

Status of Career Development Within Organization Studied

The concept of career development surfaced within the company studied March 1, 1977. The Director of Employee Relations expressed
in a memo the necessity to discuss a framework most effective to implement career development within the corporation. Workshop sessions were suggested to discuss the following as an integral part of a successful career awareness orientation program:

1. Knowledge of corporate structure.
2. Awareness of jobs, job families, and job disciplines within the corporation.
3. Awareness of conventional career paths within the corporation.
4. Knowledge of how an organization and management planning system mesh with career planning.
5. Knowledge of present employee development elements.
6. Awareness of company's role in career management.

This phase seemed essential before career planning could be accomplished with any objectivity.

Management Development, a division of Corporate Employee Relations, was given the task of researching, designing, planning, and implementing career development within the organization.

Time was given to discussion of the concept of career development and to the consideration of how the research should be collected while other assignments were pending within this given unit. This researcher, as part of an internship, was welcomed aboard to assist in the collection of career development research and the research of career development programs intact within other organizations. There was concern that the dual purpose of the career development system, organizational role and individual employee's role,
be clearly explained from the beginning. It was agreed that the following definition of terms be considered because corporate needs and individual needs play a vital role in the total career development process:

Career planning is defined as the "personal (individual) process of planning out the routes along which one's career will follow—including such decisions as occupational and organizational choice, and selection of job assignment, work activities, and programs for self-development" (Gutteridge, 1976b, p. 2).

Career management is a "process whereby the company endeavors to match individual interest and capabilities with organizational opportunities through a planned program encompassing such activities as the design of effective internal systems, employee career counseling, job rotation opportunities, and a blend of positional experiences with on- and off-the-job training assignments" (Gutteridge, 1976b, p. 2).

The manager further explained the individual employee’s role by asking four questions: (a) What are the career possibilities within this company? (b) What are my career goals? (c) How do I make my goals known to management? (d) How can I develop self? Based on research, she also stated that the organization should assist the employee in career development efforts. Individual employees taking part in a career development system would be exposed to management tasks that seemed familiar (Performance Appraisal, Career Profile, Workshops, Seminars, and Career Discussion) and other less familiar tasks, some individual exercises such as Self-Assessment and Skills...
Inventory and Career Guide. It was indicated that employees would receive ongoing feedback from their immediate manager. (See Figure 1).

With the career development framework outlined, the essential "meat on the bones" task was at hand. Management Development embarked to further design and develop the following elements to exist along side of the present career development elements:

Career guide provides: (a) encouragement for employees to plan development, (b) information about major salaried careers within the company, (c) an explanation of resources available to assist employee in self-development.

Self-assessment provides an individual employee an identification process. An employee simply asks him/herself "Who am I?" The purpose of identification is to consider an individual's values, interests, and skills that would verify, change, or add information to an individual's self-perception. Positive change can only occur when an individual is conscious and explicit about the self-assessment process.

Manager's assessment of employee's career development provides direction and information to managers so that they can assist employees in career development. The guide responds to pertinent career development issues:

1. What is career development?
2. When should a manager have career discussions with subordinates?
3. What is the employee's role in employee career discussion?
Figure 1
Career Planning Within the Organization Studied:
A Dual Responsibility
4. What is the manager's role in the employee discussion?

5. What suggestions can managers offer concerning developmental activities available within the company?

6. What types of employee career development seminars are available within the company?

The Management Development unit continues to facilitate the career development project by designating interested managers and their subordinates, with the blessings of top management, to pilot-test all materials.

The final phase of the project gives all interested employees an opportunity to participate in the company's career development process once the pilot workshops are completed.

Significance of the Study

There is an obvious need for management to enhance the development of organizational subordinates. The middle manager, in particular, holds a critical position. This need of developing individual potential, as well as the need for attaining organizational goals, demands that middle management be active in the research and development of planned change.

This study is important for the following reasons:

1. This study should provide top management of industry, education, and other institutions direction for the design, implementation, and adaptation of an effective career development system and also provide recommendations aimed at minimizing anticipated impediments and eliminating barriers.
2. This description should have implications for education as well as industry and could serve to reduce uncertainties associated with the unfamiliar area of career development system implementation. This study will describe the development and current operation of a career development system used by a major corporation as a planned process for creative, flexible, and employee involved change.

3. This study should stimulate research and experimentation to further contribute to the empirical base in the field of career development systems, and more specifically, the adaptability dimension, that is, the organization's commitment of the career development concept should enhance the individual employee's involvement in career development issues as quality of work and personal fulfillment.

Methodology

In review of the literature one significant fact emerges, that middle managers are a vital component to the implementation of a career development system. The middle manager is the linking change agent that interprets organizational goals and individual goals in order to create a compatible blend. The middle manager is a key factor to career system development because of his/her cognizance of organizational directions, needs, and perceptions, while at the same time he/she is fully aware of the individual employee's fears, needs, and desires. It is for these reasons that the middle manager's role should be explored more fully.
The investigation of middle managers' perceptions concerning the factors and conditions necessary for adapting a career development system to an industrial organization necessitates personal observation. Structured interviews, based on an interview schedule field-tested by the researcher, were conducted through face-to-face discussion with the middle managers of a selected corporation.

In order to insure a comparable group of respondents, a select group of managers of one local industry were interviewed. These managers were selected on the basis of exhibited interest in career development systems.

The present study was limited to one Michigan corporation for the following reasons:

1. The corporation selected has been involved in the development of career development systems; hence, middle managers are somewhat familiar with the problems inherent in the development of a career development system.

2. This researcher is known to many of the persons in the corporation selected; hence, she has established rapport with the organization's employees.

3. The scope of corporate operations of the company selected is sufficiently broad to provide responses from middle managers with varying backgrounds and assignments.

Initial contact by telephone was made with the Office of Employee Relations to establish an appointment with the Corporate Director of Management Development for the specific purpose of providing an explanation of the purpose and procedure of the study.
The Director of Management Development was responsible for obtaining all necessary political and/or administrative clearances for this researcher to interview the middle managers.

The interview schedule was developed on the basis of information on career development systems discussed within the literature and already in use at other corporations and the internal structure of the selected organization. The instrument was field-tested by corporate managers and all necessary adaptations were made prior to the commencement of the actual data collection.

During the interview, the researcher recorded the manager's responses verbatim. The interview revolved around the following four issues:

1. What factors and/or conditions middle managers perceive as necessary to the implementation and adaptation of a career development system.

2. What barriers to the implementation of a career development system are perceived within middle managers' ranks and how these barriers can be overcome.

3. What middle managers perceive as the extent and importance of their role in the implementation and adaptation of career development systems.

4. What suggestions and recommendations could managers offer to enhance career development system implementation and adaptation.

After each interview was completed, the researcher reviewed available materials which the manager and/or the management development team utilized in the career development system implementation.
efforts. Photocopies and transcriptions were made of such materials when appropriate and only upon permission of authorized organizational representatives. The researcher transcribed the managers' responses and synthesized the data. Chapters IV and V of this dissertation present a discussion of the data and their significance.

All perceptions concerning factors and conditions necessary for adapting career development systems to the corporate setting are reported as received; emphasis is given to proposed methods to be employed in the development of career systems. The researcher attempts to draw a consensus from the data regarding strongly endorsed recommendations for implementation and adaptation of career development systems.

In the researcher's conclusions, a career development system should serve as a guide for corporate personnel, top management, and middle management. The career development system of the organization studied suggests effective strategies for change based upon what other corporations utilized and found to be effective and also incorporates findings from the study. The findings and recommendations are available to others who are in the process of developing, adapting, designing, planning, or considering their own career development system strategy.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

For organizations to be concerned with changing technologies, they must first acknowledge change. Gutteridge (1976b), among others, states that once an organization accepts the premise of career development as an intervention method, then an organization could initiate, implement, and adapt to change consistently within a systematic approach.

This study is meant to provide assistance and information to organizations and to contribute to the theory of "changing." Career development is reviewed herein in a general manner, then, a discussion of the benefits, barriers, and elements of career development follows. Finally, a summary discussion of organizational effectiveness and change models relative to career development are presented.

The Stress of Change

In a world of rapid change every facet of society witnesses technological, political, institutional, scientific, and organizational change. Increasing uncertainty in a world of unstable choices is brought about by rapid shifts of technology, economic conditions, and social change (Storey, 1976). Corporations, government, institutions, and schools must cope with the rapid pace of change. Change is an inevitable part of life. What victimizes
organizations in the "pace of change" (Grossman, 1974, p. 24). This highly accelerated rate of change is neither natural nor good for organizations or people. Hoffer (cited in Grossman, 1974) historically states:

The main challenge of our age is drastic change from backwardness to modernity, from subjection to equality, from poverty to affluence, from work to leisure. These are all highly desirable changes. Yet it is becoming evident that no matter how desirable, drastic change is the most difficult and dangerous experience mankind has undergone.

We are discovering that broken habits can be more painful and crippling than broken bones and that disintegrating values may be as deadly a fallout as disintegrating atoms. . . . Yet a moment's reflection will show that change such as the world has seen during the last 159 years is something wholly unprecedented and unique in mankind's experience. From the beginning of recorded history down to the end of the 18th century, the way of life for the average man living in the civilized centers of the earth had remained substantially the same. . . .

The end of the 18th century makes a sharp dividing line between an immemorial static world and a world of ceaseless change. It is obvious, therefore, that change is far from being as natural and matter of fact as we imagine it to be. (p. 4)

The very survival of the organization depends upon its reaction to change which demands adaptability to the inertia of the external and internal environments (Grossman, 1974; Roger & Rogers, 1976). The literature reviewed strongly purports a view that we need to understand the process of change, particularly how to cause planned change rather than resisting the inevitability of change, and as Chin and Benne (1969) state:

Attempts are made to introduce these new thing technologies into situations, the change problem shifts to the human problems of dealing with resistances, anxieties,
threats to morale, conflicts, disrupted interpersonal communications and so on, which prospective changes in patterns of practice evoke in the people affected by the change. (p. 33)

There seems little question that great interest exists regarding "the ability of most organizations to accommodate, modify, and adapt to social and cultural change" (Huse, 1975, p. 7).

As Bennis (1969) states:

Unfortunately, no viable theory of social change has been established. Indeed, it is a curious fact about present theories that they are strangely silent on matters of directing and implementing change. What I particularly object to ... is that they tend to explain the dynamic interactions of a system without providing one clue to the identification of strategic leverages for the alteration. They are suitable for observers of social change, not practitioners. They are theories of change, not of changing. (p. 64)

Beckhard (1969) summarizes much of the literature on change as it applies to all organizations:

To resolve this dilemma of fully mobilizing the energy of organization's human resources toward organizational goals in our rapidly changing environment, new organization forms must be developed; more effective goal-setting and planning processes must be learned and practiced ... competing and conflicting groups must move toward a collaborative way of work ... in order for these changes to occur and be maintained, a planned, managed change effort is necessary. (p. v)

The failure to adapt to change is noticeable in organizations as well as individuals. Ginzberg (1977) points out that "many companies are managed with the philosophy of merely reacting to crisis or an opportunity instead of making a real effort to plan or manage change" (p. 9). Organizations will have to respond to the rapid rate of change "pressured by an uncertain economy, affirmative action, high turnover and changing values of the work force" (Kaye,
1979, p. 1) through the initiation of a planned change process (Bennis, 1969; Ginsberg, 1977; Kaye, 1979; Schein, 1977). Individuals usually react unfavorably to change because of their fear of the unknown. The rapid acceleration and complexity of change increases man's fear (Watson, 1963), and as Hoffer (cited in Grossman, 1974) contends "man is incapable of adjusting to drastic change" (p. 10), while Toffler (cited in Grossman, 1974) predicts "the increasing rate of change will cause many people to fall victim to future shock" (p. 10).

Consequently, the concept of career development as a viable method of effecting change within an organization can alter the future of organizational and individual behavior. Career development, then, effects change primarily as a concerted effort by the organization to account for individual needs. "Organizations that launch changes, such as a career development system, further affect their future directions" (Burack & Mathys, 1980, p. 2).

The challenge, therefore, is to determine more clearly what the future is for organizations in general, and to determine how an organization's career development system, as a planned change process, will prepare to deal with the future.

Career Development Systems

The majority of research studies related to career development were found in the personnel management, training and development, and business literature, with only rare mention of the career development method to be found in the education literature. From the
literature it becomes apparent that career development systems are still very much in the developmental stages. Though research on the use of the career development methods dates back as early as the 1920's when Western Electric and General Electric assisted employees in dealing with concerns associated with planning and developing careers (Hanson, 1977), extensive research on industrial career development systems began as late as the 1970's. During this time, employers, employees, and researchers from such diverse fields as psychology, occupational education, and management have become increasingly interested in career planning and career development (Gutteridge, 1976b). Evidence of the growing popularity of career development is provided by a variety of articles, books, and monographs recently published on such topics as: (a) reasons underlying the groundswell of interest in career development, (b) "how to" for the development of a personal career plan, and (c) the "state of practice" in organizational career management (Burack, 1979; Dyer, 1976; Gutteridge, 1976b; Leider, 1976; Storey, 1976; Walker & Gutteridge, 1979). The decade of the 1970's has brought a major concern for quality of life, a redefining of work in a manner opposite to Henry Ford's philosophy that "the average worker wants a job in which he does not have to think" (Leider, 1976, p. 18), and increased personal career choices and mobility, and equal employment opportunity (Hall & Hall, 1976).

Despite this increased attention, or perhaps because of it, some significant and, as yet, unanswered questions have been raised about the career development process. The focus of this chapter
will reveal diverse coverage on the subject of career development including:

1. The definition of career development and how it relates to terms such as career planning and career management.

2. The relationship between the individual employee's role and the organization's role in career development.

3. The major elements of an effective career development process.

4. The benefits and limitations of a career development system.

5. The types of change models that could affect a career development system in effective implementation and adaptation.

A survey of this literature will provide a comprehensive summary of various authors' approaches to career development—theory and research, conceptual, and empirical developments at the individual level (Hall, 1976), organizational perspective (Milkovich, Anderson, & Greenhalgh, 1976; Saklad, 1976), and an integrated approach to effective career development (Gutteridge, 1976a; Pinto 1976). In order to understand the theoretical aspects of career development, it is essential to define terms:

**Career**—The way or routes (paths) individuals follow by means of a sequence of consecutive work roles and experiences in pursuit of a commitment to an occupation and/or an organization.

**Career Management**—Process whereby employers endeavor to match individual interests and capabilities with organizational opportunities through planned programs encompassing such activities as the recruitment and placement of new personnel, performance and potential evaluation, a flexible compensation and benefits package, the design
of effective internal career systems and a blend of positional experiences with on-and-off the job training assignments.

Career Planning—The personal (individual) process of planning out the routes along which one's career will follow including such decisions as occupational and organizational choice, selection of job assignment and work activities to be performed and programs of self-development.

Career Development—A systematic approach for guiding the entry and movement of human resources through the various layers of the organization. (Gutteridge, 1976a, p. 39)

Hall (1976) considers the working definition in social science writing of a career when he gives it five distinct meanings:

1. Career as advancement—Perhaps the most common use of career involves vertical mobility, moving upward in organizational and professional hierarchies.

2. Careers as a profession—Related to the idea of career as advancement is the thought that certain occupations (those containing identifiable paths or lines of advancement) constitute a career, while others (dead-end jobs) do not. Thus, in this way of thinking, professors, managers, and military personnel have careers, while key-punch operators, washroom attendants, and waiters and waitresses may not.

3. Career as a lifelong sequence of jobs—A career is a person's particular job history, the series of positions held, regardless of occupation or level, during the course of his or her work life. In this meaning, then all people who are employed have careers.

4. Career as a sequence of role-related experiences—The movement into, through, and out of, any social role constitutes a career—for example, the housewife (Lopata, 1966), the marijuana user (Becker, 1963), the mental patient (Goffman, 1961), and the dying person (Glaser & Strauss, 1968).

5. Career as a lifelong sequence of work attitudes and behaviors—This definition combines the lifelong process of definition 3 and the subjective experiential focus of definition 4. (p. 2)
These principles provide the background for a more specific definition of career. The following working definition emerges: "The career is the individually perceived sequence of attitudes and behaviors associated with work-related experiences and activities over the span of a person's life" (Hall, 1976, p. 4).

An examination of further literature reveals that the definitional problem of career development is exacerbated when "career" is combined with other phrases such as career planning, career management, and career systems. Getteridge (1976a) interprets career development as "a systematic approach for guiding the entry and movement of human resources through an organization. Therefore, career development is concerned with the relationship between individuals, their work environment, and their job assignments" (p. 39).

Companies should be concerned with defining career development because it relates to career effectiveness. Hall and Hall (1976) add that career development is important because:

- "Career experiences" are related to career success/failure.

- Career experiences are related to attitudes and commitments toward one's self, one's work, and one's organization.

- Career experiences are related to career flexibility, adaptability and obsolescence. (p. 12)

Milkovich et al. (1976), on the other hand, approach the literature from an organizational perspective, defining careers as an "internal characteristic of an organization with dual properties that integrates both the structural and process views" (p. 18).
While the word "career" connotes a variety of meanings, the definition of career development takes on two dimensions that need to be further defined: the individual career dimension and the organizational career dimension.

Career development, then, is concerned with the "joint relationship between individuals, their work environment (within and without the organization) and their job assignments" (Gutteridge, 1976b, p. 39).

The choice of a career is an individual matter, and much theory and research dealing with the singular process of an individual's career has been documented more than any other single issue. As Super (1957) has pointed out, an individual's career choice and development is a "synthesizing process," a process of achieving congruency between the person and their chosen career. The very nature of an organization's career management development system requires a thorough understanding of the individual's perspective from within the organization (Burack & Mathys, 1980).

In recent research, Hall (1976) recognizes that a large proportion of a person's life revolves around the work place in which the individual attempts to fulfill his/her needs, interests, and satisfactions. Maslow (1968) found that people that were self-actualized were likely to be closely identified with their work. In other words, a connection exists between their career and their personal needs, interests, and satisfactions. Various self-interest/self-help vocational instruments measure a person's interest in relationship to self and work environment. According to Super and
Bohn (1970), "with the exception of intelligence, more is known about interests than about any other single personality variable" (p. 83). These self-interest instruments are generally implemented by organizations to acquire an interest profile on its employees.

Super, whose research began in the late 1930s, concentrated on the person's self-concept and the external realities of the work environment (Hall, 1976). Self-concept describes a person's image of him/herself—abilities, interests, needs, values, past history, aspirations, and so forth. This synthesis develops gradually as the person becomes aware of (a) his self-concept, (b) the opportunities and requirements in a particular situation, and (c) his experiences in implementing his self-concept by working in a particular occupation. "Development in a career consists of passing through a sequence of stages brought about by the interaction between self-concept and occupation" (Hall, 1976, p. 90). Super (1957) lists each of these stages:

Adolescence as Exploration: Developing a self-concept

The Transition from School to Work: Reality testing

The Floundering or Trial Process: Attempting to implement a self-concept

The Period of Establishment: The self-concept modified and implemented

The Maintenance Stage: Preserving or being nagged by a self-concept

The Years of Decline: Adjustment of a new self

Erickson (1963), a clinical psychologist, describes three stages of adulthood that seem to be congruent with Super's stages:
intimacy, generativity, and ego integration.

Career development as an individual matter is important for upgrading the individual employee's skills, abilities, and technologies. As an individual travels through various career stages, he/she must concentrate on four primary career questions: (a) What are my career goals? (b) What are the career possibilities within my organization? (c) How can I develop myself? (d) How can I make my goals known to management? The answers to these basic questions can be unraveled through textbooks and general conversation. An era of self-help books on enhancing one's career concept begins with Jennings's (1971) "rules for Executive Chess":

1. Maintain the widest set of options

2. Don't lose valuable career time; avoid being blocked by immobile people

3. Become a crucial subordinate to a mobile superior

4. Always favor increased exposure and visibility (relabeled "visiposure")

5. Be prepared to practice self-nomination

6. Leave the company at your convenience, not that of another

7. Rehearse before quitting

8. Define the corporation as a market; time your moves

9. Plan for a multicareer, be a "repotter" (pp. 304-318)

These rules assist an individual in exercising more control over his or her own career. "The larger, more powerful the organization, the more men must manage their careers in terms of their own coordinates
and free choices. Successful "chess" allows men to intelligently counteract the arbitrary decisions of their corporations" (Jennings, 1971, p. 307). Other useful guides for survival within an organization are Career Management by Kellogg (1972) and Getting Yours: How to Make the System Work for the Working Woman (Pogrebin, 1975).

Bolles's (1972) What Color Is Your Parachute?, Where Do I Go From Here With My Life (Crystal & Bolles, 1974), and The Inventurers (Leider & Hagberg, 1978) are general guides to all phases of career development. Another instrument to aid career planning is Holland's (1973) Self-Directed Search. These self-renewal books were published in an effort to assist an individual in learning how to life/career plan effectively. The individual who assesses his/her career through self-help techniques will increase personal awareness and an understanding of managerial roles and responsibilities.

Wanzek and Canon (1975) elaborate that individuals' employee development can: "help the staff become more interested in the division as a whole, develop self-confidence, learn who they are and what they want, learn strategies to achieve their ends, and know how to work together as a total division" (p. 431).

Gutteridge (1976a) states that:

What is good for the individual is also good for the organization. From the individual's point of view, career planning provides ongoing process for assessing one's long-range objectives in light of organizational opportunities and to establish a personal program of self-development and career growth. From the organization's point of view, career management provides a theme for integrating such diverse aspects of human resource management as a selection, placement, promotion,
transfer training, and development. And as Saklad sug-
gested, an effective manpower planning system should help
insure a continued supply of talent, well-trained, moti-
vated employees and have a positive impact on such orga-
nizational goals as efficiency and profitability. (p. 46)

The other practical dimension regarding career development is,
"What can organizations do to facilitate a person's career develop-
ment?" (Hall & Hall, 1976, p. 9). Contributions to this facet of
research are not as extensive as those concerning the individual
role in career development. However, some elements can be inferred
from research on techniques utilized in organizations, such as, man-
agement by objectives, affirmative action, performance appraisal,
assessment centers, and other management development methods (Tosi,
Rizzo, & Carroll, 1975; Wexley & Yukl, 1975). These elements are
essential to the career development process.

McAlindon (1977) states that the research conducted in the last
5 years reemphasizes the extent to which organizations are "under-
estimating people and their potential accomplishments" (p. 24). The
responsibility of the organization is to "help people grow, achieve,
and contribute" (p. 26).

McAlindon (1977) further adds that:

The development of people is inseparably linked with the
development of the organization. The qualities of people
determine the abilities of an organization. And the
quality of organizations to a large degree determines the
quality of the accomplishments and productivity of people.
(p. 27)

The organizational role in career development is important for
keeping staff informed. Organizations that exhibit a proactive role
in the career development of individuals within the organization,
then, involve a greater complexity of relations within its internal and external environment (Rogers & Rogers, 1976).

Clark (1969), Bennis (1969), and Bennis et al. (1969) also concur that organizations must afford individual employees chances to fulfill tendencies and capacities for equilibrium and growth.

Mutual adaptation and internal integration, along with commonality and commitment to the organizational goals, will fulfill the growth dimension of the individual as well as the organization within a career development system (Hall, 1976).

Characteristics necessary for any career system or newly innovative program are recognized and accepted by one basic assumption:

A management development program represents an interaction or partnership between the participant (to be developed) and the organization (the developer). If the program is to realize maximum benefits, each partner must have the attitude that each gives to and takes something from the developmental experience. The greater the attitude of "sharing" existing on both parts, the greater the probability the program will succeed. (Schmuckler, 1976, p. 30)

According to Hall and Hall (1976), another practical issue of what organizations can do to facilitate a person's career development is that the organization can be identified by basic principles from programs such as management by objectives (MBO) and affirmative action. In reviewing this literature they "identified several characteristics of organizational goals and implementation strategies" hypothesized to aid the success of effective affirmative action programs:
1. Goal clarity and specificity

2. Person/organization goal congruence and perceived instrumentality

3. Individual participation in goal setting

4. Top management support

5. Formal rewards and sanctions for employment
   (Hall & Hall, 1976, p. 9)

These characteristics are an additional means of aiding career development.

Career development attempts to accomplish the integration of societal external pressures with internal environmental needs of the organization (Hall, 1976). A major portion of an individual's life is focused around work (Hall, 1976; Leider, 1976). Therefore, it is important for work to provide a setting for satisfying human needs—physiological, safety, social, ego, and self-actualization (Maslow, 1968) and achievement, affiliation, and power (McClelland, 1967). Hall (1976) stresses the importance that work (career) plays in a person's life.

Because societal values are forever changing, work is being seen increasingly as a fundamental area in which to achieve social equality and personal liberation. Recent research has shown evidence of "increased pressures on organizations to eliminate job conditions that threaten the physical and emotional well-being of the employee" (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975). "Organizations will be forced to give more attention to the nature of the career experiences they provide for their employees" (Hall, 1976, p. 5).
Organizations such as General Electric Company and Xerox Corporation have made accountability an integral part of the manager's performance appraisal, and similarly, governmental sanctions have also influenced organizations to develop and design programs that enable individual employees to be more effective which in turn will assist the organization's effectiveness. For companies to look forward to technological advancement, a program such as career development must be congruent with organizational goals and individual goals (Hall & Hall, 1976).

To completely understand the two career development dimensions—the individual and the organization—Schein (1971) describes an organizational career model from two interrelated perspectives: (a) the career of an individual who transcends through the organization and (b) the career as defined by the organization, which involves beliefs, policies, and expectations about people's movement within the organization (Hall, 1976; Watson, 1963). In Schein's unusual depiction of the individual and organizational relationship of career development, he views the organization as a three-dimensional cone. This model is illustrated in Figure 2. The three dimensions represent various types of moves a person could make in the organization:

**Vertical:** moving up or down, represents changing one's rank or level in the organization.

**Radial:** moving more (or less) "inside" in the system, becoming more (or less) central, part of the "inner circle" acquiring increased (or decreased) influence in the system.

Figure 2

A Three-Dimensional Model of an Organization
Circumferential: transferring laterally to a different function, program, or product in the organization.

Schein (1971) goes on to offer three types of boundaries which correspond to each type of movement:

Hierarchical boundaries: these separate the hierarchial levels from each other.

Inclusion boundaries: these separate individuals or groups who differ in the degree of their centrality.

Functional or departmental boundaries: these separate departments, or different functional groupings from each other.

Schein (1971) focuses on the organization's influence on the person. A career is a two-way relationship between the person and the organization; "the person influences the organization (innovates) as well as being influenced himself" (p. 5). Table 1 depicts basic stages, positions, and processes in a career within one organization.

Barriers to Career Development

Career development offers great potential for professional and personal growth of employees. It also provides a potent force for the improvement of departmental-wide employee development programs.

Some consideration must, however, be given to possible obstacles to the implementation of a career development process. Acceptance of the career development system is dependent upon the degree to which the purpose of career development has been openly communicated to those who will be involved in the implementation and adaptation stages. Without carefully planned introduction, the career
### Table 1
**Basic Stages, Positions, and Processes in a Career Within One Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic stages and transitions</th>
<th>Statuses or positions</th>
<th>Psychological and organizational processes transactions between individual and organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre-entry</td>
<td>Aspirant, applicant, rushee</td>
<td>Preparation, education, anticipatory socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry (trans.)</td>
<td>Entrant, postulant, recruit</td>
<td>Recruitment, rushing, testing, screening, acceptance (&quot;hiding&quot;); passage through internal inclusion boundary; rites of entry; induction and orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic training novitiate</td>
<td>Trainee, novice, pledge</td>
<td>Training, indoctrination, socialization, testing the man by the organization, tentative acceptance into group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Initiate graduate</td>
<td>Passage through first inner inclusion boundary acceptance as member and conferring of organizational status, rite of passage and acceptance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first vows (trans.)</td>
<td>New member</td>
<td>First testing by the person of his own capacity to function; granting of real responsibility (playing for keeps); passage through functional boundary with assignment to specific job or department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. First regular assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indocrtination and testing of person by immediate work group leading to acceptance or rejection; if accepted further education and socialization (learning the ropes); preparation for higher status through coaching, seeking visibility, finding sponsors, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic stages and transitions</th>
<th>Statuses or positions</th>
<th>Psychological and organizational processes transactions between individual and organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion or leveling off (trans.)</td>
<td>Preparation, testing, passage through hierarchial boundary, rite of passage; may involve passage through functional boundary as well (rotation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Second assignment substages</td>
<td>Legitimate member (fully accepted)</td>
<td>Processes under no. 3 repeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Granting of tenure</td>
<td>Permanent member</td>
<td>Passage through another inclusion boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination and exit (trans.)</td>
<td>Old-timer, senior citizen</td>
<td>Preparation for exit, cooling the mark out, of exit (testimonial dinners, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Post-exit</td>
<td>Alumnus emeritus retired</td>
<td>Granting of peripheral status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

development system may be seen as a fad. According to Morgan, Hall, and Martier (1979), career development is viewed as a "positive means of increasing individual and organizational efficiency" (p. 14). By assisting with the development of employees, an organization is more apt to identify and promote from within future managers.

Should participation in a career development system be voluntary, mandatory, or contractual? There is no question that participation in career development can be required by an edict of top management. What is questionable is whether mandatory participation defeats the outcome of career development.

Several adult education writers advocate career development as a voluntary approach by the individual employee. Hammens, Wallace, and Watts (1978) offer the following argument for voluntary participation:

Career development means adult development. The underlying assumptions of adult learning are quite clear; adults learn what and when they want—normally based on an individual feeling of need due to a current problem. Consequently, while attendance can be required either contractually or by subtle influence, attention and receiving, which are prerequisites to learning, cannot. (p. 16)

Burack and Mathys (1980) also recommend the voluntary approach by stating that:

The individual cannot be divorced from active participation in his or her own career planning. True, companies may have to erect systems, programs, and policies to support individual career activities, but individuals will have to assume a more active personal role if they wish to make progress beyond their current assignment. Even where a cordial climate exists for individual growth, career planning requires an individual commitment of both intellect and time. (p. 26)
Therefore, a career development program based upon identified employee needs and employee participation is highly recommended. A career development system is dependent upon a thorough analysis of the needs of a particular organization; consequently, it is not a process which can be imposed from without (Kaye, 1979). The method of implementation is congruent with the protection of managerial control because the individual employee analysis upon which it is based reflects the needs of the particular industry (Burack & Mathys, 1980; Hall, 1976).

Regardless of what is done by the organization to secure career development involvement of employees and before the goals of career development programming can be achieved, three fundamental questions must be answered: (a) What kinds of barriers exist? (b) What benefits exist? (c) What factors are necessary for successful implementation.

Although no general consensus exists, some barriers include those of: time, funding, support, promotion, interest, leadership, and centralization. The growing interest in career development among organizations and individuals has not alleviated inherent individual and organizational barriers to the implementation of such systems. Several writers present what they consider formidable barriers to the implementation of career development. Gutteridge (1976a) synthesized the existing literature and found the following limitations to be considered:

1. The greatest organizational impediment to career management is that managers are normally not rewarded for their personal efforts.
toward staff development. In fact, there are frequently negative sanctions for managers who develop highly competent subordinates—the better workers are promoted to other departments and replaced by new, untrained employees. Meanwhile, the managers are still expected to fully achieve their economic and profit-oriented objectives. This explains why many managers attempt to "hoard" their good people and are anxious to promote from within their own departments, without considering other individuals when job openings occur.

2. Another major barrier is the planning skills of individual employees. The idea of planning for the future is completely foreign in terms of individual needs, although organization planning may be second nature. (In fact, many will argue that success is solely a matter of luck and timing and, therefore, career planning is an exercise in futility. Ironically, the underlying philosophy and basic skills involved in career planning are almost identical to those in organization planning.)

3. Psychological obstacles to individual career planning often go unrecognized. Supervisors and/or managers should evaluate and discuss the reality of career plans with their subordinates, and the organization should provide professional assistance to employees interested in developing their career strategy. The supportive attitude on the part of organizations accompanied by a demonstrated willingness to respond to realistic employee career interest should, over time, diminish the individualism to effective career planning.

4. A credibility gap may exist because the employee views career development as just another management "fad." Employees may
refuse to participate unless they can witness that the organization is sincere in its commitment to implement a career development program responsible to the individual's needs. The organization must invest time, energy, and patience, accompanied by strong top management support, to resolve the credibility gap.

5. Another barrier is the unreasonable expectation of "immediate results" through a career development program. Once an organization has committed itself to a career development program, it must be prepared to follow through and fulfill all stages in planned succession through to evaluation of its success or failure.

Claxton (1976) asserts that the most serious obstacle to the establishment of an effective career development system may be the lack of expertise and experience in knowing how to go about planning and organizing such a program. Huse (1975) maintains that obstacles appear in many corporations, governments, institutions, etc., when organizations encounter the phenomenon of change. Huse goes on to identify barriers that increase the resistance to change:

1. To the individual involved, change, as such, is not threatening if perceived as helpful. If an organization were to suddenly announce that every employee was to receive an immediate 15% pay raise, few employees would object. Frequently, however, individuals see the change as having actual or potential threat. In such a case, the individual resists change.

2. Any change will be opposed by a supervisor as a (real or imaginary) threat to his prestige and authority unless he has specifically requested the change. Supervisors are, first of all, human and they are concerned about their own status in the organization.

3. Any change will usually be opposed by the affected employee unless he has specifically requested the change. The opposition at this level is even stronger,
since the employee may literally be staking his status, prestige, or job on the coming change.

4. Any change will usually be opposed by the affected group unless the members have specifically requested the change. A proposed change usually affects more than one person; it affects the entire work unit and existing work groups within the unit.

5. The magnitude of the opposition to change (by individual, group, or supervisor) will be a direct reflection of the magnitude of the change. The greater the change the greater the opportunity for the change to threaten the group concerned and the greater its potential effect on the security, prestige, status, authority, and responsibility of those affected. (pp. 111-112)

While Huse (1975) has expanded Mann's (1969) principles of change, Watson (1969) emphatically believes that organizational barriers are founded in any flaws of policies, beliefs, and attitudes of individuals. Beckhard (1969), Bennis (1969), Grossman (1974), and Rogers and Rogers (1976) all concur that the external environment and internal organizational structure, along with the cultural, and communicative processes could effect the ability to manage change.

By acknowledging the barriers, resistance to career development can be overcome. Various strategies are suggested by different writers. Claxton (1976) declares career development programs must be thoughtfully conceived, carefully planned, and truly based upon employee and organizational needs to decrease resistance. Several writers present strategies for overcoming resistance to change (e.g., Beckhard, 1969; Bennis, 1969; Huse, 1975) and, more broadly, planning for change in the design and implementation of a career system. In a paper that focuses on the literature of change, recognizing the reaction of individuals, organizations, and entire
societies toward change, Klein (1969) contends "that a necessary pre-
requisite of successful change involves the mobilization of forces
against it" (p. 502).

Watson (1969) classified 13 principles for overcoming resist-
ance and proposed a fundamental framework of three questions:
"(1) Who brings the change? (2) What kind of change succeeds?
(3) How is it best accomplished—by what procedures and in what cli-
mate" (p. 22)? The sentiments of Guest's (1962) classical state-
ment: "The truth seems to be that we still know too little about
the way in which organizations are modified. The simple question
has not been asked enough: 'who does what, when, where, how, with
whom, and how often?'" (p. 153) supports Watson's (1969) premise.
The similarity to Guest's (1962) question is apparent in Watson's
(1969) principles given below:

A. Who brings change?

1. Resistance will be less if administrators, man-
agers, board members, and community leaders feel
that the project is their own—not one devised
and operated by outsiders.

2. Resistance will be less if the project clearly
has wholehearted support from top officials of
the system.

B. What kind of change?

3. Resistance will be less if participants see change
as reducing rather than increasing their present
burdens.

4. Resistance will be less if the project accords
with values and ideals which have long been ac-
knowledged by participants.

5. Resistance will be less if the program offers
the kind of new experience which interests
6. Resistance will be less if participants feel that their autonomy and their security is not threatened.

C. Procedures in instituting change

7. Resistance will be less if participants have joined in diagnostic efforts leading them to agree on the basic problem and to feel its importance.

8. Resistance will be less if the project is adopted by consensual group decision.

9. Resistance will be reduced if proponents are able to empathize with opponents, to recognize valid objections, and to take steps to relieve unnecessary fears.

10. Resistance will be reduced if it is recognized that innovations are likely to be misunderstood and misinterpreted, and if provision is made for feedback of perceptions of the project and for further clarification as needed.

11. Resistance will be reduced if participants experience acceptance, support, trust, and confidence in their relations with one another.

12. Resistance will be reduced if the project is kept open to revision and reconsideration if experience indicates that change would be desirable.

D. Climate for change

13. Readiness for change gradually becomes a characteristic of certain individuals, groups, organizations, and civilizations. They no longer look nostalgically at a Golden Age in the past but anticipate their Utopia in days to come. The spontaneity of youth is cherished and innovations are protected until they have had a chance to establish their worth. The ideal is more and more seen as possible. (pp. 22-23)

Watson's focus on overcoming resistance suggests "any change in the job or in the organization implies a perceived change in the
career of the employee; . . . again, . . . by being sensitive to the
career interests and aspirations of his subordinates, the manager
will be able to bring about change more effectively" (Hall, 1976,
p. 7). In addition, Bell (1975) contends that a lack of sound per­
formance appraisal systems and a planned personal development analy­
sis affects the implementation and adaptation of a career develop­
ment system.

Furthermore, Walter (1976) sees "two major tragedies among the
many confronting society: (1) the failure for individuals to manage
their careers, and (2) the failure of organizational leaders to know
and understand the career aspirations, interests, skills, and poten­
tial of their employees" (p. 112). Thus, the best way to insure
successful implementation of career development, subsequent behav­
ioral change, and measurable results is to have worthwhile career
development programs.

Benefits of Career Development

Before the goals of career development can be achieved, not
only the barriers but also the benefits are at issue. What kinds of
benefits are available for individual employees and the organiza­
tion? Burack (1979), Ginzberg (1977), Hall (1976), and Morgan et al.
(1979) state that benefits accrue not only to the organization but
also to the individual.

The individual benefits are seen in terms of better jobs, more
money, enhanced self-esteem, increased satisfaction, exposure, visi­
bility, increased responsibility, mobility, and acquisition of
skills that usually lead to increased productivity (Morgan et al., 1979; Leider, 1976).

For the organization, career development serves to contribute to organizational effectiveness, performance, and profitability (Morgan et al., 1979). Overall, organizations have encouraged career development practices "primarily to serve management-oriented needs" (Walker & Gutteridge, 1979, p. 3). According to an American Management Association (AMA) survey, Walker and Gutteridge (1979) cite shortage of management talent, desire to promote and develop employees within, desire to improve productivity, and a concern about turnover, along with employees' expression of interest in career planning and affirmative action program commitments as influential factors in adaptation of career planning practices.

A major portion of an individual's life is focused around work (career). Therefore, it is important that a potpourri of incentives provide for satisfying human needs—psychological, safety, social, ego, and self-actualization (Maslow, 1968) and achievement, affiliation, and power (McClelland, 1967). Hall (1976) also confirms the importance work plays in an individual's life.

Additional writers credit other benefits for the success of career development. Gutteridge (1976a) stresses that the individual establishes a personal program of self-development and career growth while the organization benefits by "integrating such diverse aspects of human resource management as selection, promotion, placement, transfer, training, and development" (p. 46). Saklad (1976) further suggests that an effective career development system should "ensure
a continued supply of talented, well-trained, motivated employees and have a positive impact on such organizational goals and efficiency and profitability" (p. 46). Bell (1975) identifies the development of specific skills and exposure to new career planning approaches and resource uses as the two most valuable benefits from participation in career development programs.

It is important to analyze which benefits and incentives are perceived positively so that factors can be considered in the design and implementation of a career development program. Using the most appropriate incentives can maximize the success of the entire career development system.

Fully implemented, a career development system can result in the following benefits:

1. Training for all employees in the processes of career development.
2. Better matching of individual and organizational goals.
3. An organized approach to minority training and development efforts.
4. Improved ability of employees to meet changing work demands.
5. Better organizational preparation for changing human resources needs.
7. Reduction in employee frustration about career opportunities.
8. Greater understanding by employees of organizational needs and constraints.
10. Improved attitudes about the organization's commitment to its employees.

11. Output into the organization to facilitate the human resource management process. (Chin, 1969, pp. 297-312)

Elements of Career Development

In Table 2, several writers in the literature recommend various elements for the design, implementation, and adaptation of career development systems. The elements are listed in no special order. Recommendations from practitioners, researchers, and career development experts are included in the table.

Gutteridge (1976b), among others, acknowledged that once an organization accepts the premise of career development as an intervention method, the organization must then be concerned with the initiation and implementation of such a program. Unfortunately, as Hall (1976) notes, there are not any "step-by-step procedures that will automatically ensure a successful program" (p. 42). Certain precondition elements are recommended by Gutteridge (1976b) for the successful implementation of any career development program. He suggests that:

1. Organizations must modify their promotional policies and practices so as to create an open, rather than closed, internal labor market.

2. Although organizations should facilitate the career development process, they cannot, and should not, seek to completely control it. Career decisions are basically individual choices. A career management program should be as flexible and personalized as possible, allowing ample opportunity for employee input, rather than being constructed as a rigid, lockstep system. A failure to accomplish this will simply result in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Development Components</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaye (1979)</td>
<td>Saklad (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall &amp; Ball (1976)</td>
<td>Milkovich et al. (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gutteridge (1976a &amp; b)</td>
<td>Schein (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Organization's role in the implementation of career development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individual employee participation in career development activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Managerial commitment and support to the career development philosophy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Flexibility and continuity of the organization to accommodate the career development process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participation by managerial staff in program planning and implementation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-management of career by the employee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development Components</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Variety of activities and instructional career development techniques</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organizational assessment of benefits derived from career development system</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managerial training in the area of career development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reality-testing of individual's career development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration of internal and external resources and forces influencing career development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Action plan and follow through</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
substitution of one autocratic career system for another.

3. Organizations should recognize that career development will not be a panacea for all their human resource problems; conflicts, although fewer, will continue to occur between an individual's personal welfare and the organization's objectives. In the short run, turnover may even increase. Therefore, organizations should carefully assess the benefits they expect to derive from a career development system. Unrealistic expectations on the part of personnel managers and top-level executives all too frequently distorts the evaluation of a seemingly effective career development system.

4. The commitment of senior management is essential. . . . To be meaningful, top management commitment must extend beyond a policy statement and include the active involvement of upper-level line and staff managers in the actual formulation of the career development system. (p. 7-8)

Additional elements are also recommended by other writers. Burack (1972) summarizes what is happening in the world of changing technology, management, and values describing the complexities to which career development systems must be responsive:

The leading edge of change in the future will include the new technologies of information, production, and management, interlaced with considerable social dislocation and shifts in manpower inputs. These developments are without precedent in our industrial history.

Technological and social changes have created a need for more education, training, and skill at all managerial and support levels. The lowering of barriers to employment based on sex and race introduces new kinds of manpower problems for management officials. Seniority is coming to mean relatively less in relation to the comprehension of problems, processes and approaches. The newer manpower elements and work techniques have shifted institutional arrangements: the locus of decision-making is altered, role relationships among workers and supervisors are changed [often becoming more collegial], and the need to respond to changing routines has become commonplace. (pp. 4-5)
In order for career development systems to be capable of handling such complexities, they must contain all the necessary elements and such elements must be adequately integrated.

Schein (1977) advocates that effective adaptation of career development requires organizational elements such as: flexibility of the organization, ability to communicate information reliably and validly, and commitment to the goals of the organization. Beckhard (1969) also favors a strong internal climate of support and freedom from threat since being threatened "undermines good communication and reduces flexibility" (p. 12).

Several writers elaborate upon the importance of top level support for the success of career development programs. Schmuckler (1976) contends that:

- Investments without commitments are worthless. Developmental programs need to be more than inspirational words to which lip service is paid. They need to have the complete support of management in order to be successful. A lack of commitment generally leads to a lack of clearly defined goals and objectives with the ultimate effect being the demise of the program and a loss of management's credibility. (p. 32)

Watson (1963) and McAlindon (1977) recommend that the need for our time is for organizations to have the commitment, visualization, and courage, and to recognize the human element as a positive asset to organizational growth. Hall and Hall (1976) contend that effective implementation as well as the specific objectives and content of career development programs should be left to the discretion of the individual employee and his/her immediate supervisor. Schmuckler (1976), however, developed a list of characteristics
necessary for successful implementation of a career development sys-
tem.

Management's Investment

Motivation: Supervisors and employees should be pro-
vided with the reasons, explanations and benefits to be
derived from developmental programs. Also, participants
should be shown how their involvement will be to their
advantage.

Opportunity: Participation should not be restric-
tive. The organization should demonstrate a continued
interest in all employees.

Training: The value of training programs is that
it results in skills being transferred to participants.

Honesty: An air of trust about the program must be
presented or failure is imminent. Information concerning
the program must be disseminated as completely and pre-
cisely as possible. Responses to career questions should
be direct and frank. An incorrect response may result in
a credibility gap that has little possibility of being
bridged.

Evaluation: All employees need to know how they are
doing. An employee should meet with immediate supervisor
or manager for a regularly scheduled evaluation in which
manager and subordinate can candidly discuss individual's
career.

Reward: Rewards can take the form of salary in-
creases, increased responsibility, or a title on a door.
There is no need for a reward to be public. It con-
cerns only the employee and the organization.

Help: Guidance and assistance are essential ele-
ments for career development.

Objectives: Organizations should require long range
plans with carefully defined objectives when implement-
career systems.

Obligations: Establishment of a development program
must be considered an obligation as binding as a legal
contract. Lacking the whole-hearted support of top man-
agement, the benefits reaped will fall short of maximum.
Diversity: A career development system provides an organization with the flexibility to assign employees to a variety of assignments. Parochial thinking is no longer desirable.

Employee's Investment

Performance: Selecting an employee to participate in a management development program is part of the organization's investment in a future leader.

Attitude: Assignment to development programs or placement in departments generally considered to be stepping stones for future growth frequently leads to ailments of the swelled head variety. The employee should recognize that no assignment given is below his or her level, although in actuality it may be a misuse of talents. When individuals believe they can no longer show loyalty to the organization, or when they feel that their talents are being misused or underutilized, it is their responsibility to seek changes within the organization or to seek employment opportunities elsewhere.

Technical ability: Organizations rise and fall on their skills in meeting consumer's demands. It behooves the individual to further skills and broaden the competency base thereby continuously upgrading technical ability.

Responsibility: By definition this refers to one's accountability. Thus, it concerns the employee who is able to distinguish between right and wrong and can think and act rationally. This is an individual who will "own" his/her problems and face them head on in order to arrive at a solution.

Integrity: Ethics and honesty must become dominant tools in an employee's work skills. On the job, one must be able to distinguish right from wrong and withdraw from devious situations.

Originality: Creativity and originality is a trait possessed by all of us in varying degrees. For unknown reasons, people tend to deemphasize this quality within themselves relying instead on the work of others.

Tenacity: Tenacity and persistence in spite of adversities is a skill which should be acquired. Once acquired, it should be maintained. It implies knowing when to keep going as well as knowing when to stop.
Initiative: Risk taking, especially by individuals in training programs, is usually avoided instead. Leadership, and its companion initiative, should be the end product of any management development program.

Sincerity: Our culture and society demand that people work.

Maturity. Any mature individual brings with him or her all of the above stated characteristics. More importantly, it reflects the ability of an individual to be flexible and further develop. The mark of a mature individual is one who can question as well as accept being questioned, who is capable of functioning independently, recognizing strengths in addition to accepting limitations. (Schmuckler, 1976, pp. 30-32)

Wanous (1975) concludes that the more successful career development programs are those which are (a) vigorously supported by the organization, (b) division-wide in scope, and (c) which reduce the employee's initial expectation to a more realistic level.

Career Development and the Middle Manager

During the last decade, the new term "organizational development" has found its way into the organization charts of American corporations. Because of the recency of this concept, it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which the activities carried out under this title are old activities being carried out under a new name or a new set of activities aimed at an old but increasingly urgent problem. But one fact does emerge: "There is an increasing number of men in these organizations whose primary function is to foster change. This has always been part of the job of a manager, and often a significant part" (Dalton, 1970, p. 230). This "manager" as the "prestigious influencing agent" (Dalton, 1970) is the
actor rather than the reactor in the career development process.

Why consider the subject of practitioner change agent roles?

In a sense, practitioner roles, translated as a specific behavioral mode of operation on the part of the practitioners, are at the heart of what may be termed intervention or change agentry or practice. An individual who uses knowledge, technical skills, and sensitivity in social interaction, with his own person as a major and direct instrument of impact, often plays a crucial part in professions and movements aiming to modify patterns of social arrangements. This implies that he/she must have a keen understanding of what roles to assume at what times and how to execute these roles to achieve maximum effect. (Rothman, 1974, p. 35)

Rothman's (1974) thorough literature search caused him to caution, "Practitioner role performance is a fairly amorphous area in which not many studies were found and in which there is an almost total absence of conventional theoretical superstructure" (p. 31). This being the case, this section relies primarily on expository material with some reference to the thin research available on the manager's role as change agent. This section will begin with a brief overview of career development and then move toward the role of the manager in that process.

Career development was defined in Chapter I as a planned process for increasing organizational effectiveness. Beckhard's (1969) definition of organizational development parallels the concept of career development when he states: "Organizational development is a planned process for increasing organization effectiveness and health through intervention based on behavioral sciences knowledge" (p. 9).
Pointing to extensive research, Katz and Kahn (1966) concluded that if you want employees to respond to change more responsibly, the organization must give them responsibility by letting managers and employees participate in change. Through career development systems, "Organizations have to structure jobs so workers can reach their individual potential and achieve real satisfaction" (Grossman, 1974, p. 22).

The constant evolutionary course of change within organizations has significant implications for the career development of its members. The manager can assist people in directing their developmental efforts more productively.

Jones (1976) emphasizes that managers provide two types of information which employees need: One type of information deals with the organization and where it's headed, and the other type of information revolves around the employee. "The manager is a key source of input in both regards" (p. 3).

The manager is often a significant force in the life of the employee. The extent to which a manager's own work habits and behavior complement organizational goals make it easier for employee growth. An employee's own growth is often a by-product of his/her emulation of the manager. Managers can be most important forces in employee career development. Leider (1976) suggests the following prescription:

1. Discuss with your people directions in which your organization is moving and the implications this has for their future opportunities.

2. Clarify for yourself what your people are trying to accomplish in their careers.
3. Evaluate your people's job responsibilities to determine if assignments can be restructured to provide more developmental growth experience.

4. Maintain an awareness of relevant development resources including on-the-job and off-the-job.

5. Conduct a performance appraisal and development review discussion which is consistent with the principles outlined in series.

6. Keep your accessibility known and demonstrate active interest in the achievements of your people.

7. Live according to the policies of the organization and the obligations inherent in your responsibilities. (p. 9)

Storey (1976) stresses that "it is believed that managers are primarily responsible for planning the careers of their employees" (p. 10). This premise is based upon the assumption that people need to be directed or controlled. In contrast, Burack (1979) assumes that people want to and are capable of exercising a responsible voice in matters that affect them. Since individual employee needs are different, the best prescription for employee development is explained by Storey (1976) when he states: "Managers are likely to coach and share experiences in a way that encourages employees to participate in discovering the work to be done and in identifying what work is best suited to them" (p. 11).

Brewer, Hanson, VanHorn, and Moseley (1975) also recognize the individual employee being fully responsible for his/her own career; however, specific input is expected from management for the system to function effectively:

1. The degree to which a supervisor feels committed to and responsible for career development of his subordinates will vary, depending on his motivation and
values, but assumption of such responsibility can be viewed as a basic managerial task.

2. Specific contributions from the supervisor should include providing subordinates with a nurturing environment in which a person can realize his inherent potentials.

3. The supervisor can also serve as a source of ideas and assistance for career planning; willing to share, but not assuming full responsibility for guidance.

4. A supervisor can create expectations by expecting a subordinate to develop and pursue a plan for career growth. He can be a sounding board and a source of reactions; in this role he/she can provide the employee a form of reality testing for his career aspirations.

5. A final aspect of input from management that can contribute significantly to an atmosphere of openness and trust is honesty and promptness in reporting changes, predicted skill needs, program direction, and technology that will affect current positions as well as growth related to careers. (p. 230)

Jones (1976) and Bell (1975) agree that success of career development is largely dependent upon the manager knowing how to develop subordinates. Jones further states that:

Just as the best of coaches can't play the game for the players, likewise a manager cannot do for employees what they will not do for themselves. However, a coach definitely assists the team in winning the game; likewise the manager has a key role to play in helping people develop. (p. 3)

Despite proven research that tells us development occurs out of an integration of the learner need, relevant exposure to practice, reinforcement, and feedback, Bell (1975) responds that it is the role of middle managers to bring about behavioral change of subordinates, thus, realizing a "total integration of all the system components" (p. 33).
The system prescribed by Bell (1975):

sensitizes managers to the importance of career development, enhances selection of career development, enhances selection of career development options that bring true behavioral change and most importantly, actively involve the manager in being a part of, reinforcer of, and manager of, subordinate development. (p. 35)

Leider (1976) suggests that the individual within the organization that attempts to analyze the "reality thinking" of employee career paths is the manager. This analysis requires the manager to be appropriately understanding and knowledgeable of subordinates' abilities, needs, and desires for the future. The employee is not able to reconcile the "ideal" from the "reality" because of his/her lack of awareness of the organizational perspective.

Planned Change Process and Models

The field of personnel management has addressed issues such as why is human resource planning and development important to organization effectiveness (Hall, 1976), what are major elements of career development systems (Burack & Mathys, 1980), and how can elements be integrated for maximum effectiveness (Schein, 1977).

Schein (1977) concludes that the failure of organizations to reach maximum effectiveness is the continued failure/lack of effort of "line managers and functional managers in areas other than personnel to recognize the true importance of planning for and managing human resources" (p. 1).

An organization evokes management's involvement through a strategy. Beckhard (1969) refers to organizational development as "an
effort planned, organization-wide, and managed from the top, to in­
crease organization effectiveness and health through planned inter­
ventions in the organization's "processes" (p. 9).

This planned change strategy involves a systematic diagnosis
of the organization, the development of a strategic plan for imple­
mentation, adaptation, and improvement of career development efforts.

The career development phenomenon, like organizational develop­
ment, involves a total system change (in the managerial strategy).
"A system which is relatively free to determine its own plans and
future" (Beckhard, 1969, p. 10). This planned process is managed
from the top—management has both "knowledge and commitment" (p. 10)
to the goals of the career planning development and "actively sup­
ports the methods used to achieve goals" (p. 10).

Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (Huse, 1975) were among the first
to develop an overall strategy for planned change, but later Frohman
and Kolb (Weaver & Schmitt, 1979) modified and redefined change.
However, the basic concept of planned change as a "dynamic, six step
process: scouting, entry, diagnosis, planning, action, and evalua­
tion" still remains constant.

Their description of this model begins to suggest the role of
the middle manager, as change agent, in the career development pro­
cess. Frohman and Kolb (cited in Ault, 1977) suggested that the
change agent's (in this case, the middle manager) critical task
during the scouting phase is to determine appropriate entry points
in the system, focusing on understanding both the formal and in­
formal structure of organizations. This notion is supported by the
adaptation/diffusion literature regarding the role of the opinion leaders in bringing about change (Rogers & Rogers, 1976). In addition to the structure, other writers emphasize the need in scouting to determine the "readiness" of the system for change (Beckhard, 1969; Ault, 1977). "This sensing includes the search for 'felt needs' of the system; as well as, in Beckhard's terms, the degree of 'pain felt by strategic' members of the system" (Ault, 1977, p. 49). (See Figure 3.)

In addition to opinion leaders, other "strategic" system members may need to be discovered during the scouting phase. Rogers and Rogers (1976) also referred to "gate-keepers" as quite a different species. Gatekeepers may or may not lead opinion, but they are in positions to stop the change process or allow it to occur, to shut or open the gate. While the gatekeeper may not be involved to the same extent as opinion leaders, they must be involved to the extent that they are at best "neutralized" so that they will not stop individual effort. Harrison (1971) further suggested being on the lookout for "the forces in the organization which are supportive of change and improvements" (p. 1). This is supported by some of the adoption/adaptability principles of Sashkin (1974) whereby he described six approaches to change, three of which he called "adoptive" and three of which he called "adaptive." The first category is in the adoption/diffusion of innovative tradition, while the second is aimed at helping "the client become more adaptable, more open to change, and able to change in needed ways" (p. 209). Shepard (1975) put it more succinctly when he suggested finding a "few friends"
Source: Kolb, Rubin, & McIntyre, 1971.
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(p. 3) or "find people who are ready and able to work, introduce
them to one another, and work with them" (p. 4). Harrison (1971)
also suggested multiple entry points: "a variety of people, groups,
processes and problems with which contact can be made and to which
help may be given" (p. 1). In searching for these entry points,
the client (subordinate) and the change agent (middle manager) were
advised to look for "promising arenas, relatively healthy parts of
the system . . . with individuals and groups which have as much
freedom and discretion in managing their own operations as possible"
(Harrison, 1971, p. 2). In other words, Ault (1977) succinctly
states "the status combination of the felt need, the clarity of a
goal or preferred future, and know-how regarding practical starting
points must be greater than money, time and energy required in order
for change to occur" (p. 51). A change agent (middle manager) and
client (individual/subordinate) must assess all of this in the
scouting phase.

Entry points having been chosen, the middle manager begins, in
the Frohman-Kolb model, the entry process itself by building a con­
tract with the client system. This may or may not be a legal docu­
ment and often exists purely as a "developmental and personal con­
tract," but in any case, it defines mutual expectations regarding
how future stages in the change process will progress (Burack &
Mathys, 1977, p. 5). As an early entry issue, the dynamic nature of
change calls for keeping the contract open for continued renegotia­
The diagnostic phase of the Frohman-Kolb model is of critical importance. Huse (1975) described this step as:

Starting with the perceived problems of the client, the diagnosis involves identifying more clearly the specific improvement goals to be reached. There are four basic elements to this diagnosis: (1) the problem as perceived by the client; (2) the goals of the client; (3) the resources of the client; (4) the resources, including time and knowledge, of the change agent.

The most common methods in diagnosis are questionnaires, interviews, personal observations, and the organization's previous performance data. Another important diagnostic instrument is the change agent. (p. 96)

The change agent (middle manager) can sense the organization's response to him/her as resistant or receptive, and the overall climate of the organization.

Planning proceeds from the diagnosis. This diagnosis may turn up data that give rise to the need for "a renegotiation of the entry contract" (Kolb, Rubin, & McIntyre, 1971, p. 357) and "reality testing" (Leider & Hagberg, 1978), thus returning from the planning phase back to the entry phase in the Frohman-Kolb model in Figure 3. Planning includes the identification of goals to be achieved, the action steps to be taken, and the possible problems of resistance to change. Huse (1975) has found that action has already taken place between the change agent and client at this point, and it's paramount that "planning needs to be done cooperatively with the client system to make certain that the plans are consonant with the needs and expectations of the client system so that mutual commitment may be obtained" (p. 96). However, the action phase of the model refers more specifically here to the system's acting to implement those
strategies of change agreed to in the planning phase.

Some strategies may work, some may not; therefore, it is necessary that evaluation take place to determine which is the case. The evaluation should be conducted throughout the change process between the change agent and client in order to determine whether further career planning should be continued or temporarily terminated. This evaluation may involve performance appraisal, surveys, and feedback instruments (Hall & Hall, 1976). The difficult phase of career systems to accomplish is evaluation, because of the "human element" aspect of career development system intervention.

Evaluation is, in a sense, a re-diagnosis, a renewal of the individual's development or the individual in a new state (Leider, 1976), thus a feedback arrow in the model from evaluation to planning (Figure 3). This looping process causes the approach to career systems to be seen as an ongoing process, rather than a program with a beginning and an end.

While the process goes on, the change agent's work with the individual may eventually end, thus the "Termination" phase. It has been stated as a rule of thumb in this phase that "the helping relationship may itself end, or the change agent may return to the scouting stage to explore the possibility of another change effort" (Huse, 1975, p. 98). This requires, within the internal structure, the individual and/or middle manager to sustain the process.

A general concept in career development is that it is and should be a "transactional and collaborative process" (Chin & Benne,
1969, p. 42). Thus the change agent and the individual subordinate would engage jointly in all stages shown in the Frohman-Kolb model.

Process Models

Lewin (1958) is the forebearer to the beginning of "models of change" in contemporary social sciences. He identified three phases of the change process: unfreezing, changing, and refreezing. Lewin said that this process encompasses the kinds of changes in beliefs, attitudes, and values of the system's members. The key members of the system at least recognize the need to find a better way. Influencing change usually begins with the first step of unfreezing—creating motivation to change. It is this step that represents an unsettling of the present equilibrium. The initiation of a new idea, behavior, attitude, structure, technology, or fundamental new approach occurs in the change stage.

The refreezing stage is a period of stabilizing and integrating the changes. This model has continued to be useful to both practitioners and organizations interested in change. As a general model it has withheld the test of time, research, and experience. Other models focused on the WHAT question: What is to be changed? Greiner and Barnes (1970) and other writers acknowledged the existence of change goals (i.e., better performance, increased adaptability, greater motivation, etc.) by including three areas in their formula: structure, technology, and people. Greiner and Barnes (1970) suggested two points underlying all attempts at change: "Changes in an organization's level of adaption to its environment,
and changes in internal behavioral patterns of employees" (p. 2).

Since the main concern of this study is the process of how top management and middle management can effectively plan, implement, and adapt a career system to their organization, we return for a starting point to the Frohman-Kolb Model. Their model presented the fundamental concept of understanding change as taking in a series of stages.

Beckhard (1969) has expanded on the issue of planned change by analyzing the success and failure of planned change efforts and listed the following conditions as necessary for success:

1. There is pressure from the environment, internal or external, for change.

2. Some strategic person or people are "hurting."

3. Some strategic people are willing to do real diagnosis of the problem.

4. There is leadership (consultant, key staff man, new line executive).

5. There is collaborative problem identification between line and staff people.

6. There is some willingness to take risks in trying new forms or relationships.

7. There is a realistic, long-term perspective.

8. There is a willingness to face the data of the situation and to work with them on changing the situation.

9. The system rewards people for the effort of changing and improvement, in addition to rewarding them for short-term results.

10. There are tangible intermediate results. (p. 97)

Beckhard (1969) further listed conditions for failures:
1. A gap between what top management says and what it does.

2. A flurry of activities without a solid base of change goals.

3. Confusion of ends and means.

4. Short time framework.

5. No linkage between OD change efforts and other units of change in the organization, such as industrial engineering, training, systems development, etc.

6. Overdependence on either outside help or inside specialists.

7. A gap between the effort at the top and efforts in the middle of the organization.

8. "New wine in old bottles"—i.e., trying to fit a major change into an old structure.

9. Confusing "good relationships" as an end with good relationships as a condition.

10. The search for cookbook solutions.

11. Applying an intervention or strategy inappropriately. (pp. 93-96)

The conditions referred to by Beckhard may occur throughout the change process.

Kaye's (1979) model of career development identifies six distinct, yet interconnected stages which vary greatly from organization to organization. This model "provides the structure, rationale, and framework for the practitioner whose job it is to design and develop programs within the organization" (p. 2).

An important contribution of the Kaye model was the potential it provides for improvement of an individual's satisfaction and self-esteem, contribution to organization, and "promoting the long
term success of the organization through its effective utilization of human resources" (p. 3).

Kaye's (1979) model also included the "practitioner" (individual subordinate) as the moving force in planning out one's career. However, the model depicts an influencing agent, either top manager, middle manager, or staff or department head, as dealing directly with the individual in the early stages of the career development process.

Milkovich's et al. (1979) model basically represents both properties of career development, namely, the organization and individual. However, he culled from the empirical and theoretical literature that there is a vital relationship between the environment, individual, and organizational variables.

An important contribution of the Milkovich et al. model was the introduction of "organizational careers" construct represented in two forms: actual and perceptual; "actual" referring to previously defined components of organizational careers; "perceptual" referring to employees' perceptions of those dimensions.

Figure 4 depicts the three major variables that explain variations between the structural and individual flow components of organizational careers. Martin and Strauss (1956) concur that organizational careers integrate the individual's movement and patterned structure, and these dual properties cannot be examined independently because:

over time, the paths of movement of personnel through the system of positions making up organizational structure, tend to become stabilized. Patterns of vertical and

Figure 4

A Model of Organizational Careers

Horizontal movement evolves, to form various types of career lines which terminate at various levels of the hierarchy. These career lines, which are analogous to the trunks and branches of trees, provide escalators for mobile individuals. (p. 101)

The organizational dimension, empirical investigation suggests, is a relationship between the organizational characteristics of size, structure, and technology, and the properties of organizational careers, particularly, individual mobility rate.

"Planning for and managing human resources is emerging as an increasingly important determinant of organizational effectiveness. The human resource system must be managed by middle managers" (Schein, 1977, p. 7). Schein reports the importance of the human
element in a career development system and, for maximum organization effectiveness, the position middle managers play in planning, implementing, and adapting career systems to their organizations. In order for a system to become more responsive to change, the elements of the system must be integrated. The major problem with existing systems is that they may be "fragmented, incomplete, and sometimes built on faulty assumptions about human or organizational growth" (Schein, 1977, p. 5).

If "decisions emerge out of the interplay," then Schein sees the managerial role as forcing the field of human resource management to center stage.

The more complex organizations become, the more they will be vulnerable to human error. They will not necessarily employ people, but they will employ more sophisticated highly trained people both in managerial and in individual contributor, staff roles. The price of low motivation, turnover, poor productivity, sabotage, and intra-organizational conflict will be higher in such an organization. Therefore it will become a matter of "economic necessity" to improve human resource planning and development systems. (Schein, 1977, p. 3)

This chapter focused on career development research related to the individual employee's role and the organization's role. The following chapter discusses the research design and procedures used in this investigation.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The methods and procedures used in this study are presented here in six sections: (a) Review of the Problem, (b) Population and Sample, (c) Research Questions, (d) Procedures, (e) Instrumentation, and (f) Data Analysis.

Review of the Problem

The purpose of this investigation was to describe the perceptions of middle managers concerning the implementation and adaptation dimensions, and also the pilot operation, of a career development process used by a large Midwestern (Fortune 500, 1982) company, for the purpose of defining management's role in the implementation and adaptation stages of an effective career development system, and to draw implications for the use of a career development method. The study included analysis of data obtained by interviews with key persons responsible for the implementation of career development and data gathered by participant observation throughout the interview.

The descriptive study method was chosen for this investigation. Descriptive research is frequently labeled as the "what is" kind of research. This means that it emphasizes present status, describes a current situation, or studies facts and conditions that exist. Descriptive research techniques are most commonly used to gather facts, opinions, and attitudes. The major purposes of descriptive
research include description, explanation, and exploration. According to Lovell and Lawson (1970), "it is concerned with conditions that exist, practices that prevail, beliefs and attitudes that are held, processes that are on-going, and trends that are developing" (p. 31).

Thus the data derived in descriptive research can be meaningful and helpful in diagnosing a situation or in proposing a new and innovative program. Descriptive research can be referred to as a preparation stage for action research. Descriptive research portrays a picture of existing conditions and once these conditions are defined later experimentation and observation can launch a program of improvement. Therefore, descriptive research is often referred to as a preliminary springboard to later experimental research.

Population and Sample

Selected directors of a large industrial corporation in the Midwest comprised the population for this study. Directors are defined as middle managers—those individuals who supervised other managers.

From the beginning of the researcher's association with this company it was evident that any proposed innovation would have to be measured favorably against the question: "Is this plan, project, or change consistent with the company philosophy?" This consideration took place at a conscious level with the Director of Management Development and seemed to this researcher to be an almost routine consideration. A simple statement of that philosophy is summarized...
as follows: The company invests its money in people. Thus, the company wants to assist people to achieve their personal goals while the company achieves its organizational goals.

Initial acceptance of the career development system is dependent upon the degree to which it is consistent with this philosophy and the degree to which this could be communicated to management. Successful implementation and adaptation of the career development method is dependent upon the degree to which participants, both management and nonmanagement, can see that the process takes into consideration their goals as well as those of the organization. Because the career development process combines the opportunity for both development and selection, and thus offers the possibility of contributing to both organizational and personal goals, it seems highly congruent with the company philosophy.

The researcher's association with the company and with the Management Development unit began in May 1980, when she was interviewed prior to beginning an internship there during the summer of 1980. The internship period gave the researcher the opportunity to become familiar with the organizational structure of the company, its management philosophy, its personnel policies, and its employment development efforts. The internship responsibilities, which included the design of a career development process, provided the opportunity for the researcher to discuss with members of management their concerns and needs. Furthermore, during the internship, the researcher was able to establish rapport with the management and staff of the unit which fostered a confidence in her work and later
proved invaluable in gaining their endorsement and cooperation in this research effort.

In conducting this study the company provided the researcher a list of 42 directors representing all middle management positions. The researcher stratified the sample to assure representation across all departments and selected two directors for large departments such as engineering, public affairs, and personnel. There was a total of 33 directors selected for interviews. A cross-section of directors was selected on the basis of position within the division, and those most qualified to respond to questions concerning career development of subordinates.

Research Questions

This research focused upon five research questions. Each of the five research questions was based on a corresponding section of the interview schedule which was used as the data instrument. Following are the research questions:

Research Question 1: What are the perceptions of middle managers in the area of career development systems?

Research Question 2: What are the perceptions of middle managers regarding career development as it is currently practiced in this organization?

Research Question 3: What are the perceptions of middle managers regarding who takes the responsibility for initiating a career development program.
Research Question 4: What are the perceptions of middle managers regarding prime factors influencing career development systems?

Research Question 5: What do middle managers perceive as their role in career development of employees?

Procedures

The nature of the questions addressed by managers about career development and the rapport previously established with those interviewed, allowed the researcher to conduct very frank and probing interviews. The format of the interview was standardized. Thus, each interviewee was asked the same question in the same way. The interview schedule was semistructured. For each major issue, one closed-end question was included, followed by at least one probe question. The probing questions varied for given interviewees depending upon their responses to the initial question. The semistructured format has the advantage of offering a high degree of freedom to probe into answers and to adapt to different study participants and situations. This format also allowed the interviewer to deal with faulty memories and to ensure keeping the interview on track to meet the overall interview objectives.

Open-end probes were used because of the several advantages cited by Stewart and Cash (1982) and Borg and Gall (1979). According to the authors, open-end probes:

1. Allow the interviewee to do most of the talking while the interviewer listens and observes.
2. Help put the interviewee at ease because the interviewee can determine the nature and amount of information to be given.

3. Are more effective in learning about feelings and attitudes and the intensity of feelings and attitudes of the interviewee.

4. Are less likely to telegraph or lead the interviewee to respond another way one way or another.

5. Help enable the interviewer to determine the interviewee’s frame of reference or stereotypes.

The actual data collection for this study was conducted between December 1981 and March 1982. During that time the researcher held 32 interviews. Although 33 managers agreed to become involved, one manager was unable to attend his scheduled interview and could not reschedule. Each of the initial contacts for identifying study participants were made with the following memo:

You have been randomly selected, along with other middle managers, to participate in an interview regarding career development. Gail Ganakas, who worked with us as an intern to develop a career development program, has been granted permission by the corporation to do a follow-up study with our directors.

We will be asking you to schedule an hour with Gail to give your views, opinions, and perceptions in response to questions concerning factors and conditions influencing career development programs. This is not a test of your knowledge or skill—there are no "wrong answers"—we are merely interested in your casual perceptions and observations. You will have access to the results of those interviews through Management Development, if you are interested.

We look forward to your participation and appreciate your time and cooperation. We will be contacting you within the next two weeks to arrange an interview date and time convenient with your schedule.
Should you have any questions, feel free to discuss them with Management Development prior to the interview.

Management Development followed through with scheduling an hour appointment with 32 directors. Prior to each interview a personal introduction of this researcher was given by a staff member of Management Development. This was followed by a written confidentiality statement, giving this writer's personal assurance that any specific information or comments shared with this researcher by interviewees during the conduct of the dissertation study would remain strictly confidential.

All of the directors were given a brief description of the intent of the dissertation study and the procedure prior to the hour interview. The directors were given the interview instrument to follow as the researcher read the questions. The director's responses were recorded by hand. After the interviews were completed, the researcher notated nonverbal communications that added emphasis to the verbiage of the study participants, i.e., notations regarding gestures, facial expressions, and general countenance.

Instrumentation

In conducting this research it was decided that a semistructured interview schedule would be most appropriate. A review of the literature revealed that no such instrument currently existed to address the five research questions. However, in the research, questions were generated from previous efforts which did address subsections of the research questions. One major source of contribution was the
American Management Association (Walker & Gutteridge, 1979) survey report on Career Planning Practices. In its final report, an examination of current practices relating to career planning and development were presented as the "state of the art."

Another prime source, Burack and Mathys's (1980) Career Management in Organizations: A Practical Human Resource Planning Approach, focused on questions dealing with managers' attitudes concerning implementation and adaptation of career development activities. A final source of inquiry included discussion with several corporate division managers involved in the actual implementation and adaptation of a career system.

The researcher took all these key items and rearranged them into a concise instrument. In addition, a first level review was done by the researcher to match items on the interview schedule with the research questions, which insured proper balance and insured that all questions were included.

This version of the interview schedule was submitted to the dissertation committee for a review of face validity. The members were instructed to indicate if he/she felt that the questions on the interview schedule did, indeed, match the research questions, and whether or not discussion of the research questions could occur based upon the type of information included within the interview schedule.

Subsequently, the instrument underwent several revisions. The revised interview schedule was pilot tested with corporate division managers similar to those types of individuals that would be selected
but not those ultimately involved. These individuals were asked to review the interview schedule in order to determine (a) if questions were clear, concise, and sensible and (b) if the questions in each section were logically developed from their respective research questions.

A final check was performed with cooperating graduate students from Western Michigan University who agreed to a mock interview. This allowed the researcher to practice and become very familiar with the interviewing process.

In terms of technical quality of the interview schedule, face validity was established in two ways: through expert review by the dissertation committee and then by the content and process review of the corporate managers.

The final instrument consisted of 29 closed-end and nine probing items. The closed-end items included a 5-point Likert-type scale, where interviewees were asked to respond within a range of "great extent" to "no extent." The probing of open-end items was both predetermined and ad-lib. In addition to the questions specifically related to the five research questions, five demographic issues were also addressed. These included sex, time with the company, educational background, type of staff managed, professional experience, and managerial position. A copy of the memo and instrumentation are included in the Appendix.
Analysis

The type of statistical analysis used for this research included a variety of descriptive statistics, such as frequencies, percentages, and means, for each of the closed-end questions. A review of the research questions showed that each interview item could stand independently. Hence, the analysis took on the flavor of an item analysis.

In preparation for item analysis, the responses to closed-end and probing items were, whenever possible, categorized. This allowed for both quantitative as well as qualitative discussion regarding these items. The data were then keypunched and entered for computer analysis. As it was decided for each item to be considered independently within each research question, no scale scores were established. Therefore, descriptive item analysis generated frequencies, percentages, and mean as specific statistics. For each item these statistics were developed and presented into accompanying tables for ease in reading and interpretation.

Descriptive statistics were generated, as the intent of the study was to determine "what" was occurring, not on the why, nor upon differences. There were no a priori hypothesized differences expected. Hence, inferential statistics were inappropriate.

In summary, this investigation was a descriptive analysis concerning the implementation and adaptation dimensions of a career development process. Data were gathered by interview and participant observation. The description and analysis made possible the
drawing of implications for use of a career development system within a large corporation.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe middle managers' perceptions concerning factors and conditions necessary in implementing and adapting a career development system to their organization. The descriptions given by the study participants provide an overall picture of the manager/subordinate career development relationship among this population.

This study involved a semistructured survey design, collecting of data from 33 managers from a Fortune 500 company located in the Midwestern United States. This chapter provides the data relative to the interview schedule collected for the study. The findings and discussion will be presented in three sections: (a) response rate, (b) demographic description of survey respondents, and (c) discussion of results as related to the five research questions.

Response Rate

The interviews were completed by 76% of the population. Of 42 directors, a total of 33 were selected using a stratification procedure. The total population was not interviewed because of time constraints. All 33 selected respondents agreed to be interviewed; however, one interviewee was unable to keep the appointment and was
unable to reschedule.

According to Babbie (1973), this represents a very good response rate for this type of questionnaire. Babbie suggested that response rates vary and the following indices serve as guides:

- 50% adequate
- 60% good
- 70% very good

Each respondent was contacted by a staff member of the Management Development unit to set up an appointment with the researcher.

Demographic Description

Demographic information was collected from each study participant. A review of the data revealed that the interviewees were higher-level directors—those who manage other managers. All were task-oriented managers involved in the influence of decision-making process and having managerial responsibilities within their departments. All seemed quite willing and open to discussion with an "outsider."

While in the sample there was a preponderance of males (90.6%), this truly reflects what exists throughout the corporate structure of this organization today. Currently, of 108 managers 95% are males.

While not a specific item on the interview schedule, the interviewer did observe the mode of attire of the respondents. The interviewees were classified into two categories: (a) conservatively dressed—those individuals whose attire was tailored, subdued in
color, and separates coordinated, and (b) casually dressed. The predominant group (96%) were conservatively dressed.

Two other demographic questions focused on the length of time of service: (a) length of time the individual had with the company and (b) length of time the individual held his/her current position. Findings are presented in Table 3. The majority of respondents had been with the company in excess of 3 years. Nearly one-half (46.9%) of the 32 respondents had over 15 years length of service with the company. However, a small proportion (12.5%) indicated that they had been with the company less than 3 years.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>In present position</th>
<th>At company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 also presents a tabular representation of respondents' length of time in present position. Overall, the vast majority of those interviewed (93.8%) had been in their current position less than 6 years. Only one manager had been in the same position more
than 15 years. Although this response is not surprising, it is inter­

esting to note that the respondents' perceptions of career devel­

opment were reflected in their own career advancement within the

company. This advancement was both lateral and upward. Thus, con­

sidering both the issue of time with the company and length of ser­

vice in present position, either managers are relatively mobile or

it takes many years of company service before one becomes a manager.

In response to the next demographic question concerning whether

managers were hired in as a manager or promoted from within, the

majority of directors (78.1%) indicated promotion from within. In

probing further, the researcher found that at least six of those re­

spondents promoted from within had been in at least five other posi­

tions including: engineering, research, marketing, technology, and

manufacturing.

The next area of interest was in terms of managers' educational

experience. Table 4 provides a summary of responses to this item.

A review reveals that all managers had at least some college train­
ing, and an excess of 93% had at least a B.A. degree. It appears, in

terms of educational background, the company does prefer individ­

uals with postsecondary formal training.

The final section of the demographic information focused upon

the types of individual subordinates for which the manager was

accountable. Table 5 provides a summary of the staff supervised by

the managers within the company. The respondents were given a

choice of seven categories of subordinates along with an "other" 
category. The technical and clerical categories were the most
Table 4
Type of Educational Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Education</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A./B.S.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Type of Staff Managed by Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Staff</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
common responses; 46.9% of the directors have the responsibility for at least one technical individual, while 43.8% have the responsibility for at least one clerical individual. Very few respondents indicated financial and sales subordinates among the staff members supervised. A variety of other types of subordinates were reported by more than half of the respondents. These included: tour guides, certified public accountants, and professional managers.

Given these findings the reader should be aware that the conclusions and recommendations of this study are limited to companies where the demographics are similar to those of the company in the current study. For those companies that have a high turnover, a short duration of time before one becomes a manager, or indeed, where managers are brought in from the external environment rather than work through the ranks, there is some question as to the validity of the findings reported here.

All information, including directors' length of time with the company, length of time in present position, type and number of staff managed, educational background, managerial position and promotability, dress, and willingness to talk, were obtained from the interviewees. A summary of the demographic data is presented in Appendix

The next section of this report will deal specifically with the five research questions from which this study was generated. The same format will prevail throughout; that is, the research question will be restated, and then a description of the type of analysis performed, followed by any quantitative analysis, and concluded with
any qualitative analysis.

Research Question Findings

The first research question of interest was: WHAT ARE THE PERCEPTIONS OF MIDDLE MANAGERS IN THE AREA OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS?

To obtain information regarding this question, the researcher asked two questions. One of the questions was quantitatively measured using a 5-point Likert type scale. The second question was of a more probing nature. In terms of the first question—"How important is a career development program?"—managers responded on a continuum of "a great deal of importance" to "not important." Table 6 contains a summary of responses.

Table 6
Importance of Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that only one of the respondents indicated career development as unimportant. Conversely, 68.8% indicated career development as being very important. When responding to the scaled item, some managers provided very interesting comments.
regarding their perceptions as to the importance of career development programs. Most responses were relatively positive and revealed a belief in the importance of career development. Such responses included:

"Career development is beneficial to companies' long-range goals."

"Career development is a key to a growing, changing organization."

For the second question, the respondents were asked to briefly define career development. In analyzing the data, the researcher categorized the responses and found that they generally fit into five types of definitions. These five definitions as well as the frequency for each is contained in Table 7.

Table 7
Responses to "What Is Definition of Career Development?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career development in terms of managers planning with individual employees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development is an individual (employee) matter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development as a dual objective involving both the organization and the individual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development is a challenging managerial task</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development as a progressive movement through career pathing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most frequent given career development definition response was for managers to plan with individual employee career goals and objectives (28.1%), followed by 25.0% of respondents mentioning career development as a challenge, an additional task of interest. The least often reported responses were career development as an organizational matter (12.5%) and career development as career pathing (15.6%) provides a broader career development perceptive. Thus, it generally appeared that while managers found some variation in a career development definition, managers overwhelmingly felt the importance of career development important.

The second research question of this study referred to was: WHAT ARE THE PERCEPTIONS OF MIDDLE MANAGERS REGARDING CAREER DEVELOPMENT AS IT IS CURRENTLY PRACTICED IN THE ORGANIZATION?

In answering this research question, the researcher analyzed the responses to three closed-end items and two probing items.

The first item of interest was: To what extent do you feel career development should be incorporated as part of an "employee development package"? The scale for this item was a 5-point Likert type scale with "great extent" assigned a score of 5 to "no extent" with a score of 1. Twenty-five respondents (78.1%) indicated that career development should be incorporated as part of an employee development package. The mean response to this item was 3.9—well into the positive side of the continuum. Table 8 provides the response summary to this item.
Table 8

Extent of Incorporation of Career Development As Part of an Employee Development Package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerable extent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some extent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next item offers specific information as to how directors feel about the company's job posting system. This research question is: To what extent do you believe this company's job posting system is effective in communicating job opportunities to its members? The managers responded on a 5-point Likert type scale. While 65.7% indicated that job posting was an effective communication tool, only 10 respondents believed job posting had a limited effect or no effect in communicating job opportunities to its members. In further probing the respondents, it was determined that job posting as an effective communication tool was dependent upon salaried grade level. Once a manager reaches a certain level, the company policy does not necessarily include job posting as a selection method. Table 9 provides the response summary to this item.
Table 9
Job Posting As an Effective Tool in Communicating Job Opportunities to Its Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerable extent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the final item, managers were asked about their knowledge as to which career development elements are in place in their organization. The researcher offered four commonly accepted types of elements known to be in place within the organization: self-inventory, performance appraisal, resource center, and career discussion. While these elements were already in place, managers were not consistently aware of all or any of these elements throughout the company, e.g., less than half of the managers were aware of self-inventory and resource center. Thus, although the company has career development elements, total awareness is not apparent among managers. Respondents were allowed to specify other elements which might be in place. It is clear that there are a variety of career development elements in place within the organization. The career development responses were counseling with individuals (34.4%), communication meetings within departments (28.1%), and cross-training and job rotation (21.9%). Table 10 contains a summary of all these responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-inventory</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource center</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career discussion</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job posting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization review and planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling with individuals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross training/job rotation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication meetings within departments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the interview, the directors were presented five items dealing with the third research question: WHAT ARE THE PERCEPTIONS OF MIDDLE MANAGERS REGARDING WHO TAKES THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR INITIATING A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM? All of these were quantitative but respondents were encouraged to elaborate qualitatively regarding their responses. The first item was: To what extent should organizations take the responsibility for initiating career development plans? Results presented in Table 11 indicate that the vast
majority (81.2%) felt the organization does, indeed, have a responsibility to initiate career development plans.

Table 11
Extent to Which Organization Should Hold Responsibility for Initiating Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerable extent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next item was: To what extent is it important for corporations to assist employees to develop their own careers? The responses are summarized in Table 12 which indicates that 78.1% of the managers agreed that it is important for companies to assist employees to develop their own careers. In Item 3, managers were asked to give their perceptions of top management's role in career development. Respondents viewed top management as serving in an active, participatory role through open communication, fostering the environment, and a strong corporate policy. To a lesser extent, they saw top management in evaluation (15.6%), letting career development happen (12.5%), assisting with monetary support (6.3%), and in some cases helping to generate a long-lasting commitment to career development (see Table 13).
### Table 12
**Extent to Which the Organization Should Hold Responsibility to Assist Employees to Develop Own Careers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerable extent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some extent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13
**Prime Role of Top Management in Career Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate policy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate career develop</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster the environment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization review and planning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let it happen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 exhibits a tabulation of the responses to the next item: What do managers believe to be the prime role of middle management in career development? Directors overwhelmingly perceived their own role as that of implementer, initiator, and administrator of career development (71.9%). Fifty percent of the respondents expressed a need to develop subordinates to their potential through diversified job assignments, cross training, and job rotation.

Table 14
Prime Role of Middle Management in Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement/initiate/administer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop people</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate career development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present realistic expectations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster environment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate policy/philosophy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify potential fast tracker</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement/make it happen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final question concerns: Who in the organization should be the motivating impetus in the initiation of a career development process? The results of this item are presented in Table 15.
Table 15
Motivating Impetus in the Initiation of Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the vast majority (75%) strongly believed that collectively the employee and management provide the motivating impetus. Only one respondent felt the employee provided the impetus. Further probing proved to this researcher that most managers felt obligated to share pertinent company information with subordinates; thus, facilitating the employees' ability and/or opportunity to determine their own course of action.

The fourth research question was: WHAT ARE THE PERCEPTIONS OF MIDDLE MANAGERS REGARDING THE PRIME FACTORS INFLUENCING CAREER DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS? In dealing with this question, the directors rated 13 factors. For each factor, the directors responded using a 5-point Likert type scale where "great extent" equaled 5 and "no extent" equaled 1. Table 16 exhibits the ratings of the directors. The means for these data reveal all 13 factors to be in the upper half of the response continuum. The top five factors in order of priority were: middle management commitment, top management commitment, responsibility taken by the subordinate, perceived importance of career development, and performance level of the employee. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management commitment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management commitment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility taken by subordinates</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived importance of career development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management knowledge</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of organization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance level</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived importance of career plans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee expressed interest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management encouragement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of available managerial time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
least important factors included: middle manager encouragement, middle manager training, amount of managerial time, perceived importance of career plans, and middle manager knowledge of career development. Although these five factors had the lowest ratings, it must be remembered that they were nevertheless on the positive end of the continuum. When viewing the frequency distribution, the researcher noted that for certain factors the group was extremely homogeneous. Examples include factors concerned with middle management commitment, top management commitment, and employee expressed interest where all of the respondents indicated these to be prime influencing career development factors. In other cases the group was more heterogeneous with responses on all points of the continuum. Examples include: initiative, perceived importance of career plans, and amount of available managerial time. The researcher probed directors about other influences. In most cases directors mentioned the work environment and management knowledge of how a corporate system operates as influencing factors in implementation of an effective career system (see Table 17).

The final research question was: WHAT DO MIDDLE MANAGERS PERCEIVE AS THEIR ROLE IN CAREER DEVELOPMENT? The researcher asked nine questions to obtain information related to this issue. Five of the questions were quantitatively measured on a 5-point Likert type scale, while four remaining questions were of a more qualitative nature. The five closed-end items all focused on the manager-subordinate relationship. Of the five areas of manager-subordinate relationship, the two with the highest means were career counseling.
### Table 17

**Additional Factors Influencing Career Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees' knowledge of career development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management's knowledge of career development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal, written policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice what is preached</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial attitude toward career developmen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as part of job ($\bar{X} = 4.16$) and managerial responsibility to make career suggestions ($\bar{X} = 4.16$). The item with the lowest mean obtained was "Qualified" to counsel ($\bar{X} = 5.63$). Although this was the lowest mean reported, it was still in the upper half of the scoring continuum. These results are presented in Table 18.

The next item focused upon the extent to which managers assist their subordinates in their growth by encouraging them to participate in various developmental activities. Four specific developmental activities were given, including: corporate training programs, classes, continuing education, and expanded job rotation. Respondents were given the option of answering "other." The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial involvement in implementation stages</td>
<td>8 25.0</td>
<td>19 59.4</td>
<td>3 9.4</td>
<td>1 3.1</td>
<td>1 3.1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling as part of job</td>
<td>10 31.3</td>
<td>17 53.1</td>
<td>5 15.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Qualified&quot; to counsel</td>
<td>4 12.5</td>
<td>14 43.8</td>
<td>12 37.5</td>
<td>2 6.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving counseling skills</td>
<td>12 37.5</td>
<td>12 37.5</td>
<td>6 18.8</td>
<td>2 6.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial responsibility to make career suggestions</td>
<td>10 31.3</td>
<td>18 56.3</td>
<td>3 9.4</td>
<td>1 3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
responses to these activities are shown in Table 19. The mean scores ranged from $\bar{x} = 3.53$ to $\bar{x} = 4.34$ and reflect encouragement on the part of management in providing for personal and professional growth. The group was extremely heterogeneous in their responses, with no respondents indicating no extent and only one individual indicating a limited extent.

The next three items probed directors regarding their role in employee development and directors were asked to describe their role. This researcher was able to categorize the responses into five roles: developer, counselor, provider of communication systems needs and wants, implementer, and mentor. A tabulation of responses is shown in Table 20. The most frequently given role was to assist the employee in the development of his/her professional goals and objectives. This was selected by nearly one-half (40.6%) of the interviewees. Based on the positive descriptions of the manager's role in employee development, it was concluded that the entire survey population perceived themselves in some type of leader role.

Two items focused upon the percentage of time devoted to career development of subordinates. It seemed that all directors had difficulty responding to this item. For the sake of this particular item, this researcher defined career development as including all work related kinds of tasks—small projects, daily divisional operations, performance appraisal, and assisting subordinate with ongoing job. The researcher found that 56.3% of the directors devoted less than 25% of their time to career development of subordinates. While probing the respondents, this researcher concluded that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate training</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Expanded job&quot; rotation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

Manager's Role in Employee Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide communication system needs/wants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

although the directors placed a high priority on career development of subordinates, it is difficult to devote time to others when director's own job assignment is task-oriented (see Table 21).

In the final item, this researcher probed the interviewee to elicit any recommendations that would enhance career development. Responses were categorized into 10 recommendations. Table 22 presents the ranking of recommendations according to frequency of response.

Although many directors felt career development was being practiced within their departments, the following were also identified as vital factors for integration of a total career system: communication networking (43.8%), a strategic plan (40.6%), promotion of career development throughout company (34.4%), integration of functional groups (34.4%), and in-service to organizational structure (31.3%).
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Table 21
Time Devoted to Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of time managers should devote to career development of subordinates</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%-49%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%-74%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% or above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of time managers presently devote to career development of subordinates</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%-49%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%-74%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% or above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22
Recommendations That Would Enhance Career Development Within the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication networking</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalize system/strategic plan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote career development company wide</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate functional groups</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service managers to organizational structure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor and coordinate points</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing existing environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombudsman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, it generally appears that directors perceived themselves to play a vital role in the successful implementation and adaptation of a career development system.

Based upon the work conducted, the intent of Chapter IV has been to analyze and describe a group of managers' perceptions concerning factors and conditions necessary to implement and adapt a career development system in their respective organizations. In reporting the interviewees' perceptions, each research question and subsection item was analyzed and discussed.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The intent of Chapter V is to present a summary of the study, discuss findings, draw conclusions, make recommendations, and discuss the implications for the use of a career development system in an industrial organization.

Summary

This dissertation focused on the investigation of the perceptions of middle managers concerning the factors and conditions necessary to implementing and adapting a career development system to an industrial organization. As stated in Chapter I, change is an inevitable fact of life in our present, highly complex, evolutionary society. Organizations have recognized the importance of change and have directed attention to the human element within the organization as it relates to change; namely, that any change in the organization reflects a change in the individual employee. The research literature purports that companies such as American Telephone and Telegraph, General Electric, and International Business Machines found that when management exerts a conscious effort to adapt to change by including responsible individuals in the initiation and implementation of change, employees are more satisfied, flexible, and productive, which then contributes to meeting organizational goals. American Telephone and Telegraph, General Electric, and International
Business Machines moved to conform to the creative uses of human resources available within their organizations through career development systems. Similarly, the company investigated in the present study is committed to the human element within the organization and has developed a career development system to address the problems inherent within the change process.

As a planned process, career development affects change primarily because there is a concerted effort by the organization to account for individual needs.

In order for an organization to effectively adapt career development to its changing environment, organizational members must establish cohesiveness in the implementation of a career development process. The literature supports the concept that both top management and middle management commitment is an essential element to the success of career development (Burack, 1979). To be truly effective, middle management, through active involvement, must continually reaffirm the committed position of top management. Thus it follows that middle managers must reflect a positive attitude toward efforts to help employees adapt to change through such interventions as career development strategies (Hall, 1976). Furthermore, the awareness of middle managers and their acceptance of their role is essential to the successful initiation, implementation, and adaptation of career development.

Because of the critical role the middle manager plays in the implementation of a career development system, the present study sought to investigate the perceptions of middle managers regarding
their role in career development and to ascertain the managers' perceptions concerning factors and barriers to the career development process.

This study is summarized by the research questions selected for this investigation as presented below:

1. What are the perceptions of middle managers in the area of career development systems?

2. What are the perceptions of middle managers regarding career development as it is currently practiced in this organization?

3. What are the perceptions of middle managers regarding who takes the responsibility for initiating a career development program?

4. What are the perceptions of middle managers regarding the prime factors influencing career development systems?

5. What do middle managers perceive as their role in career development of employees?

The above research questions were investigated by use of an interview schedule developed by the researcher, adapted from instruments developed by the American Management Association (Walker & Gutteridge, 1979) and Burack and Mathys (1980). The survey instrument was administered to 32 middle managers and received a 95% response. Face validity had previously been established by the dissertation committee and a review by corporate managers.

The statistical analyses for this study included a variety of descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, and means.
for the closed-end items in the interview. In addition, the re-
sponses to open-end questions were categorized allowing for quanti-
tative as well as qualitative discussion.

The population from which the data were gathered included mid-
dle managers (those "directors" who supervise other managers) of a
Fortune 500 company. The population surveyed can be characterized
as predominantly male between the ages of 35 and 50. The data were
collected by the researcher via interviews with 32 responding man-
gers who were willing to talk openly and frankly about career de-
velopment within their company between the months of January 1982
and March 1982.

In this section the research questions are discussed as they
relate to the literature in the field of career development and con-
clusions and recommendations are posited for consideration of those
interested in initiating career development systems in their organi-
izations.

Research Question 1

What are the perceptions of middle managers in the area of
career development systems?

Findings and discussions. There were a number of questions and
items on the survey instrument which focused upon managers' percep-
tions of career development systems. One specific item within this
research question addressed the issue of career development "impor-
tance." Managers were overwhelmingly supportive of career
development as an important part of their responsibility, indeed, 90.7% responded positively in support of the importance of career development. Respondents were also asked to describe their personal understanding of career development. Collectively, the respondents' statements reflected an awareness of career development. The strategies below were typical of those reported by those surveyed:

1. Career development in terms of managers planning with individual employees.
2. Career development as an individual (employee) matter.
3. Career development as a dual objective involving both the organization and the individual.
4. Career development as a challenging managerial task.
5. Career development as a progressive movement through career pathing.

The above strategies summarizing managers' understanding of career development are consistent with previous research efforts by Walker and Gutteridge (1979), *American Management Association Survey Report*. Walker and Gutteridge found that managers define career development as a comprehensive approach to managing human resources. The literature supports career development as a positive means of increasing individual and organizational efficiency (Morgan et al., 1979).

Findings from the present study reveal that middle managers' awareness and perceptions of career development and their definition of career development appear to be consistent with the career development definitions recognized within the field. Inasmuch as
middle managers within the company under study appear to be both knowledgeable and supportive regarding career development, career development training for managers does not appear necessary before implementing a fully endorsed career development system in this company.

Not only are the findings from the present study consistent with the national findings (Walker & Gutteridge, 1979), but there seems also to be consistency displayed by the managers across the organization's various departments. Therefore, it would appear that there would be no need for a complete general orientation. Rather, the company could concentrate on specific issues and/or specific strategies of implementing career development.

Research Question 2

What are the perceptions of middle managers regarding career development as it is currently practiced in this organization?

Findings and discussion. While the first research question dealt with the notion of career development in a general sense, Research Question 2 dealt with career development as it applies specifically to the practices of the company being studied. Three items on the interview schedule addressed career development elements known to contribute to the success of an integrated career development process. When presented to the managers, again there seemed to be consistency with their responses as in the case of Research Question 1. For example, over 65% of the respondents were
aware of the career development elements currently in place within their organization.

The first item focused upon managers' knowledge of the "employee development package" currently used within the organization. The researcher initially found that there was confusion regarding the term "employee development package." For the sake of this study, the researcher defined employee development package to the respondents as a package consisting of the performance appraisal, self-inventory, career discussion, resource center, and/or any other development components that would enhance an individual employee's career. With this definition clearly established, 78% of the managers responded that they were well aware of these career development components within the company and believed they should be incorporated as part of an employee development package.

The second item addressed those career development elements known to be currently in place within the organization. This researcher determined, through discussion with the company's personnel staff and review of the organization, that four key elements were currently in place: self-inventory, resource center, performance appraisal, and career discussion. There was consistency in responses regarding two of the elements; managers were aware of performance appraisal (100%) and career discussion (87.5%). However, the self-inventory and the resource center components appeared to be less visible with respondent acknowledgments of 46.9% and 50.0%, respectively. Although almost half of the managers were unaware of these latter two elements, this researcher learned that in compensation,
many managers developed and implemented the self-inventory and resource center components within their own departments. In response to the researcher's further question concerning communications between departments, it was learned that such interactions occurred rarely, and informally, if at all.

In addition to the four elements already in place within the organization, the researcher asked managers to specify any other elements that they knew to be in place, either within their departments or throughout the organization. Other elements mentioned by the respondents as being practiced within various departments across the company included: counseling with individuals (34.4%), communication meetings within departments (28.1%), and small task-oriented projects with progressive career movement (15.6%)

The third item relating to this issue directed attention to the effectiveness of job posting as a communication tool. Most managers (65.7%) perceived job posting as an effective communication tool for initial entry or lower level positions, such as those which were primarily in nature. While job posting is accomplished within the company, it was perceived by respondents as a less than satisfactory means of communicating job availability for upper management positions. Traditionally, upper-echelon management positions are not posted in the company. When a particular managerial quality, skill, or strength is needed or a specific quality, skill, or strength is recognized in a given individual, the company utilizes other search, selection, and promotional processes in lieu of job posting to satisfy the organizational need.
It is apparent from this study that managers have a commanding knowledge of the career development elements in place within the organization and that they are interested in career development to the point of independently pursuing implementation of "missing" elements necessary to employee career development. However, it is evident that the base managerial knowledge could probably be expanded through communications between departments. This could result in a sharing of resources, information, processes, and elements possibly resulting in eliminating unnecessary duplicity in the managers' individual attempts to develop and implement career elements within their areas of responsibility. It is also possible that such increased communication could provide a more cost efficient operation to the company. It would appear that career development, in this institution, would benefit from additional emphasis on the public relations aspect specifically to disseminate career development information and coordinate ongoing and proposed career development activities.

Research Question 3

What are the perceptions of middle managers regarding who takes the responsibility for initiating career development programs?

Findings and discussion. This research question included three closed-end items and two open-end items. The open-end items were categorized so that quantitative analysis could be performed. The first two items dealt with the extent to which the organization
should take responsibility for initiating career development plans to assist employees. Overwhelmingly, 90.6% of the managers believed that the organization did have a responsibility for initiating development of career plans. Also, 96.9% of the managers believed it "important" for the corporation to assist the employees with the development of their career plans. In light of these responses, the researcher concentrated on pinpointing the responsible agent within the organization who should initiate a career development program—the employee, management, or both. Respondents felt that this responsibility should be borne as a co-venture between the employee and management. While management should assist employees, respondents indicated that the individual employee should be an involved part of the process.

The next two items in the interview process related to the role of top management and the role of middle management in terms of career development. With regard to top management, there were several prime roles considered to be important by the managers in the implementation of career development. Respondents viewed top management as serving an active, participatory role through open communication, fostering the environment, and setting forth a strong corporate policy. To a lesser extent, they saw top management as assisting with monetary support, evaluation, and letting career development happen. The role of middle management was viewed as implementer, initiator, and administrator of career development processes. In addition, the middle manager was perceived by the respondents as holding the unique task of developing subordinates.
It must be emphasized that although organizations should facilitate the career development process, they should not seek completely to control it. Research indicates that career decisions are basically individual employee choices (Hall, 1976). Further, the literature supports the role of the organization as that of making the career development program as flexible and personalized as possible, allowing ample opportunity for employee input (Burack, 1979; Kaye, 1979). Organizations that plan successful career development systems substantially improve the use of the career development system by the individual employee.

As a group, the managers indicated that career development efforts were a joint venture whereby the manager and employee work cooperatively. This is consistent with what has been postulated in the literature by Schmuckler (1976), who stated that the organization's role in career development provides an investment in human resources which realizes maximum benefits to the organization. Likewise, according to Schmuckler, the individual employee who takes the responsibility for initiating career plans benefits through job promotion, personal and professional growth, and increased self-esteem.

Indeed, looking at Research Question 2, the company has established its role through four major elements of career development: performance appraisal, career discussion, self-inventory, and resource center. It seems that not only managers believe in the career development system but that company attitude promotes a consistency in endorsement of existing elements. What appears to be
needed in this company is a coordination of efforts, increased communication, and an attempt to integrate present components into a workable system.

Results of the present study seem to indicate that top management should play a different role than middle management in career development practices. According to the respondents, top management's role should be in the areas of fostering the environment, implementing a strong corporate policy, and opening the communication channels, while middle management's role is that of implementer, initiator, and administrator of career development practices. It would appear that middle managers preferred to play the latter role because they have a closer communication linkage with their employees and a finely developed trust relationship because of the constant communication networking between the manager and subordinate.

Research Question 4

What are the perceptions of middle managers regarding the prime factors influencing career development systems?

Findings and discussion. In the fourth research question, managers were asked to rate 13 factors including: employee expressed interest, amount of available managerial time, top management commitment, middle management commitment, middle management encouragement, middle management training, middle management knowledge, flexibility of the organization, responsibility taken by the subordinate,
perceived importance of career development by middle management, perceived importance of career plans by employees, performance level of employees, and initiative. Responses revealed all 13 factors as of "considerable" or "great" importance in influencing career development. However, top management commitment, middle management commitment, individual employee's responsibility, and employee initiative were rated by respondents as of "great" influence in the successful implementation of career development systems whereas middle management encouragement, middle manager training, and amount of available managerial time were rated as "considerable" influence in career development implementation.

Responses to these factors are consistent with the findings of the previous research question regarding who takes the responsibility in initiating career development programs. Managers believed that their own personal involvement along with that of the subordinates were essential to the implementation of a career development system. It is interesting to note that of 416 responses (13 factors x 32 respondents) only 3% of the total responses fell within the lower half of the continuum.

The respondents were then asked to indicate additional factors that might influence career development. A number of factors were indicated: Employees' knowledge of career development, management's knowledge of career development, work environment, and the notion of two-way communication were most frequently given. However, none of these were considered to be as important to the success of career development systems as were the other 13 factors. For the company,
the 13 factors seemed to be considered the primary, or key, factors in influencing career development.

**Research Question 5**

What do middle managers perceive as their role in career development of employees?

**Findings and discussion.** Research Question 5 dealt directly with the managers and how they perceive themselves relative to career development of subordinates. Managers' responses revealed their perceptions in eight areas of their role in the career development of employees. The first area dealt with career counseling as part of their job. Managers overwhelmingly responded (84.4%) that they are presently taking an active role in the counseling of subordinates. This is consistent with responses concerning what is currently practiced within the company. Even though managers were unaware of available company-wide career development programs, many have taken the initiative to implement career programs within their own departments thus providing opportunity for further career discussion.

The second item considered the manager's responsibility in making career suggestions to subordinates. Again, the majority (87.1%) responded that it was, indeed, managerial responsibility to make career suggestions. Existing literature suggests that the managerial role of reinforcer, manager of employee development, and counselor brings about behavioral change of subordinates thus enhancing
selection of career development options (Bell, 1975).

The third item asked managers to describe their role in employee development. Managers perceived themselves in some type of leader role. The following were most commonly mentioned: (a) a manager develops subordinates, (b) a manager is a counselor, (c) a manager provides a communication system analyzing wants and needs of subordinates, (d) a manager is an implementer of the career development process, and (e) a manager is a mentor to his/her subordinates. This item is also consistent with Research Question 3 which considers the prime role of middle management as implementer, developer, communicator, and provider of realistic expectations. Furthermore, the research parallels these findings by mentioning the key role a manager plays in furthering employees' individual developmental efforts, discussing organizational needs, and introducing realism into the employee's career goals (Jones, 1976).

It is interesting to note that when managers were asked what percentage of their time should, ideally, be devoted to the full range of developmental elements for subordinates versus the amount of time presently devoted, respondents felt that about 25% of their time would be ideal. This is indicative of the high priority the managers placed on career development of subordinates. In further probing, managers agreed that although they might want to devote more time to subordinates in the area of career development, it was difficult to do so because of their own task-oriented job assignments.
In the next two items, respondents were asked the extent to which they felt qualified to counsel subordinates in career planning matters and the extent to which they would be interested in additional training in the area of counseling. Although 56.3% of the managers felt qualified to counsel subordinates, a majority of respondents (75.0%) expressed an interest in additional training.

Based upon the managers' responses regarding the extent to which they would assist managers and encourage subordinates in participating in developmental activities, it was found that the favored avenues for assistance and encouragement were the developmental elements of corporate training programs (84.4%), personal enrichment classes (93.8%), continuing education (84.4%), and expanded job rotation (87.5%). These responses relate to responses given to Research Question 2, which indicate that job rotation, cross-training, and corporate training activities are currently being practiced departmentally and/or company-wide which is to say that in the company studied in the present investigation, middle managers appear to be practicing the developmental activities to which they subscribe in theory.

The final item for analysis focused upon further recommendations that would enhance career development within the company. Managers indicated that there was a vital need for opening the internal communication channels, promoting career development company-wide, and integrating the current functional career development elements.
In summary, it is appropriate to note that managers in the company studied perceive themselves as predominant participants assuming a major role in the area of employee development with a strong commitment to the implementation and adaptation of career development within their organization.

Recommendations

As a result of the above findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are presented, in two parts for consideration. The first relates specifically to the company in terms of career development plans. The second set of recommendations relates to the conduct of further research which would contribute to the field.

Recommendations to the Organization

Results of the present investigation indicated that in the company studied middle managers play a vital role in the implementation and adaptation of career development of employees. Middle managers appear to be linking change agents that interpret organizational goals as well as individual employee goals in order to further the career development of employees. The middle manager is a key factor to career development because of his/her cognizance of organizational directions, needs, and perceptions while at the same time he/she is fully aware of the individual employee's fears, needs, and desires.

The following recommendations are made as a result of interviews with middle managers in the company studied in the present
investigation:

1. It would appear that there is a need in the company studied for a concerted effort to communicate what is being done to implement various career development components and aspects of career development such as self-inventory, resource center, performance appraisal, and career discussion within the various units of the company. What appears to be needed is consistency across departments, and to this effect "communication" is critical. Increased effectiveness might be expected by improved links of communication in two directions: (a) top management communicating downward and (b) middle management communicating laterally.

2. There appears to be a need for advanced training of managers specifically designed to enhance their current level of skill in the area of career planning and counseling. In-service training is recommended to satisfy the need expressed by managers to specialize in the techniques of counseling, enabling them to further develop skills that will be of value in their attempt to direct and counsel employees.

3. There is a need to institute career development as a highly visible organizational priority. This could be accomplished by transforming what is clearly evident as upper level company attitudes and endorsements to formal written policies reinforcing career development as part of daily company-wide operations.

4. Through identification of the middle manager as the chief implementer, developer, and initiator of career development, the company should be able to bring the target group—employees—into
the career development arena. The middle manager provides technical as well as human communicative assistance to the employee. By recognizing and utilizing the middle managers as the prime resource of career development knowledge, the company might eliminate additional time and expense which would otherwise be necessary to promote a career development system.

5. It is recommended that concentrated attention be directed toward the principal resources needed for a career development system including the following: (a) managerial staff including subordinates, (b) access to intradepartmental information concerning availability of career possibilities, (c) management development services, and (d) additional resources centers that include technical assignments that would enhance thinking about employee's own career goals. The company now possesses the basic rudimentary resources.

6. Development of a public relations campaign is highly recommended. A campaign could be instrumental in educating all managers within the corporate structure. A public relations program could also be the medium used to solicit and encourage communication across departments and enhance the implementation and adaptation of the career development system.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study raised interesting possibilities for further research. This dissertation study has demonstrated that there are indeed concerns on the part of middle managers for the successful
implementation and adaptation of a career development system in the organization under study. Further research may include but not be limited to the following:

1. Inasmuch as the present study was limited to one industrial organization, a comparative study of the population of industrial organizations of other geographic areas, with similar demographics, to ascertain possible differences in managerial perceptions concerning factors and conditions necessary to implement and adapt career development would appear to be indicated.

2. Since this study focused only upon one organization, a replicate study in industries different from the one used in the present study may be indicated. The industry under study concentrated on a single product, whereby studying a more diversified industry might result in a generalizable set of criteria of career development that would be applicable across numerous industrial settings.

3. A study involving organizations in addition to industry would permit a comparative analysis between an industrial organization, public education institution, and a government agency to ascertain differences which exist in their career development practices. Ultimately, this type of study could broaden career development research in an effort to identify common elements and criteria that would be applicable across a wide variety of settings.

4. Inasmuch as this study focused upon management level information, a replicate study is recommended which would obtain data from the employees to determine if the employees are knowledgeable, aware, and comfortable with career development practices within
their organization, and to see the consistency in responses between management and the employees.

5. Since this study focused upon a given time period, it is recommended that a follow-up study be conducted or a longitudinal study be established, to note changes over time, with the same company to investigate the extent to which career development has endured.
You have been randomly selected, along with other middle managers, to participate in an interview regarding career development. Gail Ganakas, who worked with us as an intern to develop a career development program, has been granted permission by the corporation to do a follow-up study with our directors.

We will be asking you to schedule an hour with Gail to give your views, opinions, and perceptions in response to questions concerning factors and conditions influencing career development programs. This is not a test of your knowledge or skill—there are no "wrong answers"—we are merely interested in your casual perceptions and observations. You will have access to the results of those interviews through Management Development, if you are interested.

We look forward to your participation and appreciate your time and cooperation. We will be contacting you within the next two weeks to arrange an interview date and time convenient with your schedule.

Should you have any questions, feel free to discuss them with Management Development prior to the interview.
I. RESEARCH QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE PERCEPTIONS OF MIDDLE MANAGERS IN THE AREA OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS?

1. Briefly describe what career development means to you?

2. How important is a career development program?

II. RESEARCH QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE PERCEPTIONS OF MIDDLE MANAGERS REGARDING CAREER DEVELOPMENT AS IT IS CURRENTLY PRACTICED IN THE ORGANIZATION?

3. To what extent do you feel career development should be incorporated as part of an "employee benefit package"?
   - great extent
   - some extent
   - little extent

4. To your knowledge which of the following career development elements are in place in your organization?
   - self-inventory
   - resource center
   - performance appraisal
   - career discussion
   Please specify any other elements in place?

5. To what extent do you believe K.C.O.P.S. is effective in communicating job opportunities to its members?
   - great extent
   - some extent
   - little extent
III. RESEARCH QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE PERCEPTIONS OF MIDDLE MANAGERS REGARDING WHO TAKES THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR INITIATING A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM?

6. To what extent should organizations take the responsibility for initiating career development plans?
   great extent    some extent    little extent

7. To what extent is it important for a corporation to assist employees to develop own careers?
   great extent    some extent    little extent

8. What do you believe to be the prime role of top management in career development?

9. What do you believe to be the prime role of middle management in career development?

10. Who in the organization should initiate a career development program?
    employee    management    personnel division
IV. RESEARCH QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE PERCEPTIONS OF MIDDLE MANAGERS REGARDING PRIME FACTORS INFLUENCING CAREER DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS?

11. To what extent do the following factors influence the successful implementation of career development programs?

   a. EMPLOYEE EXPRESSED INTEREST
      great extent  some extent  little extent
   
   b. AMOUNT OF AVAILABLE MANAGERIAL TIME
      great extent  some extent  little extent
   
   c. TOP MANAGEMENT COMMITMENT
      great extent  some extent  little extent
   
   d. MIDDLE MANAGEMENT COMMITMENT
      great extent  some extent  little extent
   
   e. MIDDLE MANAGER'S ENCOURAGEMENT OF SUBORDINATES IN DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIFIC CAREER PLANS
      great extent  some extent  little extent
   
   f. MIDDLE MANAGEMENT TRAINING IN THE AREA OF CAREER COUNSELING OF SUBORDINATES
      great extent  some extent  little extent
   
   g. MIDDLE MANAGEMENT KNOWLEDGE OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES
      great extent  some extent  little extent
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h. FLEXIBILITY OF THE ORGANIZATION TO ACCOMMODATE THE CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

   great extent   some extent   little extent

i. RESPONSIBILITY TAKEN BY THE SUBORDINATE

   great extent   some extent   little extent

j. PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT BY MIDDLE MANAGEMENT

   great extent   some extent   little extent

k. PERFORMANCE LEVEL OF EMPLOYEES

   great extent   some extent   little extent

l. PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF CAREER PLANS BY EMPLOYEE

   great extent   some extent   little extent

m. INITIATIVE BY EMPLOYEE IN TAKING ADVANTAGE OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM

   great extent   some extent   little extent

What other factors may influence the success of career development programs?

V. RESEARCH QUESTION: WHAT DO MIDDLE MANAGERS PERCEIVE AS THEIR ROLE IN CAREER DEVELOPMENT OF EMPLOYEES?

12. As a middle manager, describe your role in employee development?
13. To what extent do you believe managers should be involved in the implementation stages of career development?
   - great extent
   - some extent
   - little extent

14. To what extent do you feel career counseling of subordinates is part of your job?
   - great extent
   - some extent
   - little extent

15. To what extent do you feel qualified to "counsel" your subordinates in career planning matters?
   - great extent
   - some extent
   - little extent

16. To what extent would you be interested in improving your counseling of employees?
   - great extent
   - some extent
   - little extent

17. To what extent would you assist your subordinates in their growth by encouraging them to participate in developmental activities such as:
   a. CORPORATE TRAINING PROGRAMS
      - great extent
      - some extent
      - little extent
   b. CLASSES
      - great extent
      - some extent
      - little extent
   c. CONTINUING EDUCATION
      - great extent
      - some extent
      - little extent
   d. "EXPANDED JOB" ROTATION
      - great extent
      - some extent
      - little extent
   e. OTHER
      - great extent
      - some extent
      - little extent
18. What percentage of your time do you think you should devote to career development of subordinates?

19. How much time do you believe you presently devote to career development of your subordinates?

20. To what extent do you believe it's your responsibility to make career suggestions to subordinates?

  great extent  some extent  little extent

21. Do you have any recommendations that would enhance career development within your organization?

DEMOGRAPHICS:

22. How long have you been with the company?

23. How long have you been with the company in your present position?

24. Were you hired in as a manager or promoted from within the Kellogg Corporation to a managerial position?

  Manager  Promoted from within

25. What has been your professional experience/educational background?

26. How many employees report directly to you?

  Number of females ________
  Number of males ________
  Approximate age range ________
27. What type of staff do you manage?

- Technical
- Sales
- Clerical
- Financial
- Other
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