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ABSTRACT

Socialization could use for prediction or explanation of people behaviors. Some researches indicated that more organizational socialization leads to less argumentation. On the contrary, there are also other researches showed that employees in an organization might use argumentation as a mean for specific goal or purpose, those phenomena showed that more organizational socialization leads to more argumentation. We wonder which one is in reality? It became the research problem of this study.

This study hypothesis is that more organizational socialization leads to more argumentation. Authors implemented survey to be examined. Study results indicated that higher organizational socialization and middle organizational socialization those two groups compare with lower organizational socialization will lead to more argumentation when conflict happened between employees. These results do not consist with previous study findings.
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INTRODUCTION

Scholar has indicated that Organizational socialization research exist-tage, context, and or content [44]. [4] Who argued that stage models as learning processes and stage model equivalent to the process of individual’s socialize. The newcomers’ adaptation over the course of their socialization process can also be perceived as a learning process [8, 9, 36]. Organizational socialization tactics influence newcomers' adjustment and find newcomer socialization very important for involving both learning processes and relationship-building opportunities [17]. [11] Study result thought high social-desirability of individuals is lower argumentativeness. But [12] in the “Elementary forms of social activity” thought competition is one of social actions. According to the principle “natural selection survival of the fittest” that means a person in an organization often acts argumentation for competition with others.

[35] Who thought the concept of norm is often made use of in theories of social learning. People need obey social norms that established by society for afraid of competition cause no peace in society. If employees who have had more argumentative in the organization had hurt interpersonal relationship. [11] He conducted social-desirability as a limitation for employees’ argumentation behavior and employees would be tend to match social culture and acceptable behaviors for reduce conflict of argumentation behaviors with others. On the other hands, social desirability is Individual’s behavior for meet social expect. Social desirability had an effect on the level of agreement [37]. This viewpoint pay attention arguer wouldn’t accept by social. Social desirability encourage individual learning obey social norm, inhibit argumentation and reduce the competitive natural character of human being. Social- desirability argued that nature of interpersonal relationship based on peace.
Socialization based on social learning. Some people are learning norms for limitation their personal behaviors but others are learning self-interests. For example, [48] He argued that learning self-interest is argumentation behaviors. Also some people think argumentation as a mechanism for achieving cooperation and agreements [30]. In the other words, employees in the organization saving learning social norms and also learning other dimension. So we can recognize social desirability is different from socialization. This study focused on employee’s instinct of survival that makes employee learn self-interest and create competitive ability. All the above-mentioned, are different from social desirability [11].

Though [11] author argued that higher social-desirability individuals were lower argumentation. But other researcher indicated socialization could use for prediction or explanation of people behaviors [40]. Socialization is conceptualized as a stable trait that the individual selected in learning situations and interact with organizational environment. But no any study that individuals’ organizational socialization came from social learning can predict oral argumentation in conflict behavior. In other words, there are no research finding can in response to higher organizational socialization has influence on stronger or weak argumentative behavior?

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Organization Socialization and social learning**

Organizational socialization definite is the process of an individual got the skills and social knowledge to assume an organizational role [33]. Organizational socialization is the process or a period of changing organizational from one state to another for newcomers [5]. Some scholars have pay attention to the topic of socialization predict and explain behaviors, for example: the theory of socialization could predict individual’s behaviors [40]. Past 5 years of research in six major areas: Socialization tactics; Socialization training; Proactive socialization; Socialization learning and content; Group socialization moderators, mediators, and individual differences [43]. Expect for a number of studies have examined socialization by focusing on what newcomers actually learn and internalize [10, 39]. New comers repeatedly undergo learning tasks and events during socialization [43]. Author thought social theory is concerned with the learning of complex processes, such as the acquisition of personal characteristics, and social behavior [6]. Social environment changing, the result of individuals socialization had decided from different accumulated issue that during social learning may not include social expect behaviors. [9] found are discussed in terms of differences in childhood socialization in the 3 social contexts. Differing socialization processes may predispose some males and females to express emotions differently in some cultures and in some context [7]. Organizational socialization of this study, its definition is based on the theory of social learning for self-interests issue and internalize; furthermore, it have influence on individual’s behaviors of argument in an organizational. [22] Who has argued that the learning organization is produced individual’s social relations in an organization.

**Social desirability**

Authors’ study indicated that social-desirability is interrelationship in organizational behavior research [38]. Scholars have focused much attention on social-desirability as personal meet social need that presents’ the self in a “favorable light” [16, 29, 49]. While “favorable light” showed positive means higher social-desirability. [15] Scholars conducted studies concerning the motivation of individuals seeking social approval and found that higher social-desirability individual tended to be more cautious,
persuadable and conventional. [2] Authors conducted the results of longitudinal studies that significant relationships existed between social-desirability and imitation, conformity to parents. [13] Researchers found that individuals with a higher degree of social-desirability were less proficient in using language and were less aggressive verbally and physically in interacting with others. Studies also showed that higher social-desirability individuals expressed significantly less aggression [3, 20]. [14] Who also conducted that higher social-desirability girls were avoided social interaction and they generally expressed less physical or verbal aggression against the others. In summary, all the above scholars assume social-desirability positioning on society expect more peaceful and against conflict. [11] His study showed that social-desirability is considered and individual’s tendency to perform socially and culturally acceptable and approved behaviors. This viewpoint is different from socialization. Social-desirability is individuals learning what society expected, but socialization is individuals learning how to survival of the fittest from society. [32] Authors findings showed social-desirability and socialization significant have negative correlation.

Argumentation
Review previous literatures, those papers related to individual’s argumentative behavior, [19] They has indicated argumentation is a verbal activity, which takes place by means of language use, and is generally based on intellectual think. [21] His study focused on argument as an interactivity occurring between persons in an organization. It means individual working in an organization, argumentation behavior be effected upon trait of communicators, for example, assertive communicators are more argumentative. [34] Their research results indicated argumentation also will be effected by environment, for example, Some studies individual engage in argumentative behavior with an affirming communicator style (i.e., highly relaxed, friendly and attentive) that behavior so as to yield more positive [24, 27]. Arguer’s motivation affects argumentation behaviors. Cite an example, [31] Authors found individual enhance motivation and skill had an effect on argumentative behavior. Scholars study’s findings either by ones’ motivation to argue (cognitive approach) or using direct skills training in argumentation (the behavioral approach), both could affected on argumentative behavior [1, 28]. Otherwise, training will change individual’s argumentative behavior. For example, some researchers devoted to suggest effective prerequisite to communication pedagogy that focuses exclusively on skill training [42, 42]. [41] Authors indicated that argumentative preferable and good communication ability has positive relationship, the result explore training course significantly increase students’ argumentative tendency, and argumentative ability [47]. After participating in an argumentative conversation, students were evaluated by their partners on measures of opinion change. Simon and his colleagues to develop a Toulmin’s argument pattern system of levels for evaluating the quality of oral argumentation [18].

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

Research Hypothesis
[23] Author consider there has a stable trait that argumentative individual will be oral argumentation with other people. Argumentation in this study has been defined as same viewpoint as [23], it means that have stable feature when individual in conflict issues tendency toward argue verbally with other people.

Employees in an organization, have its natural character call “competition”. Employees have higher organizational socialization would not only learned social norm but also survival of the fittest and those
competitive behaviors that have no objection by the society. During the normal communication behaviors, individuals have different opinion from others, can’t to use violence but use higher argumentation as weapon or tool to solve conflict. Therefore, individuals learn from experience “more argue, more candy”. Generally speaking, there always has conflict existing between employees and this conduct individual have argumentation preference by means of competitiveness for self-interest. Oral argumentation behavior between employees is one of them.

Although [11] Scholar found higher social desirability tended to be stronger argumentation behaviors. But employees often take argumentation behavior as competitive tool with others in an organization. And recognized organization socialization is a social learning process and reflecting more social learning has more competitive ability. So it seems to infer hypothesis of this research that the employees on organization higher socialization tended to be stronger argumentation. But there have no empirical evidence to be proved.

The purpose of this study clarified the relationship between different degrees of organization socialization of individual with stronger or weak argumentation behavior. Based on above reasoning, we presume that organization socialization has positive influence on argumentation. Thus research hypothesis is formed as follow:

**H1:** Individual who has higher organization socialization leads to stronger argumentation

**METHODOLOGY**

**Sampling**

Respondents of this study have had working experience and measure their degree of organization socialization within workplace. Employees are frequently interacting with each other in an organization. Even in ordinary works, there are always has conflict issue occurred which concern with their own interests. In such situation, it was acceptable by organization or people are oral argumentation. For the purpose to generalization, samplings were random selected and clustered, Questionnaire object are teachers, part-time students, white collar and office workers. Sampling unit is based on individual, for the purpose to infer individual’s status about the relationship between organizational socialization and argumentation. There are 230 questionnaires collected in total. Effective questionnaires are 206, returned rate up to 89.57%. But we deleted 41of them, because those respondents have had communication training. Finally, total effective sample size is 165. We expect statistic error less than 0.77, 95% significant. Because individual who has communication training, will affected his or her behavior of argument [41]. Type of communication apparently is a necessary complement to an argumentative behavior [25, 26]. According to previous studies, we take communication training as control variable of this study. All 165 respondents have to response 20 different items both in organization socialization and in argumentation then comparison those relationships between organization socialization higher, middle and lower degree with stronger or weak argumentation. Authors distribute Questionnaires, answer respondent’s question, and retrieved questionnaire personally.

Socialization scale adapted from a [10] “Organizational Socialization: Its Content and Consequences”; Original have 34 items. At first, item reliability have been proved to be used cronbach coefficient alpha, all of alpha coefficient over 0.91, deleted lower items of correlation with total and remained 20 items. Respondents were asked to respond random items from very agreement to very disagreement. Using K-S to test observed value of total sample size 165 have matched normal distribution (p<0.05) requirement, and separate these samples to 3 groups, ranked socialization according to its score.
The top 54 were ranged group 1 as higher degree socialization, the rest 56 as middle degree socialization, the last 55 as lower degree socialization. On the other hands, we transfer analytical variable to categorical variable for test argumentation become stronger or lower, whether those results are significant difference or not.

This study used questionnaires consist of 20 items adapted from scholars [24] argumentative scale. At first, those scales reliability have be proved to be used cronbach coefficient alpha for predict it suitable for execute in Taiwan. All 20 items are over 0.82. The scale has been showed to be reliable and valid [26]. Each item used Likert 5-point scale.

RESULTS

This study have found three groups of higher, middle and lower organizational socialization have significant difference with argumentation. The argumentation degree of higher and middle organizational socialization were stronger than those of lower organizational socialization (table 1).

As table 1 shows One-Way Anova results, that those relationships between higher, middle and lower organizational socialization and stronger or weak argumentation were significantly different. Results show $\alpha=0.05 \cdot \text{F}=4.821>3.052 \cdot \text{p}<0.01$. These results gave empirical evidence that stronger or weak argumentation were different among higher, middle and lower organizational socialization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>C-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1048.373</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>524.1866</td>
<td>4.821</td>
<td>0.009253</td>
<td>3.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>17614.8</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>108.7333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1644.147</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next step, we use pairwise test for judge the source of different. In orderly to test higher organizational socialization and middle organizational socialization, middle organizational socialization and lower organizational socialization, and higher organizational socialization and lower organizational socialization for reflect each group stronger or weak argumentation difference. Individuals of higher organizational socialization ($M=62.019, SD=11.85$) with middle organizational socialization ($M=60.196, SD=10.01$), t value $0.872<1.982$, P$>0.05$, result indicated have no significant difference. Individuals of middle ($M=60.196, SD=10.01$), with lower organizational socialization ($M=55, SD=9.29$), t value $2.298>1.982$, P$<0.05$, result indicated have significant difference. Individuals of higher organizational socialization ($M=62.019, SD=11.85$) with lower organizational socialization ($M=55, SD=9.29$), t value $2.956>1.984$, P$<0.05$, result indicated have significant difference (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Socialization</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62.019</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60.196</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60.196</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.982</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>2.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62.019</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55.982</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>2.956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$P<0.05$
The above data illustrate that there have significant differences between two variables, organizational socialization and argumentation. Furthermore, we use regression analysis to clarify the explanatory power from organizational socialization to argumentation.

Both sample data of organizational socialization and argumentation use 5 points of Likert scale for understanding the relationship between analytical independent variable “organizational socialization” and dependent variable “argumentation”. Simple regression analysis to have realized the predictive power from organizational socialization to argumentation. The result shows regression coefficient reached to significant level \( p < 0.05 \). Its present organizational socialization could explain argumentation and have positive effect. \( R^2 = 5.6 \) means organizational socialization have an explanation power on stronger argumentation degree (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Simple Regression Analysis of Organizational Socialization and Argumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coeff.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( **P < 0.05 \)

This research finds that middle degree of organizational socialization can predict and explain stronger argumentation than those lower organizational socialization, so that hypothesis to be supported.

**DISCUSSION**

The result of this study is higher degree of organizational socialization were to lead to stronger argumentation. It is different from author’s findings that higher social-desirability predict lower argumentation [11]. These two results are inconsistence. The higher degree of organizational socialization can be predicted to stronger argumentative behaviors. It means individual for survival of the fittest and cause stronger argumentative behaviors. After detailed analysis of author’s findings, “social desirability” is different from “organizational socialization” [11]. His viewpoint focus on an individuals’ behavior demonstrate preference to meet social expectation in learning process. Less argumentation will be more accepted by other people. So social desirability only measures that individuals behavior ingratiate whatever social wants that people in a society don’t like argue with each other. Social desirability more meet with acceptance of the conflict theory of behavior approach, which to emphasize social want more peacefulness and center on other people eventually. So the conflict theory is only focus on society peaceful.

Researcher found whether people are speaking or thinking generally involves engaging with self-interest [48]. Authors study findings indicated a design for argumentation tasks is that of competing theories [45]. People interact more frequently and look for their own benefit. Under this situation, by argumentation, so conflict behaviors will be happened eventually. Scholars’ research result found the individual’s argumentation for compete against others is to gain personal purpose [30]. But our study focus organizational socialization on general behavior that people in his growth process will learning how to make choice for himself and centered on selfhood and self-interest. Those behaviors still follow society rules and wants but might not to ingratiate with the others. The viewpoint is learning self-interest behavior as same means has learning behavior to use conflict for the best self-interest. Our study go further steps, transfer this thinking of self-interest to concrete organizational socialization for prediction and explanation about argumentation behaviors. According to “social learning”, people learn how to
apply argumentative conflict for getting best self-interest. This research result found individual with higher degree of organizational socialization learning to get more benefit from argumentative conflict.

Researcher argued that there are two common conceptions of norm: norm as an evaluation of conduct and norm as people’s expectation [35]. The former conduct typical of Gemeinschaft relations that deal with “ought” or “ought not” to do. The latter conception of Gesellchaft relations points to regularities of conduct that may be based on habit. Like author’s study that social learning appears as a component nest to the “pure acquisition of knowledge” in the process of transmission of social contents [46]. As socialization, it is a concept of social learning delimited by social science as a discipline. In fact, it illustrated social learning not only learning the social expectation, but also learning self-interest and competitive behavior. Author [35] has bring up gemeinschaft relations was the same as that scholar [11]. It bring up social desirability was learning how to match social wants and social expectations. Meier’s [35] gesellchaft relations were the same as this study viewpoint of organizational socialization. Individual is learning again and again how to protect and reap his own benefit when compete with others. Finally, those learnings internalize as form individual’s characteristics eventually.

Author’s [12] viewpoint was that competition is one of social activities. Individuals’ competition with each other is striving to resources limitation. Those competitors’ behaviors are collect useful information for gain self-interest. The research unit of this study is individual. But people can’t live without others and will be influenced by the factor of social competition for survival within it, finally learning how to be a winner from social competition.

This study doesn’t present whether the survival of the fittest will cause stronger argumentation. This topic or issue can be placed to future study for more clarification.
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