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ABSTRACT

To date, there have been no empirical attempts to examine how employee and organizational influences jointly impact the socialization of newcomers. Through the use of the proposed dual influence model, consisting of employee and organizational influences working in a compensatory manner to influence relevant socialization criteria, the current study set out to model the newcomer socialization process across the anticipatory, adjustment, and outcomes stages. Additionally, this paper examined the broader context in which newcomer socialization is embedded by empirically testing the influence of non-organizational factors on newcomer retention attitudes and behaviors. Survey analyses involving data collected from within a multi-national pharmaceutical company generally supported the overall propositions of the dual influence model. The importance of employee and organizational influences as differential predictors of newcomer socialization outcomes is discussed in terms of the implications that such findings have for the future design of organizational socialization strategies.
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INTRODUCTION

Employment during the first two years in a new organization is tenuous at best. As evidence, research conducted by the Kenexa Research Institute (KRI) revealed that more than 50% of newly hired individuals considered leaving their respective organizations after less than two years of employment (Kenexa Research Institute, 2007). In a study populated with more than 840,000 responses from individuals employed in U.S. and U.K multi-national companies, KRI found that despite the fact that a majority of these newcomers (72%) exhibited high levels of motivation and drive to succeed during their early months on the job, the mid-point of year one marked the beginning of a notable decline in overall satisfaction among many of these individuals. By the end of year two, almost 57% had committed to finding new employment. Given these findings, it would appear that a vast majority of organizations should be motivated to uncover the drivers of newcomer adjustment, in an effort to increase retention. From a practical standpoint, the present study was prompted in part by the desire of a large U.S. multi-national organization in the pharmaceutical industry to understand why they were losing, on average, 15% of newly hired workers within the first two years of employment. From a theoretical standpoint, this need to understand adjustment and retention during the first several years of employment was seen as an opportunity to merge the recruitment and socialization literatures by exploring how employees’ pre-employment experiences are enacted in post-entry settings.

Research surrounding recruitment has typically focused on the impact that recruitment activities have on pre-entry attitudes and job acceptance intentions (e.g., Harris & Fink, 1987; Turban, Forret, & Hendrickson, 1998). In some cases, this research
has gone one step further and looked at how these pre-entry experiences affect not only post-entry attitudes, such as job satisfaction, but also actual turnover behaviors (e.g., Griffeth, Hom, Fink, & Cohen, 1997; Moser, 2005; Saks & Ashforth, 1997a; Williams, Labig, & Stone, 1993). Largely absent from the recruitment literature however, has been an exploration of the ways in which recruitment experiences impact post-entry socialization experiences. Socialization researchers on the other hand, have traditionally focused most of their efforts on understanding how and why post-entry socialization efforts initiated by the organization and/or employee result in subsequent attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Allen, 2006; Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005). In a few select cases socialization researchers have evaluated the influence of pre-entry beliefs/attitudes on post-entry socialization (see Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). Generally speaking though, these beliefs/attitudes have been measured post-entry. For all practical purposes, socialization researchers have failed to acknowledge that employees arrive at their first day on the job with anything other than individual personality differences, which could serve to influence their latter socialization experiences. I would argue however, that all employees, whether fresh out of college or long-time workforce veterans, have an arsenal of prior experiences that will influence their subsequent socialization experiences at the start of new employment.

Despite the fact that recruitment and socialization researchers have made very few, if any attempts to consolidate their respective findings, it seems readily apparent that a merger is long overdue. I think researchers from across both domains would agree that it would be far too simplistic and misleading to suggest that pre-entry experiences incurred during the anticipatory socialization period (e.g., recruitment activities) are the
primary antecedents of post-entry attitudes and eventual turnover. Clearly, there is a substantial amount of evidence within the socialization literature (as described above) to support the impact of post-entry experiences (e.g., training) on subsequent attitudes and behavior. At the same time, I feel socialization researchers would be hard-pressed to find instances in which the pre-entry experiences of newcomers did not extend their influence beyond the pre-entry (or anticipatory socialization) period. Once again, there is a well-established body of recruitment research (as described above) highlighting the differential effects that recruitment sources and recruitment activities for example, have on post-entry expectations, attitudes, and behaviors.

Additionally, the average rate at which employees are changing jobs over the course their employment lifetimes should serve as enough of an impetus, at least to socialization researchers, to begin incorporating more pre-entry aspects of employment socialization (e.g., prior occupational experience, recruitment) into future research. According to Sullivan (1999), American employees appear to be changing jobs roughly every 4 ½ years. Given this level of turnover frequency, coupled with the research demonstrating that experienced and inexperienced newcomers are differentially impacted by pre-entry experiences (see Beyer & Hannah, 2002), researchers must begin to incorporate this rising segment of the newcomer workforce (i.e., veteran newcomers) into their research, rather than continue to focus primarily on inexperienced newcomers (Carr, Pearson, Vest, & Boyar, 2006).

As my first contribution to the literature, I aim to address this aforementioned gap in the socialization literature by evaluating both anticipatory socialization and post-entry socialization within the same study. Presently, I am not aware of any study that has
explicitly examined the socialization experience from beginning to end. In other words, I am looking to track organizational newcomers as they pass through each of the socialization stages as proposed by Allen (2006): (a) the *anticipatory socialization* stage, (b) the *encounter* stage, and (c) the *role management* stage. More specifically, the first data collection phase coincides with newcomer employment acceptance prior to organizational entry (i.e., anticipatory socialization stage). As per my model, newcomers form pre-entry organizational beliefs, shaped in part by recruitment/interview activities and prior work experiences. Phase two of the current study captures newcomer attitudes during the encounter and role management stages. During this phase, pre-entry beliefs work in tandem with socialization efforts imparted by both newcomers and the organization (e.g., proactive behaviors and training), to impact early adjustment attitudes and perceptions. Despite Allen’s (2006) original conceptualization of two distinct post-entry stages (i.e., the *encounter* and *role management* stages), I opted to collapse these two stages into a single *early adjustment* stage due to the relatively brief life-cycle timeline under examination (i.e., less than 3 years). In turn, these early attitudes and perceptions formed during the early adjustment stage, along with non-work responsibilities and career development efforts, jointly impact employee retention attitudes and behaviors collected during phase three (i.e., presently referred to as the *final outcomes* stage).

Of further note, the legitimacy of the current research is strengthened by the collection of data at multiple points throughout the employment life-cycle, starting with the collection of pre-entry data. Prospective employees completed this anticipatory socialization survey in the days and weeks leading up to their initial day on the job, rather
than after their official start of employment. Additionally, post-entry adjustment data was collected on three separate occasions throughout the first year of employment. Turnover intentions were captured on a fifth and final survey that newcomers randomly received at some point following their completion of at least one early adjustment survey.

To date, the theory of work adjustment has provided one of the primary models for depicting the ways in which both the newcomer and the organizational concurrently work toward integration into the workplace setting. As my second contribution to the socialization literature, I have designed a dual influence framework of work adjustment, in contrast to the earlier work adjustment model, which not only allows me to examine multiple newcomer and organizational contributions to the overall socialization process, but more importantly, allows me to examine the purported compensatory nature of these dual-sided contributions throughout each of the relevant employment life-cycle stages (i.e., recruitment, early adjustment, and turnover). Specifically, I propose and aim to test the hypothesis that the organization, as well as the employee, directly contributes to newcomer socialization, and that these forms of influence act in a compensatory manner throughout each of the three life-cycle stages, such that high levels of positive employee influence will compensate for low levels of organizational influence and vice versa.

Finally, there has been a fair amount of recent discussion across several organizational research domains directed toward the examination of employee embeddedness – specifically, what are the various forces that keep employees tied to their current organization when other organizational opportunities present themselves. While past research has indeed shown that job attitudes such as satisfaction play a role in predicting sustained tenure with an organization (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Hom
& Griffeth, 1995), other factors like embeddedness have proven useful in explaining employee retention above and beyond attitudes and job alternatives (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001). From a career mobility perspective, Ng and several other researchers (e.g., Feldman & Ng, 2007; Ng & Feldman, 2007; Ng, Sorensen, Eby, & Feldman, 2007) have begun to address the boundaryless career and its implications on the inter- and intra-organizational and occupational movements of employees. Others have examined how employee embeddedness, which is impacted by forces within one’s family and community settings, later translates into retention decisions (e.g., Blegen, Mueller, & Price, 1988; Lee, Mitchell, Sablynski, Burton, & Holtom, 2004; Mitchell et al., 2001).

Finally, a recent study by Allen (2006) addressed the effects of embeddedness within the context of newcomer socialization. My third contribution, aimed in part at synthesizing these various research streams, is to incorporate family and community contextual influences into a single socialization study designed to model early adjustment and turnover among organizational newcomers. The reader is referred to the overall conceptual model of employment life-cycle socialization presented in Figure 1.

The remainder of this paper will be laid out in the following manner: I will begin with an overview of the socialization literature in which some of the key socialization research areas will be highlighted. I will conclude this first section, guided by the Saks and Ashforth model of socialization (1997b), with a description of the theoretical framework and socialization drivers used to support the current model. In the second section, I will address the employment life-cycle phases and corresponding hypotheses that form the inner core of my socialization model. Sections three and four will outline employee and organizational influences respectively, that are purported to impact
newcomers throughout each phase of the employment life-cycle. The varying intensity of socialization tactics and employee attitudes’ relationships throughout the *early adjustment* phase will be discussed in section five, while contextual influences during the *final outcomes* phase will be discussed in section six. In the final section I will detail the rationale used in proposing a compensatory influence model of socialization. Specifically, I will describe the multiple interactions between employee and organizational influences that are expected to occur throughout the employment life-cycle. With no guiding precedent upon which to base these relationships, this final set of hypotheses will be treated in an exploratory manner. Thus, neither the direction nor the strength of these interactions has been pre-defined in the current study.

**SOCIALIZATION**

It has been almost 30 years since Feldman (1976), Van Maanen and Schein (1979), and Louis (1980) sparked an interest in the area of organizational socialization – a domain that has slowly, but steadily begun to take a prominent role in the field of I/O Psychology. Following this initial interest, the socialization literature of the 1980’s and 1990’s was dominated by essentially two types of inquiry (Chao, O’Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, & Gardner, 1994). A large number of studies examined the *process* of socialization (e.g., Buono & Kamm, 1983; Chao, 1988; Dubinsky, Howell, Ingram, & Bellenger, 1986; Feldman, 1976, 1981; Louis, 1980, Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975; Reichers, 1987; Taormina, 1997; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Wanous, 1992). Specifically, what stages does an organizational newcomer pass through en route to becoming socialized?
As an extension of this process-motivated research, a notable number of studies also looked at one particular behavior manifested by newcomers during the socialization process, this being proactive or information-seeking behavior (Ashford, 1986; Ashford & Black 1996; Miller & Jablin, 1991; Morrison, 1993a, b; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992).

The second area of research centered on the content of socialization, or what newcomers learn as they progress through the socialization process (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Jones, 1986). Across the current decade researchers have begun to incorporate aspects of both the socialization process and socialization content into their empirical studies. Recently in fact, there has been a surge of research centered on the dual examination of socialization tactics (i.e., content) and proactive behaviors (i.e., part of the socialization process) (e.g., Ashforth, Sluss, & Saks, 2007; Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006; Kim et al., 2005). Note that while socialization content will be reviewed in the current section, socialization processes (i.e., proactive behaviors) will be discussed in section three as an example of employee influence. Additionally, forthcoming sections of this paper will review two prominent, recently published socialization meta-analyses, as well as highlight the manner in which these meta-analytic findings have influenced the design and framework of the current study (see Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007; Saks, Uggerslev, & Fassina, 2007).

**Socialization Content**

Chao and colleagues (1994) were one of the first research teams to formally identify what has been regarded as the standard classification scheme of socialization content. According to these researchers, the socialization domain is predominantly focused on six major content areas: (a) performance proficiency, (b) people, (c) politics,
(d) language, (e) goals/values, and (f) history. Performance proficiency, or task mastery, has long been recognized as an important aspect of the socialization process. Beginning in the early 1970’s, researchers were quick to realize that task mastery (i.e., gaining the knowledge, skills, and abilities relevant to one’s actual work) was of profound importance in becoming integrated into the organization (see Dubinsky et al., 1986; Feldman, 1976, 1981; Fisher, 1986, Hall, 1987; Louis, 1980, Van Maanen, 1976; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Essentially, a newcomer who is unable to master job roles and responsibilities, regardless of whether he becomes socially integrated into the organizational network and well-versed in other organizational dynamics, is likely to find himself faced with early termination, or at least job reassignment. Along with performance proficiency, the people in the organization represent a second socialization content area that has been widely recognized as an important contributor to employee adjustment (see Dubinsky et al., 1986; Feldman, 1976, 1981; Fisher, 1986, Louis, 1980; Reichers, 1987; Schein, 1968; Van Maanen 1975). In any organization, newcomers regularly come in contact with work colleagues with whom they coordinate work activities, receive performance guidance and feedback, and/or share a satisfying work relationship (e.g., a friend with whom one eats lunch). Despite having a certain level of personal control in opting how dense a social network to create within the organization, newcomers must nevertheless become somewhat successful at establishing a certain number of important work relationships (e.g., with one’s supervisor, with a coworker) in order to become fully adjusted.

The four remaining socialization content areas have more recently come to be recognized as critical elements in the socialization process. According to Chao et al.
newcomers’ knowledge of organizational politics – understanding who is powerful, who the real decision-makers are, and how the power-wielding network operates – can be effectively used as a tool for increasing overall levels of adjustment. Knowing who has influence versus who is essentially powerless in terms of organizational decision-making can help to preserve newcomers’ cognitive resources. Rather than expending energy and effort in seeking information and guidance from organizational members who either lack the motivation or the ability to provide this guidance, newcomers can go straight to the powerful and useful sources of information. Thus, political knowledge can be an invaluable resource in the socialization process. The content area of *language* encompasses the technical terminology, slang, jargon, etc. that is unique to the organization. To become fully adjusted, newcomers need to speak like existing organizational members. As far back as 1968, Schein recognized that newcomers must learn and understand the goals and values guiding the organization’s mission in order to become socialized. However, it was not until Chao and colleagues (1994) included *goals/values* in their content framework that it became more widely accepted as an important area of socialization. Every organization operates according to an implicit, underlying set of principles which essentially govern the way in which the organization is run. Employees who understand, as well as agree with these organizational goals and values, are more apt to develop a strong sense of organizational identification. This level of identification in turn, is dually beneficial to employees and the organization, as it contributes to increasingly positive overall job attitudes/perceptions, as well as rates of employee retention. Finally, knowledge of relevant historical information pertaining to the overall organization and certain key
organizational members can facilitate the socialization process. An awareness of the traditions and customs that constitute an organization’s legacy and historical relevance for example, can help newcomers contextualize actions and decisions within the organization, and thereby facilitate their formulation of cognitive schemas pertaining to adjustment within particular work settings.

**Socialization Framework**

Both the array and complexity of disparate influences which all newcomers must face in the midst of organizational adjustment makes the synthesis of these variables into a coherent framework somewhat unwieldy. However, a combination of existing learning theories, along with a multi-level process model of socialization (see Saks & Ashforth, 1997b), have been useful in providing the most clear and relevant understanding of the socialization process to date. In the following section I will provide an overview of the multi-level process model devised by Saks and Ashforth (1997b), followed by a review of relevant learning theories and other proposed socialization drivers.

In their original conceptualization, Saks and Ashforth (1997b) positioned learning at the heart of their multi-level process model (see Figure 2), due in large part to the amount of supporting research which had shown learning to be one of the primary processes involved in the overall socialization experience (e.g., Bauer & Green, 1994; Chao et al., 1994; Holton, 1996; Miller & Jablin, 1991; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). Not surprisingly, learning is involved in each and every facet of newcomer adjustment, such that the magnitude of information to be learned throughout the early stages of employment is practically unquantifiable. Upon immediate arrival, newcomers strive to assimilate explicit and implicit organization-relevant information into their existing
knowledge base over a relatively short period of time. Whether learning the cognitive and/or physical skill requirements of their job, or the supervisor and co-worker interaction styles that are most commonly accepted throughout the organization, newcomers are continually engaged in a learning process during the adjustment period.

The remaining components of the multi-level process model (i.e., the antecedents and outcomes of learning) will be described chronologically. First, contextual factors, including those at the extra-organizational (e.g., national laws), the organizational (e.g., structure), the group (e.g., size), and the job (e.g., job design) levels are positioned to impact organizational, group and individual socialization factors. Organizations attempt to impart relevant job and cultural information through training and orientation programs. They may also actively encourage or require that newcomers be paired with experienced mentors. Additionally, supervisors and work groups are responsible for passing along job-related information, as well as social interaction feedback. Finally, newcomers themselves are in part responsible for gathering information within the organization. The use of proactive strategies for example, enables them to independently uncover discrete, nuanced information (i.e., information that can only be gleaned from in-depth observations, interactions, and discussions with existing organizational insiders) that is not readily available to less proactive organizational members. Note that each of these sources of information, along with their respective information-providing and information-seeking strategies, will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections of the paper. For now, suffice to say that each of these sources and strategies may prove to be extremely influential in altering the adjustment outcomes of organizational newcomers during the socialization period.
As outlined in the original model, socialization factors (i.e., organizational, group, and individual), along with cognitive sense-making, are positioned to directly influence the acquisition of information. In turn, information acquisition helps to reduce newcomer uncertainty and increase newcomer learning in various socialization content domains (e.g., organizational goals/values, task knowledge). Learning eventually leads to proximal outcomes, such as role clarity and person-organization fit, followed by distal outcomes at the organizational (e.g., stronger culture), group (e.g., stable membership), and individual (e.g., higher performance) levels. The reader should note that only one example of each type of socialization factor and type of outcome has been provided for illustrative purposes in Figure 2. In their original model, Saks and Ashforth (1997b) identified numerous socialization factors (at the organizational, group, and individual levels), along with proximal outcomes (at the individual level), and distal outcomes (at the organizational, group, and individual levels) that purportedly influence the overall socialization process of organizational newcomers.

Uncertainty reduction. Regardless of the learning content (e.g., role responsibilities, social support structures, organizational culture) or the learning context (e.g., size, type, location of the organization), there is generally a high level of uncertainty that accompanies organizational entry. This uncertainty is the first primary driver of newcomer learning. According to uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975), newcomers are driven to learn in an effort to reduce the discomfort brought on by uncertainty. New employees can experience incredibly high levels of stress when they are unfamiliar with the what, when, how, and with whom they are expected to carry out their assigned task responsibilities. In an effort to make their
surrounding environment more understandable and predictable, newcomers strive to gain new information as quickly and efficiently as possible. Acquisition of new information in turn, helps to reduce newcomer uncertainty, leading to greater role clarity (Miller & Jablin, 1991; Saks & Ashforth, 1997b), increased satisfaction, and greater intentions to remain (Morrison, 1993a).

Cognitive sense-making. The second driver of newcomer learning is grounded in cognitive sense-making theory (Louis, 1980). From the moment they make initial contact with the organization, newcomers begin to compare and contrast incoming information from the new organization (gained from recruitment and/or interview experiences, for example) with knowledge and experience gained in previous work and personal settings. *Veteran* newcomers (i.e., those having previous occupational experience) will attempt to assimilate this incoming information into pre-existing cognitive work schemas, while *neophyte* newcomers (i.e., those having no previous occupational experience), must begin to construct new cognitive schemas altogether. Although veteran newcomers may be aided by previous occupational experiences in forming more accurate pre-entry expectations, these previous experiences may or may not prove to be helpful in facilitating adjustment once the newcomers have actually entered the organization. In cases where the new organization is strikingly similar to previous work settings, veteran newcomers may adjust more rapidly, as the assimilation of new information will be relatively effortless. Conversely, veteran newcomers may struggle more than neophyte newcomers to adjust to work settings that are completely at odds with anything they have experienced in the past. In these instances, attempts to restructure existing cognitive schemas in order to align with current conditions may require more cognitive effort on
the part of veteran newcomers, than is required by neophyte newcomers in forming new schemas altogether. Whether as a veteran or neophyte newcomer, all newcomers are identical in the sense that they will attempt to gain information, driven by the need to make sense of their surroundings and attribute meaning to their interactions with existing organizational members (Saks & Ashforth, 1997b).

**Psychological contracts.** The third proposed driver of newcomer learning – psychological contracts – has been deemed an integral part of the employment relationship (Rousseau, 1990). As one component of the newcomer-organization social exchange relationship (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1961), this relational contract provides a framework for identifying what newcomer attitudes and behaviors (e.g., loyalty, organizational citizenship behaviors) will be expected in response to various organizational provisions (e.g., compensation, training, career development). From the organization’s perspective, psychological contracts are one of the most powerful means by which to elicit appropriate behaviors and attitudes from employees (Schein, 1980). By following up on promises to provide comprehensive training for example, organizations are indirectly sending signals that newcomers are now expected to reciprocate with high levels of performance and commitment to the organization (Bartlett, 2001). Accordingly, newcomers use information gained prior to or during the recruitment/interview stage to form their own initial beliefs, which may include the organizational provisions they feel they are entitled to receive (Robinson, Kratz, & Rousseau, 1994). Upon entry into the organization, newcomers become highly attuned to any efforts on the part of the organization to initiate a psychological contract. In turn, newcomers who perceive that an organization has kept its initial promise to provide
training for example, will be more willing and responsive in their efforts to repay these implicit obligations. Repayment can vary in both form and magnitude, from the more moderate (e.g., job satisfaction) to the more extreme (e.g., retention).

*Person-organization fit.* According to the person-organization fit literature, job applicants rely largely on perceptions of how well they fit into their new work settings in choosing whether to accept positions within certain organizations (Cable & Judge, 1996). By the time newcomers initially set foot into organizations, these fit perceptions have already become an integral part of their cognitive work schemas. It is at this point that newcomers then set out to affirm the accuracy of these pre-entry fit perceptions. Thus, the evolution of goal and value congruence between newcomers and organizations is proposed to be the fourth and final driver of newcomer learning in the context of socialization. From the organization’s standpoint, training represents a critical mechanism often used by the organization during the socialization process to control the cultural signals that are conveyed to newcomers. Within the confines of training, organizational representatives can not only verbally describe the goals and values that drive the organization’s existence, but veteran workers can also demonstrate appropriate responses to challenging workplace situations and events (Bauer, Morrison, & Callister, 1998). Socialization therefore, represents an attempt by the organization to bring newcomers’ goals and values more in alignment with those of the organization. Newcomers on the other hand, are equally driven to determine whether their goals and values match up with those of the organization. As a result, they are motivated to pay close attention to how the organization manages its people (Van Maanen & Shein, 1979). Specifically, an organization’s response to newcomers’ attempts to navigate unfamiliar
workplace territory serves as a powerful indicator for the kind of culture in which newcomers can expect to work if they choose to remain with the organization (Cable & Parsons, 2001).

To summarize, the multi-level process model (Saks & Ashforth, 1997b) posits that learning – the primary process involved in socialization – is jointly driven by desires to reduce uncertainty and to form or modify cognitive schemas. I further propose that tactics employed by both newcomers and the organization not only help clarify job responsibilities, but they also help (a) validate the existence of social exchange relationships between newcomers and their employers, as well as (b) provide evidence of the organization’s underlying goals and values, which newcomers can then use to evaluate their fit within the organization. In response, socialization effectiveness will be manifested in the forms of role clarity, fit perceptions, and/or overall satisfaction. Furthermore, contextual features outside the immediate boundaries of the organization will serve to influence the overall socialization process, as well as newcomers’ decisions to remain with the organization.

**EMPLOYMENT LIFE-CYCLE**

**Anticipatory Socialization**

Although the mere mention of the anticipatory socialization stage has been largely absent from the majority of socialization studies, this stage currently is, and will continue to be, an integral component of the overall socialization experience. In reality, it hardly seems possible that an employee could ever report to their first day of work without having had a reasonable amount of communication with at least one organizational representative. In essence, the anticipatory socialization period begins when an
individual becomes receptive to the idea of employment with a specific organization. Once an individual entertains employment with Firm A for example, he becomes the recipient of organizational information intended to shape his perceptions of future interactions and experiences that may occur once inside the workplace. This period essentially marks the point at which the organization begins to exercise a certain level of control in dictating the amount and type of information that an individual receives. Thus, the organization has positioned itself to begin socializing potential newcomers by exposing them to some of the goals, values, and ideas that drive the organization. In addition to these organizationally-driven experiences, newcomers bring their own set of existing knowledge, gathered from previous personal or professional experiences, which further shapes their perceptions of future workplace environments.

I suspect that part of the reason many socialization studies fail to address this initial socialization stage stems from researchers’ beliefs that this information has already been captured in the recruitment context by researchers investigating employment search and employment acceptance processes. However, if we accept Louis’ (1980) definition of organizational socialization as “a process by which an individual comes to appreciate the values, abilities, expected behaviors and social knowledge essential for assuming an organizational role and for participating as an organizational member” (pp. 229-230), then we must also acknowledge that process and content information gleaned prior to organizational entry is part of the opening stage of the socialization process. As a result, researchers must begin to whole-heartedly incorporate this initial phase of the socialization process into more of their research. Further, data intending to capture this process should be collected during the actual anticipatory stage rather than after the fact.
(i.e., during the adjustment stage) as some researchers have done (e.g., Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003).

Pre-entry expectations. Three anticipatory socialization outcomes have been utilized in the current study (see Figure 3). One such outcome – organizational expectations prior to entry – has been identified by Saks and Ashforth (1997b) as a key variable in this initial socialization process. Pre-entry organizational expectations can be defined as newcomers’ beliefs concerning the organizational attributes (e.g., values, culture) that they expect to encounter upon entry into the organization. These beliefs are formed using information gained from a multitude of sources, including but not limited to, personal contacts, school placement offices, the media, and organizational representatives, such as recruiters and interviewers.

Pre-entry person-job fit. A second proposed anticipatory socialization outcome is P-J fit. Organizations most often hire individuals who possess the requisite skills and abilities necessary to perform on the job. Likewise, individuals themselves strive to attain positions for which they feel at least somewhat qualified. In both instances, the organization and the individual are looking to achieve person-job fit (i.e., an alignment between an employee’s skills and abilities and those required by the organization). While it can be extremely difficult in many cases to evaluate actual fit, researchers oftentimes rely on perceptions of fit. Although P-J fit has generally been measured using newcomers in the early stages of adjustment, more recent research has begun to examine pre-entry P-J fit – the perception formed during the anticipatory socialization stage that one’s skills and abilities are going to be in alignment with future job requirements (Carr et al., 2006).
Pre-entry person-organization fit. P-O fit perceptions currently function as the third proposed outcome of the anticipatory socialization phase. In the attraction stage of Schneider’s (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition model, individuals purportedly self-select into organizations perceived as having attributes that are congruent with their own attitudes and personalities. Organizational values are one such attribute that is particularly salient to organizational newcomers. The congruence between personal and organizational values has been examined in the context of the A-S-A framework (e.g., Schaubroeck, Ganster, & Jones, 1998), as well as in the socialization domain (Kraimer, 1997), and has served as an indicator of person-organization fit (Cable & Judge, 1996).

As is frequently the case with P-J fit measures, P-O fit measures involving perceptions of fit have become more commonplace. Likewise, the collection of P-O fit perceptions prior to organizational entry has recently come into play (e.g., Carr et al., 2006).

In the current model, pre-entry organizational expectations, person-job fit, and person-organization fit not only serve as important outcomes of the anticipatory socialization phase, but they also serve as important predictors of both post-entry adjustment, as well as turnover. Past research has indeed confirmed many of the aforementioned links between pre-entry beliefs and subsequent adjustment. Specifically, pre-entry expectations have been positively linked to job satisfaction and commitment (Holton & Russell, 1999; Wanous, Poland, Premack, & Davis, 1992), while negative outcomes, such as lowered on-the-job adjustment (Buckley, Fedor, Veres, Wiese, & Carraher, 1998; Wanous et al., 1992) and turnover intentions (Holton & Russell, 1999; Wanous et al., 1992) have been the result of unmet expectations. Similarly, perceptions of P-J fit prior to entry have been a significant predictor of job satisfaction, organizational
commitment, and turnover (Riordan, Weatherly, Vandenberg, & Self, 2001; Saks & Ashforth, 2002). Finally, P-O fit perceptions involving value congruence have been directly linked to positive outcomes such as job satisfaction and commitment (Cable & Judge, 1996; Chao et al., 1994), and negative outcomes including turnover (O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Based on the aforementioned findings, I propose that expectations formed during the anticipatory socialization stage (including pre-entry P-J and P-O fit perceptions) will carry over into the post-entry socialization stage and directly impact both adjustment- and turnover-related criteria.

**Hypothesis 1:** Pre-entry expectations will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, (c) role clarity, and negatively impact (d) turnover intentions and (e) turnover.

**Early Adjustment**

Perceptions of role clarity and P-O fit have been some of the most widely examined indicators of newcomer adjustment in the existing literature. Researchers have uncovered multiple instances in which these proximal adjustment variables have been the direct result of organization socialization tactics (e.g., formal training) and newcomer proactive behaviors, for example (e.g., Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003; Kim et al., 2005). Job satisfaction, on the other hand, has frequently been measured as a more distal adjustment measure. In the current study however, I positioned job satisfaction as an early adjustment variable, alongside role clarity and P-O fit perceptions, given the following rationale. First, proximal socialization outcomes such as role clarity and fit perceptions have been linked in previous research to final outcomes, including withdrawal behaviors (e.g., Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003) and turnover (e.g., Cable & Parsons, 2001). Thus, it seemed reasonable to predict that role clarity and fit
perceptions would have a direct impact on employees’ retention decisions in the current study. Second, there have been several studies directly linking proximal outcomes such as role clarity, with distal outcomes such as job satisfaction (see recent meta-analyses by Bauer et al., 2007; Saks et al., 2007). Third, I would argue that in the midst of the socialization process, employees are not only evaluating (a) the clarity of their roles and responsibilities and (b) the congruence between their goals/values and those of the organization, but they are simultaneously assessing and reassessing their level of overall satisfaction with the job. Thus, it made practical and theoretical sense to position job satisfaction as an early adjustment variable alongside role clarity and person-organization fit. Given that the current study was designed with the intention of capturing employment life-cycles of relatively short durations (less than three years), I predicted that socialization experiences during the early stages of employment would affect one’s perceptions of clarity, congruence, and satisfaction with the job. In turn, these short-term socialization outcomes would ultimately influence employees’ retention decisions.

In addition to serving as outcomes of the early adjustment phase in the current model, job satisfaction, P-O fit perceptions, and role clarity are positioned as predictors of turnover, as well as mediators of the anticipatory socialization-final outcomes relationship (see Figure 3). The supporting rationale for each of these proposed links is described below.

*Job satisfaction.* Job satisfaction represents the first proposed outcome of the early adjustment phase. According to older versions of the psychological contract, employees exchanged loyalty for long-term stability with the organization. Under the provisions of the newer contract however, employees agree to employability in exchange
for performance and flexibility (see Arthur & Rousseau, 1996). By accepting the terms of this newer contract, employees implicitly acknowledge that their tenure in the organization is not guaranteed for any pre-specified length of time. Simultaneously, organizations must accept the fact that they cannot command employee loyalty if they are not willing or able to offer job stability. Thus, the newer psychological contract essentially requires employees to monitor outside job prospects from the minute they cross the organizational threshold. This early monitoring is beneficial to employees in that it enables the constant evaluation of newer and better job opportunities, as well as helps to ensure personal economic stability by reducing the likelihood that employees will be without a job (and more importantly an income) for a prolonged period of time in the event of unexpected job loss. As newcomers begin to consider their career options outside the existing organization, they are confronted with a number of potential dilemmas. They frequently evaluate (a) affective responses to leaving the organization, (b) the perceived difficulty of leaving the organization, and (c) their alternative opportunities. Theoretically speaking, March and Simon’s (1958) original turnover model posits that turnover is a function of both the desirability of organizational departure (commonly operationalized as job satisfaction) and the ease of organizational departure (commonly operationalized as number of perceived alternatives). In other words, employees jointly consider, “Do I want to leave the organization?” (i.e., “Am I happy here?”) and “How easy would it be for me to leave the organization?” (i.e., “How many alternative job options do I have?”).

Empirically speaking, the sheer quantity and consistency of research involving the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover is enough to justify the proposed
relationship between these two constructs in the current study. Meta-analytic findings have quantified the relationship as falling somewhere between -.20 and -.30 (Griffeth et al., 2000). This is not the only adjustment variable expected to influence turnover, however. According to Hom and Griffeth’s (1995) estimates, attitudes like job satisfaction account for only about 4-5% of the variance in explaining employee retention. Therefore, as Maertz and Campion (1998) have pointed out, it is important to try and identify the other relevant factors that play an important role in contributing to the deliberate act of leaving an organization. In addition to job satisfaction, person-organization fit perceptions, and role clarity are positioned to negatively influence turnover in present study.

Hypothesis 2: Job satisfaction will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

P-O fit perceptions. Currently, P-O fit perceptions are positioned as the second early adjustment outcome within the employee socialization model (see Figure 3). The P-O fit literature, while not as extensive as the job satisfaction literature, has examined fit perceptions as a significant antecedent to turnover. Newcomers are extremely sensitive during the initial stages of adjustment within a new organization. During this highly uncertain period, newcomers evaluate the information, actions, and behaviors of the organization and its representatives as signals of the overarching culture and value system governing the organization. When perceptions of incongruence reach a certain level, newcomers begin to reevaluate the likelihood of being able to fit in the organization. If they feel that the disparity between their personal values and those of the organization is far too great, they are likely to consider leaving the organization as a means by which to rectify this incongruence. Existing empirical evidence generally seems to support these
views. A recent independent study (see Cable & Parsons, 2001), along with two separate meta-analytic investigations of fit consequences (see Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005), found P-O fit perceptions to be negatively related to actual turnover. Therefore, P-O fit perceptions are expected to negatively impact turnover in the current research project.

*Hypothesis 3:* P-O fit perceptions will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

*Role clarity.* Regarding role clarity – the third proposed early adjustment outcome – there has been minimal research examining the potential link between the adjustment variable of role clarity and turnover. This may be due to the fact that many researchers have positioned role clarity as a proximal adjustment variable that mediates many of the relationships between socializing influences/tactics and more distal adjustment outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (e.g., Bauer et al., 2007 meta-analysis; Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). As has been the case with met expectations however, researchers have been successful in directly linking role clarity with other negative newcomer outcomes, including withdrawal behaviors (e.g., Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003) and turnover intentions (e.g., Bauer et al., 2007). Therefore, I propose that role clarity, along with P-O fit perceptions and job satisfaction will have a negative impact on newcomers’ decisions to leave the current organization.

*Hypothesis 4:* Role clarity will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

As previously mentioned, I propose that the effects of pre-entry fit expectations on turnover will be diminished when job satisfaction, P-O fit perceptions, and role clarity
are taken into account. The reader is referred to Figure 3 for a graphic overview of all employment life-cycle hypotheses.

*Hypothesis 5:* (a) Job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity will fully mediate the impact of pre-entry expectations on turnover intentions.

*Hypothesis 6:* (a) Job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity will fully mediate the impact of pre-entry expectations on turnover.

**EMPLOYEE INFLUENCES**

Past researchers have explicitly acknowledged that the newcomer, the organization, and various organizational representatives (e.g., supervisors, coworkers), play a significant role in the newcomer socialization process. As Taormina (1997) pointed out, organizations initially choose to select an employee and subsequently they can choose to dismiss that employee. Concurrently, newcomers make the choice to adapt to the new organization and ultimately decide whether or not to quit. There have been limited attempts however, to conceptually or empirically position the newcomer as a socialization agent whose actions can enhance or detract from the socialization efforts enacted by the organization and its representatives. Recognizing that in some cases the proactive behaviors on the part of the newcomer may compensate for a lack of socialization support on the organization’s side, the current model positions the employee as a distinct socialization agent whose actions may serve to compete or coordinate with those of the organization. Concerning the few studies that have at least attempted to differentiate among various socializing influences, evidence suggests that differing patterns of adjustment do transpire among newcomers within organizations and that these adjustment patterns become more readily apparent only when the socializing sources are teased apart (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). In the current study, I will not only
explore the impact of employee influences during the adjustment stage, but I will also examine employee influences during the anticipatory socialization stage, as well as the final outcomes stage. Accordingly, prior occupational experience will be subsequently discussed as a relevant employee influence within the context of the anticipatory phase. Separately, proactive behaviors and kinship responsibility (i.e., employee influences that are relevant to the early adjustment and final outcomes phases respectively) will also be discussed (see Figure 4).

**Prior Occupational Experience**

Long gone are the days when employees worked for one, maybe two organizations in their career life span. This older generation of workers has since been replaced by a more mobile workforce – one consisting of individuals working for shorter periods of time for greater numbers of employers. According to a National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2006), American workers have held an average of ten jobs between the ages of 18 and 40 over the last 25 years. Thus, in addition to facing an annual surge of *neophyte* job applicants (i.e., those who are new to both the organization and occupation) organizations are equally likely to find themselves faced with increasing numbers of veteran job applicants (i.e., those who are new to the organization, but who have previous work experience within the current occupation). On the one hand, veteran applicants may have gained valuable job-related skills and abilities in previous organizational settings and will thus have a strong advantage over their inexperienced counterparts when transitioning between organizations, while maintaining the same occupation. On the other hand, these same KSAs will be of little use to experienced applicants entering into new occupational settings in the midst of
transitioning into new organizations. In the latter context, experienced and inexperienced newcomers may be relatively indistinguishable. Note that in the current study prior occupational experience is operationalized along a continuum in terms of the number of years of professional experience (i.e., less than 1 year to 10+) that a newcomer has accrued prior to accepting employment with the present organization.

There is at least one invaluable by-product of previous experience within the same occupational setting however – cognitive schemas pertaining to job content – that clearly distinguishes the veterans from the neophytes. Equipped with related work experience from previous organizational settings, veteran workers bring with them a baseline standard of person-job fit, which they can then use to evaluate the likelihood of fit within future workplace settings. With this previous occupational experience, veteran workers are also likely to be more well-versed (than their neophyte counterparts) in the tasks and responsibilities required in an occupationally-similar position. Thus, veterans’ increased job content “know-how” is likely to result in improved information-processing efficiency during the early stages of adjustment (Kirschenbaum, 1992; Meglino, DeNisi, & Ravlin, 1993), enabling them to devote greater cognitive resources toward understanding work group social dynamics and organizational goals and values. Neophytes on the other hand, may experience greater cognitive overload as they attempt to learn how to do their job while simultaneously grappling with understanding the interpersonal and goal-driven aspects of their new workplace environment.

Despite its logical usefulness in the work socialization domain, few studies in this field of inquiry (notable exceptions include Brett, Feldman, & Weingart, 1990; Feldman, 1981; Feldman & Brett, 1983) have incorporated the characteristic of previous
organizational experience as a dominant and influential variable in predicting important organizational outcomes such as employee turnover. Instead, a majority of studies have utilized samples of inexperienced workers in examining the socialization process. Most recently, Carr and his colleagues (2006) examined the degree to which prior occupational experience not only impacted pre-entry beliefs, but also post-entry tenure. Using Beyer and Hannah’s (2002) model of the socialization of experienced workers, Carr et al., (2006) determined that prior experience did indeed positively influence retention, but that this influence was mediated by pre-entry perceptions of job and value fit with the organization. Additionally, results showed that prior experience had a direct, positive impact on more generalized pre-entry expectations.

In the current study, I anticipate that experienced newcomers would not have been motivated to leave their existing organizations, had they not perceived that future opportunities within the current organization would exceed both average expectations and past experiences. Additionally, having gained previous experience in occupationally-similar work settings, I propose that experienced newcomers are in a better position (than their inexperienced counterparts) to form more realistic pre-entry expectations, especially those pertaining to P-J fit. Using P-J fit schemas formed in one or more previous organizational settings, these veterans can more accurately evaluate the degree of fit between their own skills and those required by the current employer (Beyer & Hannah, 2002). In the case of neophyte newcomers, their lack of pre-existing job requirement knowledge essentially leaves them to “guess” at how well their skills are likely to match up to the job requirements imposed by their new employer. Likewise, the results of a Carr et al. (2006) study in which prior experience lead to greater perceptions of
organization fit, prompted me to propose that veteran newcomers will be in a better position than neophyte newcomers to evaluate the degree to which their goals/values are going to be in alignment with the goals/values of the new organization.

**Hypothesis 7:** Prior occupational experience will positively impact pre-entry expectations (which include pre-entry P-J and P-O fit perceptions).

**Proactive Behaviors**

Proactive behaviors – an active employee influence during the early adjustment phase – will now be discussed (see Figure 4). There has been one research stream in the socialization domain that has portrayed newcomers as passive recipients during the socialization experience (Ashforth et al., 2007). This particular area has tended to focus on the organization (using socialization tactics such as training, for example) as the sole agent of post-entry socialization. A separate, yet complementary line of research has been attuned to the active role that newcomers themselves play in becoming socialized (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2007; Gruman et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2005). As previously discussed, newcomers are driven to reduce uncertainty as they enter into a new organizational setting and are faced with countless unknowns. On one hand, they may rely on the organization to provide relevant information that will be useful in terms of overall adjustment. They may have been informed during the recruitment stage for example, that they would receive formal training and/or orientation upon entry into the organization. On the other hand, owing in part to personality characteristics and/or frustration over continued uncertainty, newcomers may initiate varying degrees of proactive information seeking. Newcomers who are proactive by nature (i.e., proactive personality) may immediately seek out information from various formal and informal sources the minute they set foot in the door. Other newcomers may be less forthright in
seeking out information from the start, but may gradually begin to take matters into their own hands by approaching various interpersonal (e.g., supervisor, coworkers) and written sources for information and feedback as they struggle to adjust through a period of continued uncertainty. This uncertainty reduction approach to socialization is at the core of Miller & Jablin’s (1991) model of newcomer information seeking.

As previously mentioned, newcomers may be motivated to seek out task, role, work group, and organizational information during the early stages of adjustment in an effort to reduce uncertainty (Saks & Ashforth, 1997b). This search for information, commonly referred to as *proactivity* in the socialization literature, was defined by Reichers (1987) as “any behavior that involves actively seeking out interaction opportunities” (p. 281). According to Miller & Jablin’s model (1991), newcomers regularly initiate efforts designed to gather the information needed to increase their level of organizational understanding. These newly hired individuals essentially seek out three types of information. First, they go in search of information that will help them to function on the job. In other words, they seek to attain role clarity. In the Miller & Jablin model, this is referred to as *referent* information. Additionally, newcomers look to uncover *appraisal* information. They seek feedback regarding how well they are performing on the job. This is akin to achieving self-efficacy. Finally, newcomers are motivated to pursue *relational* information. They are not only interested in uncovering supervisor and coworker expectations in terms of social interactions within the work group, but they are also motivated to uncover broader organizational expectations with respect to networking with non-work group members. In essence, newcomers are interested in defining the parameters of acceptable non-task behavior. More specifically,
they want to know what will it take to build an effective relationship with their supervisor and how will they be able to fit into their respective work groups.

Newcomers can gather information from multiple sources (e.g., supervisors, coworkers, mentors) via multiple means. Rather than approaching organizational members directly, in some instances it may be more appropriate or more feasible to gain information through the process of observation. Other types of information may be best acquired using trial and error methods. Information that is difficult to obtain using either of these two methods may be most accurately conveyed through printed sources, such as organizational manuals. For example, the most accurate information pertaining to supervisor and work group sanctioned social behaviors could probably not be gleaned from reading an organizational handbook. Conversely, gaining information about how to file a formal complaint against one’s supervisor would certainly not be an appropriate topic of conversation with one’s supervisor, or even with work group members. A newcomer wishing to file a complaint might be better served by consulting an organizational handbook that objectively outlines the appropriate steps and procedures that must be followed under these particular circumstances. In their information-seeking study, Saks & Ashforth (1997b) discovered that newcomers relied most frequently on observation, followed by interpersonal sources in an effort to obtain information. The information most commonly sought was task-related, followed by role and then work group information. Furthermore, they found that the use of supervisors as a primary source of information was most likely to result in positive socialization outcomes.

The study of proactivity has justifiably become an important focal point in the socialization literature. As researchers like Morrison (1993a, b) and Ostroff and
Kozlowski (1992) have pointed out, proactive information seeking is integral to newcomers’ socialization experiences, in that employees can largely govern the speed and ease with which they become fully integrated organizational members (as cited in Major & Kozlowski, 1997). Studies have revealed a significant degree of variance across newcomers with regard to the level of proactivity that they exhibit (Ashford & Black, 1996; Crant, 2000). When used as an overarching construct in past research, measures of proactivity have tapped into a variety of behaviors, including networking, general socializing, building relationships with supervisors, negotiating job changes, information seeking, feedback seeking, and positive framing (Ashford & Black, 1996). As a unified construct, these proactive behaviors have been linked to job satisfaction (Ashford & Black, 1996) and turnover intentions (Ashforth et al., 2007). Other studies focusing on a sub-set of proactive behaviors have linked proactivity to role clarity, social integration, fit perceptions, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (e.g., Gruman et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2005). Additional studies have been conducted in which information-seeking or feedback-seeking was the sole proactive behavior under consideration (e.g., Ashford, 1986; Major & Kozlowski, 1997; Morrison, 1993b). When operationalized as a single type of proactive behavior, information-seeking has been linked to increased role clarity and job satisfaction, along with decreased turnover intentions (Morrison, 1993a, b). Similarly, information acquisition (i.e., the direct result of information-seeking behaviors) has been shown to be related to increased satisfaction and commitment, as well as decreased turnover intentions (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). Furthermore, the results of a recent meta-analysis support earlier findings in that information-seeking was strongly linked to important socialization outcomes, including role clarity and
organizational commitment (Bauer et al., & Tucker, 2007). Given the aforementioned research, I propose that employees exhibiting proactive behaviors will experience greater post-entry adjustment.

Hypothesis 8: Proactive behaviors will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity.

As newcomers transition from the anticipatory socialization stage into the early adjustment stage, they do not suddenly discard all pre-entry attitudes and beliefs. Rather, these pre-entry beliefs are carried over into the early adjustment stage where they must compete with additional incoming information. Once inside the organization, newcomers begin to seek out additional information. In the midst of this information-seeking activity, newcomers must reconcile earlier beliefs formed prior to entry with more recent information and experiences (Miller & Jablin, 1991). I anticipate however, that neither source of information is eliminated in this process and that newcomers will continue to evaluate the accuracy of pre-entry beliefs in the midst of evaluating current information. Therefore, I propose that both pre-entry beliefs and proactive behaviors enacted by employees will significantly impact early adjustment.

Hypothesis 9: Proactive behaviors will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity, above and beyond pre-entry expectations.

Kinship Responsibility

The consideration of employee influences concludes in this final section with a discussion centered around kinship responsibility’s impact on newcomer turnover during the final outcomes phase (see Figure 4). At any point that newcomers begin to consider alternative career opportunities outside the existing organization, they are confronted with a number of potential dilemmas. According to March and Simon’s (1958) original
model, turnover is a function of both the desirability and the ease of leaving an organization. In other words, employees consider, “Am I satisfied with my job at this organization?” and, “What external alternative job options do I have?” Later turnover models, most notably Lee and Mitchell’s (1994) unfolding model of voluntary turnover, posited “shocks” and “image violations” as additional precursors to turnover. To illustrate, a woman who becomes pregnant (i.e., a shock event) may decide to leave her job in order to raise her child. In this particular instance, turnover is the direct result of a shock event, rather than the result of disaffection. Image violations, on the other hand, occur when objects, events, and/or processes in one life domain conflict with those in another domain. A husband who is offered an overseas promotional opportunity may experience an image violation when faced with the prospect of career growth and subsequent household disruption (as a result of severing friendships and community ties), versus job stagnation and the maintenance of family stability.

Further evidence of a link between an employee’s family domain and his/her turnover activity can be gleaned from kinship research conducted by Blegen et al. (1988). Prompted by the assertion that family members (e.g., spouses, children) form their own attachments within the community which make it increasingly difficult for an employee to leave his/her job, particularly when community relocation is involved (Domsch, Kruger, & Gerpott, 1983), Blegen and colleagues (1988) were able to demonstrate that the number of family members in one’s immediate household setting (i.e., kinship responsibility) was directly tied to turnover activity. Specifically, these researchers found that employees who were married, as well as those who had children, exhibited lower rates of turnover intentions and turnover than employees who were single and/or childless.
(Blegen et al., 1988). Additionally, Abelson (1987) found that being married and having more dependents requiring early-childhood care was associated with greater intentions to remain on the job. Further, a study by Lee and Maurer (1999) found that having a spouse and children at home was more predictive than organizational commitment in predicting turnover. Given the aforementioned findings, I propose that higher levels of kinship responsibility (i.e., having a spouse/partner and/or children) will be associated with decreased turnover intentions and actual turnover behaviors. Additionally, it should be noted that the conceptualization of kinship responsibility used in the current study is taken directly from prior research by Blegen and colleagues (1988) and is intended to objectively capture the nuclear composition of an employee’s household in terms of having a spouse and/or children. The current definition is not to be confused with definitions more commonly associated with the work-family literature. Thus, no subjective conclusions regarding the strength or direction of the relationship between an employee and his/her spouse and/or children are to be inferred from the current measure.

**Hypothesis 10:** Kinship responsibility will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

Similar to the transition from the anticipatory stage to the early adjustment stage, newcomers crossing into the socialization outcomes stage carry with them attitudes, perceptions, and experiences gleaned from the previous stage (i.e., the adjustment stage). Therefore, I again propose that newcomers will be directly impacted by influences within the current stage, as well as by attitudes and perceptions formed in the previous stage. In accordance, early adjustment attitudes and perceptions (i.e., job satisfaction, P-O fit perceptions, and role clarity), along with outcomes stage influences (i.e., kinship responsibility) will significantly impact turnover intentions, as well as actual turnover.
The reader is referred to Figure 4 for a graphic overview of all employee influence hypotheses.

_Hypothesis 11:_ Kinship responsibility will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond job satisfaction.

_Hypothesis 12:_ Kinship responsibility will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond P-O fit perceptions.

_Hypothesis 13:_ Kinship responsibility will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond role clarity.

**ORGANIZATIONAL INFLUENCES**

Prior to the consideration of specific organization influences, I feel it necessary to point out that while in some instances it may be appropriate to measure perceptions of organization influence according to the organization’s point of view (i.e., perceptions of senior-level decision makers), in other instances it may be more relevant and informative to measure perceptions of organization influence according to the employee’s point of view. In the current study, it is important to investigate perceptions of organization influence according to the newcomer’s point of view, given the following rationale. In the case of organizational training for example, Saks (1996) reported that newcomers’ perceptions of training adequacy were more predictive of subsequent attitudes and behaviors than the amount of time actually spent in training. Thus, the efficacy of various socialization tactics such as training will not necessarily be realized (in the forms of increased role clarity and job satisfaction, for example) if employee perceptions are not in alignment with organizational accounts of having provided an appropriate amount of effective training. Additionally, as Bauer & Green (1994) noted, “when individual perceptions and attitudes are determining employees’ responses to work, self-reports should be a valid and useful source of data” (p. 22). Thus, employees’ ratings of
organizational influences (e.g., recruitment, orientation, career development) should qualify as a valid means by which to evaluate the efficacy of organizational interventions in the current study.

**Recruitment**

As mentioned in the previous section pertaining to employee influences, much of the socialization literature posits the organization as the primary agent of newcomer socialization. Beginning with the anticipatory socialization stage, prospective employees are potentially exposed to multiple types of information from multiple sources as they participate in organization-sponsored recruitment and/or interview activities. Information pertaining to aspects of the job (e.g., starting pay, benefits, advancement opportunities), as well as aspects of the organization (e.g., reputation, industry standings, internal culture), is typically conveyed to job applicants during the recruitment phase. Additionally, these types of information can originate from various sources, including organizational recruiters, current employees, school placement offices, and newspaper postings. Furthermore, one’s “level of treatment” during the recruitment process has attracted a substantial amount of research interest. Specifically, perceptions of the recruiter/interviewer in terms of how he/she interacts with the candidate (e.g., their level of personableness), have most often been studied (Rynes, 1991). Because they have been shown to exhibit varying degrees of influence on subsequent employee attitudes and behaviors, the following three aspects of the recruitment/interview process and their corresponding implications for the anticipatory socialization phase (as depicted in Figure 5) will be discussed in greater detail below: (a) perceptions of overall treatment during the recruitment/interview process, (b) perceptions of treatment from the actual
recruiter/interviewer and (c) initial compensation. Although compensation is generally considered as a topic separate from recruitment, I have included it in the current section due to the fact that job applicants generally receive initial compensation information during the recruitment/interview process.

Perceptions of the recruitment/interview process. According to Rynes (1991), recruitment experiences can serve as a powerful motivating force in the job choice process, particularly in the absence of informal sources of information. She further suggested that various aspects of the recruitment process, including the behavior of the recruiter/interviewer, serve as signals of organizational attributes. For example, an applicant who is kept well informed of his employment status by a recruiter/interviewer throughout the selection process may interpret this behavior as a signal that the organization is well organized and efficient. Conversely, perceptions of a disorganized and unpredictable recruiter may be translated by a potential employee into perceptions of a disorganized and unpredictable organization. There have been several studies which have examined how perceptions of the recruiter translate into both attributions toward the job and company, along with interest in joining the organization. As early as 1970, a study by Alderfer and McCord demonstrated that a recruiter’s enacted interest in a job candidate, along with his willingness to provide information to that candidate, was significantly related to the candidate’s likelihood of accepting a job offer by that organization. Additional recruiter characteristics, namely competence, informativeness, aggressiveness, and personableness have been linked in several studies to college students’ perceptions of job and organizational attributes (e.g., Harris & Fink, 1987; Schmitt & Coyle, 1976; Stevens, 1997; Turban, 2001; Turban et al., 1998). As further
evidence, consider the results of one longitudinal interview study with recent college graduates. Eighty-three percent indicated that the treatment they had received during the recruitment process had a notable impact in their job choice decision (Boswell, Roehling, LePine, & Moynihan, 2003). Specifically, frequent and prompt follow-up by the organization was cited as having one of the strongest positive influences on job acceptance, while delayed follow-up and poor interviewer behaviors and attitudes were cited as negative influences. The reader is referred to a recent review by Breaugh & Starke (2000) for a list of additional studies that have examined various recruiter characteristics and their impact on important recruitment outcomes.

In some instances, the signaling strength of the recruitment process and/or the recruiter/interviewer may be diminished. When job applicants begin the recruitment process with a considerable amount of organization-relevant information, when applicants and recruiters/interviewers are from different functional areas, and/or when recruitment activities are conducted strictly off-site (e.g., college campuses), the overall recruitment process serves as less of a signal for future organizational experiences, and therefore has less of an impact on applicants’ subsequent job decisions (Rynes, 1991). In a separate study, Rynes, Bretz, and Gerhart (1991) uncovered evidence of signaling, such that applicants’ pre-entry fit perceptions were more strongly impacted when recruiters were seen as being “symbolic of broader organizational characteristics” (p. 487). Once again however, only the perceptions of applicants who lacked detailed knowledge of the organization at the start of the recruitment process and who were from the same functional area as the recruiter/interviewer were strongly influenced.
In reality, job applicants most certainly differ in terms of how much information and organizational background knowledge they bring to the recruitment and/or interview process. Some applicants will begin the anticipatory socialization process with significant amounts of information gained from highly-informed sources (e.g., current or past employees). Others essentially will be “in the dark” in terms of their pre-existing knowledge concerning the in’s and out’s of life in the current organization. Although I anticipate that all applicants will be positively influenced by their recruitment/interview experiences, I suspect that applicants with greater pre-recruitment/pre-interview knowledge will be less strongly influenced by the recruitment/interview process than their uninformed applicant counterparts. Applicants with little to no pre-recruitment/pre-interview knowledge on the other hand, will interpret the experiences gained during the recruitment/interview process as signals of future organizational life and will therefore be highly influenced by their recruitment/interview experiences. As I was unable to measure applicants’ pre-recruitment/pre-interview knowledge however, I could not test this more refined prediction. Instead, I tested the hypothesis that the direction of influence exerted by recruitment and/or interview experiences (including the impact of recruiters/interviewers) upon newcomer pre-entry expectations will be significantly positive for all newcomers (regardless of their pre-recruitment/pre-interview knowledge).

**Hypothesis 14:** Perceptions of (a) the recruiter/interviewer and (b) the recruitment/interview process will positively impact pre-entry expectations.

**Compensation.** What induces an individual to accept a particular job once an offer has been made? The answer to this question can be found within the recruitment and compensation literatures. Note that compensation is the third proposed organizational influence relevant to newcomer socialization during the anticipatory phase
(see Figure 5). Theoretically speaking, the objective factor theory (Behling, Labovitz, & Gainer, 1968) posits that an individual evaluates each employment opportunity according to the perceived attributes of the job in question. Empirically, numerous studies have found factors such as advancement opportunities, work location, and nature of the work (e.g., Taylor & Bergmann, 1987), as well as compensation (e.g., Boswell et al., 2003), to be influential in the employment acceptance process.

In terms of compensation, individuals become acutely aware of what they are “worth” (i.e., how much they should be paid), as they begin to accumulate tenure in the workforce. Although these individuals are often unwilling to admit the importance of pay (when responding to organizational surveys) as Rynes, Gerhart, and Minette (2004) have noted, empirical evidence has been uncovered to substantiate the claim that pay is clearly an important attribute used by individuals in evaluating employment opportunities. For example, a direct estimation study by Jurgensen (1978) found that while pay was rated as the fifth and seventh most important personal motivator by men and women respectively, there was an overwhelming tendency by both men and women alike to rate pay as the most important motivator for all others. For everyone but themselves, applicants rated pay as a more important motivator than job security, type of work, advancement opportunities, and the actual organization, for example. Researchers have qualified this apparent discrepancy in self versus others’ ratings as merely an example of socially desirable responding (Rynes et al., 2004). It is far more socially acceptable for individuals to rank a job attribute such as “job challenge” as being of greater importance than an attribute such as pay (Gerhart & Rynes, 2003). Societal norms have taught us to value the intrinsic qualities of work more so than the extrinsic
qualities such as pay. Realistically though, individuals clearly recognize that certain basic needs (e.g., food and shelter) can only be attained with money. In a more recent Towers Perrin survey (2003), competitive base pay was ranked the second most important factor in attracting employees.

Additional inquires within the compensation research domain have uncovered further evidence supporting pay’s importance in motivating human behavior. In comparison with direct report responses, policy capturing studies have consistently yielded results that position pay at the forefront of an employee’s focus when evaluating the attractiveness of a job (e.g., Feldman & Arnold, 1978; Rynes, Schwab, & Heneman, 1983). Alternately, research that has examined compensation variance in response to job change has found that employees typically experience substantial gains in salary level upon switching to a new employer. For example, a study by Keith and McWilliams (1999) found that those who voluntarily quit their jobs for reasons other than family realized salary gains of 8% to 11%. Likewise, the results from a study conducted by Dreher and Cox (2000) indicated that employees who had changed jobs at least once were compensated with salaries that averaged out to be $15,000 higher than those who had remained with a single employer. More recently, Chapman and colleagues (2005) meta-analyzed the results from 71 recruitment studies that looked at the relationships between predictors such compensation and outcomes such as job attraction, job acceptance intentions, and job choice. Rather than having a direct effect, these researchers found that the impact of these attributes on job choice was partially mediated by job acceptance intentions.
There has been a separate, yet complementary line of research in the job choice literature that has categorized job and organizational attributes as either compensatory or non-compensatory (see Osborne, 1990). Compensatory factors are those for which lower levels can be off-set by higher levels of other factors. As an example, the absence of flexible work options might be minimized in the presence of a large sign-on bonus, by a married, father of two who is the sole breadwinner in the family. On the other hand, flexible work options may be non-negotiable for a single, mother of two. In this latter instance, flexible work options would be considered a non-compensatory factor – one for which a certain value or level of attractiveness must be reached before a job candidate will pursue a certain position.

Pay is typically seen as a non-compensatory factor. Unless under extreme labor workforce conditions (e.g., high unemployment during a national recession), many individuals will not even consider a position for which the pay does not meet a certain reservation wage (Anderson, Born, & Cunningham-Snell, 2001). As a result, I expect that there may be some range restriction in the current results if pay is indeed considered by many to be a non-compensatory factor. Those individuals who felt that the proposed pay, for example, was too low to consider employment with the current organization would have already self-selected out during the recruitment process and therefore would not be part of the current sample. Correspondingly, those individuals who felt the pay level had met or exceeded the reservation wage, would have remained in the selection cycle until they reached the acceptance stage. In having gotten to this stage, these individuals who had psychologically accepted the proposed pay during the job attraction stage, would now be focused on alternative job and organizational criteria as a means by
which to evaluate the prospect of accepting a job offer. In the current study, respondents had already accepted a position at the time of survey completion. Therefore, I was most interested in examining the degree to which compensation influenced pre-entry expectations, rather than the degree to which it had influenced initial job choice.

Being one of the few quantifiable and highly visible organizational attributes which prospective employees can accurately evaluate prior to starting on the job (Rottenberg, 1956), initial compensation was included as an organizational influence in the current study. Additionally, it was included in the current research project on account of the lack of existing field recruitment research which has specifically examined the consequences of initial organizational compensation, including attraction and retention (Gerhart & Rynes, 2003). Specifically, I propose that newcomers’ positive perceptions of organizational compensation will lead to higher levels of pre-entry expectations. Although the impact of certain job and organizational characteristics on pre-entry expectations (namely fit perceptions) has been examined in at least one longitudinal interview study involving graduating college students (see Rynes et al., 1991), I am not aware of any study that has empirically addressed the impact of compensation, relative to other organizational influences (e.g., the recruiter/interviewer), during the anticipatory socialization stage.

_Hypothesis 15_: Initial compensation will positively impact pre-entry expectations.

_Training/Orientation/Mentors_

Upon entry into the organization, newcomers are confronted with socialization efforts on the part of the organization. In an effort to reduce post-entry uncertainty, organizations use socialization tactics such training to manipulate not only the amount
and type of information that newcomers receive about their jobs and the larger organization, but also the source(s) from which they receive this information (Mignerey, Rubin, & Gorden, 1995). According to Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas, and Cannon-Bowers (1991), deliberate socialization efforts on the part of the organization (e.g., training) result in positive outcomes because they serve as a signal to newcomers that they are indeed valued by the organization. Newcomers perceive that the organization is committed to having them succeed on account of this provision of training, for example. In other words, “Why would the organization bother to provide training or orientation if they were not interested in fostering my growth and development?” is in part what goes through the newcomer’s head. These perceptions of organizational concern have been shown to result in improved adjustment (Jones, 1986) and value congruence (Chatman, 1991). Additionally, since organizational efforts like training are typically geared toward the instruction and/or clarification of job roles and responsibilities, the provision of these formalized socialization efforts has been associated with higher role clarity (Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Jones, 1986). Following an overview of Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) socialization tactics framework and Jones’ (1986) classification scheme, three of the most commonly cited examples of institutionalized socialization tactics in the existing literature (i.e., training, orientation, and mentorships) will be examined as forms of organizational influence, and the impact these tactics are expected to have on newcomer socialization during the early adjustment phase will be discussed (see Figure 5).

Tactics framework & classification scheme. As outlined in the original Van Maanen and Schein (1979) socialization tactics model, there are essentially six bipolar tactics that can be used to describe organizational efforts to structure newcomers’ early-
stage socialization experiences. Jones (1986) later categorized these six tactics into three broader factors: context tactics, content tactics, and social tactics. Context tactics are comprised of Van Maanen & Schein’s (1979) sub-dimensions of (a) collective versus individual tactics and (b) formal versus informal tactics. Organizations that use collective socialization tactics are in essence subjecting newcomers to common experiences as part of a collective, or a group. When newcomers are said to be individually socialized, they are typically socialized in isolation (i.e., separate from other newcomers). Similarly, newcomers who are not exposed to any socialization efforts on the part of the organization could also be characterized as individually socialized. In distinguishing among the formal and informal tactics, newcomers who are segregated from existing organizational members and trained off the job for example, are said to be experiencing formal socialization tactics. Conversely, minimal separation is involved during informal socialization processes. It is not uncommon for newcomers to be socialized in the company of more experienced incumbents when informal socialization tactics have been put in place.

According to Jones (1986) classification, content tactics include the Van Maanen & Schein (1979) dimensions of (a) sequential versus random tactics and (b) fixed versus variable tactics. Sequential tactics are enacted according to a pre-defined order. newcomers are apprised of the steps that must be completed in order to pass onto the next phase. With the use of random tactics, newcomers are placed in more ambiguous situations. They do not necessarily know what steps they must take and/or what phases they must pass through in order to become full-fledged organizational members. Separately, fixed tactics are exercised according to a specific timetable. Newcomers are
made aware of the specific date or end-point at which they will have completed the socialization process. Variable tactics, on the other hand, do not take place according to a designated timeline. The organization either has no pre-defined end point to determine the completion of the socialization process, or they have deliberately left open their options to shorten or extend the socialization process depending upon a newcomer’s performance thus far.

The social tactics category (Jones, 1986) is comprised of (a) serial versus disjunctive tactics and (b) investiture versus divestiture tactics (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Organizations can opt whether or not to assign mentors or role models to newcomers as they begin the socialization process. Newcomers who are socialized with the help of organizational insiders are exposed to serial tactics, while those who have not been assigned a mentor or role model are socialized using disjunctive tactics. By using investiture tactics, organizations ensure that newcomers receive positive feedback and affirmation of their status as an organizational member during the socialization process; whereas organizations using divestiture tactics may go so far as to purposely provide negative feedback and actually discount newcomers’ importance within the organization until the newcomers have become officially socialized.

In addition to defining the context, content, and social tactics categories, Jones (1986) devised the institutionalized versus individualized classification scheme. According to his framework, institutionalized socialization involves the use of collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, and investiture tactics. As a group, institutionalized tactics help to reduce newcomer uncertainty by exposing newcomers to a relatively structured and well laid out set of socialization procedures and processes. In devising
socialization tactics that are up front and straightforward in their approach, organizations are making deliberate attempts to socialize newcomers to accept the status quo and to refrain from questioning the job-related steps and procedures that have been explicitly outlined by the organization (Saks & Ashforth, 1997b). Conversely, individualized socialization takes place using individual, informal, random, variable, disjunctive, and divestiture tactics. By avoiding the use of overly structured, well-defined socialization procedures, organizations are implicitly prompting innovation and creativity among newcomers as they strive to adapt to unfamiliar roles and responsibilities (Saks & Ashforth, 1997b).

Throughout the literature, organizational socialization tactics have been examined as a single, all-encompassing factor (e.g., Ashforth, Saks, & Lee, 1998; Kim et al., 2005), as three factors according to the content, context, and social classification scheme (e.g., Cable & Parsons, 2001), and as six factors using the original Van Maanen & Schein (1979) framework (e.g., Ashforth & Saks, 1996). In a recent study, Gruman and colleagues (2006) actually compared the fit of these three models and concluded that the 1-factor model exhibited the best fit. In a majority of the research that has examined the role of socialization tactics (whether in the form of 1, 3, or 6 factors), full or modified versions of Jones’ (1986) original 6-dimension, 30-item scale have been used. According to Saks et al. (2007), the continuing use of this scale has been a major limitation of the socialization research to date. For one, the reliabilities of the individual dimensions have been low in some studies and have been noticeably varied across studies (see Allen & Meyer, 1990; Baker, 1989; Baker & Feldman, 1990; Black, 1992; Jones, 1986, as cited in Saks et al., 2007). A second issue with continued use of this scale has been the tendency
in some instances to use modified versions of the original scales. Conceptually, the use of modified scales is likely to lead to inaccurate assumptions regarding the relationships between socialization tactics and relevant outcomes. As each of the scale items across the six dimensions was originally designed by Jones (1986) to tap into separate areas of the tactics domain, the shortening or modifying of these scales potentially eliminates important information (Saks et al., 2007). Empirically speaking, the alteration of Jones’ (1986) scales has been a problem because the shortened or modified scales have exhibited significantly lower reliabilities than the full scales, which themselves have been problematic (Ashforth & Saks, 1996). Most recently, Saks and colleagues (2007) meta-analytic findings indicated that stronger tactics-outcomes relationships were obtained when Jones’ (1986) complete scales were used.

Ultimately, the use of one or more forms of socialization tactics should not only reduce newcomer uncertainty (therefore impacting perceptions of role clarity), but this use should also impact employee attitudes such as job satisfaction. Given the aversiveness of uncertainty (White, 1974), any actions taken by the organization to alleviate this discomfort are likely to leave newcomers feeling more satisfied and more integrated into their new work settings. Additionally, the provision of at least one of these organization socialization tactics should contribute toward meeting psychological contract needs, which in turn should lead to positive adjustment attitudes such as job satisfaction (e.g., Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). As a form of social exchange, an organization’s use of training for example, indicates to newcomers that the organization is initially willing to satisfy their end of the deal in the employment relationship. Newcomers in turn, may then begin to feel as though the organization does indeed care
about their well-being and as a result, newcomers may perceive that their goals/values are in alignment with those of the organization.

*Training.* Training – the first of the proposed early adjustment organizational influences (see Figure 5) – has clearly been the predominant socialization tactic used by many organizations. The extent to which training has been used has led to the perception, at least among practitioners, that the terms *training* and *organizational socialization* are synonymous (Feldman, 1989). In the current study however, this is not the case. Training is discussed as one (albeit the primary) socialization tactic employed by the organization during the early adjustment period. As a socialization tactic, training has been fairly successful in improving newcomer attitudes toward the organization and increasing the likelihood that newcomers will remain after the initial adjustment period ends. There has been some inconsistency across researchers however, in how training (as a socialization tactic) has been measured. Some researchers have examined the *amount* of training (Saks, 1996), while others have looked at training *helpfulness* (Louis, Posner, & Powell, 1983; Saks, 1996). Additionally, training *fulfillment* (Tannenbaum et al., 1991), training *availability* (Louis et al., 1983), *perceived access* to training (Bartlett, 2001), and *prior participation* in training (Birdi, Allan, & Warr, 1997) have been researched. Except for training availability, the other aforementioned measures of training have been tied to positive adjustment outcomes (Louis et al., 1983). Specifically, both training amount and helpfulness have been linked to higher newcomer job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and reduced turnover intentions (Louis et al., 1983; Saks, 1996). Met expectations regarding the training experience (i.e., fulfillment) have been strongly related to higher newcomer self-efficacy and increased organizational
commitment (Tannenbaum et al., 1991). Finally, prior participation in training has been positively linked to newcomer job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Birdi et al., 1997).

In the current study, training was operationalized according to the Jones’ (1986) institutionalized-individualized classification framework. Newcomers exposed to institutionalized tactics, specifically training that was considered to be formal, collective, sequential, and fixed, were contrasted with newcomers who experienced more individualized tactics (i.e., informal, individual, random, and variable training). Despite the concerns voiced by Saks et al. (2007) regarding the predominant use of Jones’ (1986) socialization scales, the results obtained from many of these empirical studies have been highly consistent (Saks et al., 2007). Institutionalized tactics have proven to be stronger than individualized tactics in influencing relevant adjustment outcomes. Multiple studies, along with two sets of recent meta-analytic findings (see Bauer et al., 2007 and Saks et al., 2007), have found institutionalized tactics to be predictive of (a) learning-related outcomes, such as higher role clarity (e.g., Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003; Mignerey et al., 1995; Saks & Ashforth, 1997a), (b) adjustment attitudes, including higher job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and met expectations (e.g., Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Bauer et al., 1998; Cable & Judge, 1996; Saks & Ashforth, 1997b), and (c) fit perceptions (e.g., Allen, 2006; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Cooper-Thomas, Van Vianen, & Anderson, 2004; Kim et al., 2005; Riordan et al., 2001). Individualized tactics on the other hand, have been more strongly associated with role innovation (e.g., Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Black & Ashford, 1995; Mignerey et al., 1995; Saks & Ashforth, 1997a). Given the
aforementioned research findings, I predict that the provision of formal training (i.e., institutionalized tactics) in the current organization will have a significant, positive impact on newcomer adjustment attitudes, while informal training (i.e., individualized tactics) will have little to no impact.

*Hypothesis 16*: Institutionalized tactics (i.e., formal, sequential, collective, and fixed training) will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity.

**Orientation programs.** Despite the fairly widespread use of orientation programs (i.e., the second proposed early adjustment organization influence shown in Figure 5) within workplace settings (Saks & Ashforth, 1997b), there has not been nearly enough research to support their continued use (Wanous, 1993). In fact, the little research that has been done might lead one to the conclusion that these programs are a waste of organizational resources. Research evidence suggests for example, that the availability of these programs is not related to common adjustment outcomes (e.g., organizational commitment, turnover intentions), and that newcomers consider these orientation programs to be only somewhat helpful (see Chatman, 1991; Louis et al., 1983; Nelson & Quick, 1991; Saks, 1996). In the current study, I based my hypothesis that newcomers will in fact experience greater post-entry adjustment when they perceive that formal orientation programs have been helpful on past research evidence showing a positive (albeit modest) relationship between orientation programs and adjustment.

*Hypothesis 17*: Orientation programs will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity.

**Mentors.** The assignment of mentors as an explicit, serial socialization tactic appears to have achieved greater success than the use of formal orientation programs. Accordingly, mentors function as the third seemingly relevant organizational influence in
the context of the early adjustment phase of the newcomer socialization model (see Figure 5). Mentors serve dual functions in that they are commonly expected to provide career-related guidance, as well as psychosocial support (Kram, 1983). Job satisfaction has been one of the most commonly reported outcomes of mentorships (e.g., Chao, 1997; Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Fagenson, 1989). In addition, involvement with a mentor has been linked to newcomer perceptions of greater goals/values congruence with the organization (e.g., Chao, 1997; Chao et al., 1992). I therefore propose that the use of mentors will lead to positive post-entry outcomes in the context of the current study.

_Hypothesis 18:_ Mentors will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity.

As with proactive behaviors, newcomers will attempt to try and reconcile information gained prior to organizational entry with post-entry information and experiences. Specifically, I anticipate that newcomers will continue to evaluate the accuracy of pre-entry beliefs in the midst of evaluating training, orientation, and/or mentorship experiences, and in doing so will not discard either source of information. Thus, I propose that both pre-entry beliefs and socialization tactics enacted by the organization (i.e., training, orientation, and/or mentorships) will significantly impact early adjustment.

_Hypothesis 19:_ Institutionalized tactics (i.e., formal, sequential, collective, and fixed training) will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity above and beyond pre-entry expectations.

_Hypothesis 20:_ Orientation programs will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity above and beyond pre-entry expectations.

_Hypothesis 21:_ Mentorships will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity above and beyond pre-entry expectations.
**Social Support**

Undoubtedly, one of the biggest steps that an organization can take in an effort to socialize newcomers is to provide them with training. In addition to training, organizations are indirectly responsible for newcomers’ exposure to existing organizational members (e.g., supervisors, coworkers). Social support therefore, represents the fourth influence enacted by the organization during the early adjustment phase (see Figure 5). This exposure to experienced insiders has a tremendous impact on how newcomers adjust to their new environment, including how they obtain information, how much information they obtain, and how they interpret and respond to newly acquired information. In spite of the fact that supervisors and coworkers clearly seem to function as a collective socializing force on behalf of the larger organization, only one other empirical study (i.e., Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003) has positioned this social support network as a type of organization socialization tactic. The present study attempts to increase the depth of this research by positioning supervisor and coworker support as an explicit organization socialization tactic.

There has been no shortage of evidence highlighting the importance of supervisors and coworkers in the socialization of newcomers. Compared to other organizational representatives, supervisors and coworkers do in fact have the most intimate and frequent contact with newcomers. Accordingly, success in obtaining role and task information from supervisors has been tied to higher role adjustment (Bauer & Green, 1998), job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). In a separate study, newcomers identified supervisors as their most important socializing influence (Anakwe & Greenhaus, 1999). Additionally, in the context of
newcomer adjustment, social support was found to have a compensatory effect, such that effective interactions with supervisors mitigated the negative effects brought about by unmet expectations (Major, Kozlowski, Chao, & Gardner, 1992; as cited in Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992).

In their socialization research, Moreland and Levine (2001) reported that socialization into one’s work group (i.e., successful integration) is more critical for some newcomers than being socialized into the larger organizational environment. Given that coworkers have been identified as one of the most important sources of work group information (Morrison, 1993b; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992), it seems rather intuitive that there would be a strong link between the socializing influences of coworkers and successful newcomer adjustment within the work group, if not within the overall organization. Supporting studies have shown that having supportive and informative interpersonal resources (e.g., coworkers) leads to increased job satisfaction (Anderson & Thomas, 1996; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2005; Louis et al., 1983), organizational commitment, and greater intentions to remain (Louis et al., 1983).

In many studies, the influence of these organizational representatives has been considered separate from more formalized organizational influences such as training. Along these lines, the current study empirically separates supervisors and coworkers from the organization in terms of socializing influences. However, in keeping with the proposed model in the current study (comparing employee and organizational influences), supervisors and coworkers are conceptually grouped under the heading of organizational influence, given that they are to a certain extent under the control of the organization rather than under the control of the employee. Accordingly, perceived
support from supervisors and co-workers (as a form of organizational influence) is expected to have a positive impact on newcomer adjustment in the current study.

_Hypothesis 22:_ Social support will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, and (c) role clarity.

Once again, I propose that newcomers will not automatically discount the usefulness of pre-entry experiences upon entry into the organization. As a result, successful early adjustment will likely be the result of positive post-entry supervisor and co-workers interactions, as well as positive pre-entry beliefs.

_Hypothesis 23:_ Social support will positively impact (a) job satisfaction, (b) P-O fit perceptions, (c) role clarity above and beyond pre-entry expectations.

**Recognition & Development**

Once newcomers have entered into the organization, received training/orientation, and been inducted into their respect work groups, they are now expected to perform. As newcomers begin to engage in task-relevant behaviors, representatives of the organization begin to evaluate their performance and subsequently consider advancement opportunities. Temporally speaking, organizational interventions such as training, orientation, and mentoring are followed by interventions related to performance evaluation and career development (shown in the final outcomes stage of the model). In this final organizational influence section, the ways in which performance recognition and career development purportedly affect newcomer socialization during the final outcomes phase is reviewed (see Figure 5).

**Performance recognition.** Generally speaking, newcomers respond more positively to situations perceived as fair and more negatively to situations perceived to be unjust. This is known as the fair process effect (Folger, 1977) and is one of the most
replicated findings in the social psychology literature (Van den Bos, Wilke, & Lind, 1998). Thus, there should be no doubt that newcomers who perceive they have been evaluated and rewarded in a fair manner will respond more positively than those who feel they have been unfairly evaluated and/or rewarded. What is in doubt however, is the degree to which newcomers will negatively react to perceptions of injustice. I propose there are several reasons why performance recognition might indeed impact newcomers’ decisions to remain with an organization.

Going back to the earlier discussion about the importance of P-O fit, it seems reasonable to conclude that newcomers’ perceptions of fit are going to be affected by organizational justice perceptions. If newcomers feel for example, that the organization is evaluating and rewarding their performance in a fair and equitable manner, they are more likely to perceive the organization as one that adheres to a strict sense of fairness when dealing with employees, and thus provides a better fit. On the other hand, an evaluation and reward structure that is perceived to be politically driven, and hence extremely unfair, is likely to result in greater value incongruence within the minds of newcomers. A study conducted by Kirschenbaum and Weisberg (1990) found evidence to support this contention. In their study, employees who failed to receive a promotion experienced greater feelings of inequity and ultimately resorted to turnover as a means to rectify this perceived imbalance. In another study, performance recognition had a negative impact on turnover intentions (Pare & Tremblay, 2007). Specifically, employees who perceived that the organization had failed to recognize their performance in an adequate or fair manner reported greater intentions of leaving the organization. Therefore, I propose that the extent to which newcomers perceive they have been
evaluated and rewarded in an equitable manner will serve to negatively impact subsequent turnover behaviors.

*Hypothesis 24:* Performance recognition will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

*Career development.* Over the last two decades, our society has witnessed a technological explosion in terms of the ways in which communication and interactions patterns within the workplace have been drastically altered. Aided by advancements in technology, organizations have become increasingly adept at expanding their global presence in the marketplace. These positive societal changes have not come about without a price however. In order to keep pace with these societal changes, organizations have begun to engage in massive restructuring, to the detriment of a large portion of the American workforce. Further, as a direct result of downsizing there has been a confluence of unprecedented changes to the psychological contract (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Rousseau, 1998; Rousseau & Wade-Benzoni, 1995). According to the norms of the “old” psychological contract, organizations were obligated to provide high levels of job security in exchange for continued loyalty and commitment to the organization. Past organizational structures facilitated this form of exchange because they were typically comprised of steep hierarchies with multiple rungs (i.e., job levels) that employees could climb in attempting to ascend the corporate ladder. More recently, downsizing has resulted in flatter, leaner organizations consisting of fewer job levels (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996). Whereas the traditional career model (e.g., enacted within steeply structured organizational settings) supported a one or two-job career, today’s workers expect to change jobs (and possibly occupations) multiple times throughout their career life cycles (Sullivan, 1999).
Recognizing that workers were becoming less and less likely to follow the traditional career path in response to these organizational changes, researchers began to examine new types of career models, most notably the boundaryless career model (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996). As previously mentioned, the traditional career model is one in which employees (a) advance through the ranks of one, maybe two organizations and (b) exchange loyalty for job security. Additionally, the traditional career path specifies that (c) employee skills are firm specific, (d) success is measured according to pay, promotion, and status, (e) training is conducted via formal programs, and (f) the organization is primarily held responsible for career management. According to the specifications of the boundaryless career model, employees (a) work for multiple firms (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996; Osterman, 1996), (b) exchange performance for employability (Altman & Post, 1996; Hall & Mirvis, 1996; Rousseau, 1990; Rousseau & Wade-Benzoni, 1995), (c) acquire transferable skills (Arthur, Claman, & DeFillippi, 1995; Baker & Aldrich, 1996; Bird, 1996), (d) measure success in terms of psychologically meaningful work (Mirvis & Hall, 1996; Mohrman & Cohen, 1995), (e) participate in on-the-job training (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1998), and (f) take personal responsibility for their own career management (Brousseau, Driver, Eneroth, & Larsson, 1996; Hall, 1996).

The impact of career development (compared to performance recognition) on retention is not necessarily as straightforward. As previously mentioned, the norms of the newer psychological contract dictate that employees have greater flexibility in how often they terminate employment with one organization and seek employment elsewhere. Expectations of increased inter-organizational movement are on the rise as the number of
employees choosing to remain with only one or two organizations throughout their career life spans continues to decrease. If in fact their careers have no boundaries (i.e., boundaryless careers), present generation employees are more likely to seek out multiple job opportunities across multiple organizations throughout their careers. Similarly, the expectations regarding career management have changed as a result of this newer contract. Employees no longer place complete responsibility on the organization, but instead take the burden of career management upon their own shoulders (Arnold, 1997). Accordingly, employees with a proactive stance toward career development are less likely to be impacted by the organization’s failure to engage in career development activities than newcomers still wed to the more traditional career model.

Despite the emerging interest in newer psychological contracts and boundaryless careers, the fact remains that a substantial number of employees still operate according to the principles of the older psychological contract in that they expect some level of career development assistance (Sturges, Guest, Conway, & Mackenzie Davey, 2002). For these individuals, an organization’s failure to provide career development opportunities may be perceived as a violation of the psychological contract, which could then have a direct impact on decisions to leave the organization and seek out more stable employment elsewhere (Sturges, Conway, Guest, & Liefooghe, 2005). Additionally, failure to show interest in a newcomer’s career progression may inadvertently send incongruent value messages to newcomers. Thus, newcomers may perceive P-O fit to be out of alignment if they perceive an organization is unwilling to invest in their future.

Research concerning the impact of career development on retention is somewhat limited. One line of research suggests that employees operating under the principles of
the older psychological contract will be negatively impacted when organizations violate their end of the contract by failing to offer career development opportunities. In turn, employees are expected to rectify this perceived inequity by leaving the organization. In support, Pare and Tremblay (2007) found that career development inadequacies were significantly and negatively tied to turnover intentions. However, it should be noted that this particular study was of a cross-sectional nature, and therefore researchers could not evaluate the direct impact of career development on actual turnover.

In a separate line of research, social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) posits that employees receiving some form of support from their employer will feel obligated to reciprocate (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). Along these lines, perceived organizational support has been negatively linked to turnover (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Thus, some researchers have argued that when employees perceive career development as a form of organizational support, they are more likely to reciprocate in the form of sustained tenure for example (Sturges et al., 2005).

The current study attempted to uncover additional evidence to support the existence of a link between absent or inadequate career development on the part of the organization with actual employee turnover. On the one hand, boundaryless career theorists might argue that employees in the 21st century will not be negatively impacted by an organization’s failure to offer career development due to the fact that career development falls more in the hands of the employee under the provisions of the newer contract (e.g., Arnold, 1997). I, on the other hand, would argue that numerous organizations still exist – the current organization being one such example – that continue to operate according to the terms of the older psychological contract. Largely as a result
of the relative instability of the industry in which the current organization operates, along with the physical absence of direct competitors within the surrounding communities, the current organization has had to maintain a “golden handcuffs” culture in an effort to retain current employees and recruit new ones. As part of this particular culture, the current organization adheres to a more traditional psychological contract in that it offers exceptional benefits and work incentives (including a commitment to long-term career development) at the start of employment. In return, high performance and sustained commitment are expected. I therefore propose, within the context of the current organization, that newcomers will perceive the organization’s failure to provide development opportunities (as per the terms of the older psychological contract) as a violation of the underlying employment agreement. These perceptions in turn, will result in increased feelings of inequity and poor fit, and eventually will lead to organizational departure. The reader is referred to Figure 5 for a graphic overview of all organizational influence hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 25:** Career development will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

I further propose that performance recognition and career development will continue to have a significant impact on turnover intentions and turnover, even when adjustment attitudes and perceptions (i.e., job satisfaction, P-O fit perceptions, and role clarity) are taken into account. Early adjustment phase criteria on the one hand, represent satisfaction-, fit-, and uncertainty-based responses to early adjustment events and information. Organizational influence activities like performance recognition and career development on the other hand, induce equity-based responses. Thus it is possible for newcomer turnover to be simultaneously impacted by cognitive and affective reactions.
generated during the early adjustment phase, along with reactions generated during the final outcomes phase, as these reactions are differentially grounded.

Hypothesis 26: Performance recognition will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 27: Performance recognition will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond P-O fit perceptions.

Hypothesis 28: Performance recognition will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond role clarity.

Hypothesis 29: Career development will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 30: Career development will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond P-O fit perceptions.

Hypothesis 31: Career development will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond role clarity.

TACTICS-OUTCOMES STABILITY

There seems to be little disagreement among researchers that newcomers manifest perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors as a result of socialization efforts relatively early in their tenure (Major & Kozlowski, 1997). As an example, Major and colleagues (1992) found that differences in socialization outcomes were discernible after only four weeks. There is additional evidence to suggest that perceptions formed at the on-set of employment are predictive of subsequent adjustment. In Morrison’s (1993b) study, outcome measures collected at the point of organizational entry were strongly related to outcome measures captured six months later. Adkins (1995) further underscored the stability of early attitude formation during the socialization experience, as newcomers’ predictions of future job satisfaction in his study were indeed the strongest predictors of actual satisfaction up to six months later. Saks & Ashforth (1997b) went on to interpret
these findings – rapid change in adjustment during the early part of the socialization process, followed up by relative adjustment stability – as evidence that relevant socialization variables ought to be measured in the earliest stages of this process.

Despite agreement that important socialization outcomes occur within a relatively short time span, researchers have exhibited tremendous variability in choosing end points at which to measure socialization outcomes. Past studies have utilized measurement endpoints of 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 12 months in assessing early adjustment for example (e.g., Adkins, 1995; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Ashforth et al., 2007; Ashford & Black, 1996; Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Bauer et al., 2007; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2005; Jones, 1986; Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). In addition to this inconsistency in measurement timing, researchers have also been at odds as to whether or not measures of socialization tactics and adjustment can be collected at the same time without compromising the validity of the findings. Theoretically speaking, the evidence supporting a strong tactics-outcomes relationship at a very early point in the socialization process (as described above) would suggest that results are less affected by the overall research design and more affected by the timing of initial tactics measurements. If researchers wait until at least one month after the organization has begun to administer socialization tactics before beginning to measure this use of tactics, tactics-outcomes relationships measured cross-sectionally versus longitudinally may yield minimal variation in adjustment. Specifically, studies employing longitudinal designs, whereby tactics measures are collected at the one month tenure mark and outcomes measures are collected roughly three months later (one of the most typical data collection intervals; see Bauer et al., 2007 meta-analysis), should produce results similar
to cross-sectional findings, given the moderately high level of adjustment stability that newcomers purportedly endure during the first six months. Alternatively, if tactics are measured prior to four weeks tenure (i.e., adjustment has not occurred), there is a greater likelihood that differences will be present across adjustment measures collected concurrently with tactics, versus those collected three or more months later.

Once the timeframe for collecting tactics measures has been determined, an appropriate consideration is whether to measure tactics and outcomes simultaneously or longitudinally. As previously mentioned, researchers might have greater flexibility in deciding whether to measure outcomes and tactics together or separately if tactics are being measured shortly after the initial adjustment has occurred (e.g., four weeks). In choosing to measure tactics during the latter adjustment period (i.e., beyond the six month mark) however, researchers must use caution in measuring tactics and outcomes simultaneously. Because considerably less socialization research has been conducted looking at adjustment between the sixth month and one year tenure mark, one cannot convincingly say whether the effects of socialization tactics remain strong after six months or whether these effects begin to diminish. Thus, the strength of this cross-sectional relationship assessed beyond six months of tenure may be more a reflection of the study’s measurement design (i.e., variables measured at the same time tend to be more strongly related) than of a strong relationship, whereas the weaker tactics-outcomes relationship collected from the longitudinal design may in actuality reflect a decrease in socialization effects.

In the current study, socialization tactics and adjustment data were collected at multiple points in time during newcomers’ first year inside the organization (see Figure
Measures were initially collected at eight weeks (i.e., beyond the suspected point at which some researchers believe initial adjustment has occurred). In turn, additional measures were collected at the six month and one year mark. Having repeated the cross-sectional measurement of both predictor and criterion variables at three points in time during the first year, I was not only able to compare and contrast the relative strengths of cross-sectional and longitudinal relationships, but I was also able to assess the strength of socialization influences (as reflected in measures of adjustment) across an entire year span. I propose that in all cases, cross-sectional measures will be more strongly related than longitudinal measures as a result of common-method bias. Additionally, I propose that there will be an actual decrease in the strength of socialization influences which will play out in the form of weaker relationships at the 1-year mark than at the 8-week or 6-month marks.

Hypothesis 32a: Tactics-adjustment relationships measured at 8 weeks of tenure will be stronger than relationships measured at 6 months.

Hypothesis 32b: Tactics-adjustment relationships measured at 6 months of tenure will be stronger than relationships measured at 1 year.

CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES

Thus far, I have described several of the employee and organizational factors that may directly or indirectly impact newcomers’ retention decisions. As the overall conceptual model illustrates (see Figure 1), newcomer attitudes and behaviors can be shaped by dual influences – those that originate within or immediately outside the organization and those that originate within or immediately outside the employee’s personal self. These dual influences form the inner framework of my socialization model. This framework falls short however, in failing to capture influences beyond the
newcomer and the organization that can impinge upon the socialization experience. The contextual influence section will begin with a review of the career mobility construct and six mobility perspectives (Ng et al., 2007) which account for the factors motivating (or inhibiting) individuals to seek out alternative employment opportunities. Specifically, I will describe how these six perspectives map onto the current socialization model (see Figure 2). Next, the construct of job embeddedness (Mitchell et al., 2001) and its three corresponding dimensions – fit, links, and sacrifice – will be discussed in terms of factors motivating individuals to remain in their current organization. The contextual influence section will conclude by highlighting the relevance of the job embeddedness construct in understanding employee retention in the context of the current study.

**Career Mobility**

Ng and colleagues (2007) recently identified six mobility perspectives, aimed at capturing the totality of influences purported to affect employees’ decisions to stay or leave their current organization (as cited in Feldman & Ng, 2007). Three of these perspectives – the organizational perspective, the social support/group cohesiveness perspective, and the personality/personal style perspective – have already been addressed in earlier sections of the paper, and as a result, will only be reviewed in brief detail below. The personal life perspective – the fourth mobility perspective – has not been addressed up to this point, and thus will be discussed in thorough detail throughout the remainder of this section. The final two perspectives – the structural and occupational perspectives – will also be discussed, albeit briefly in the current section. The scope of the current however, limits the evaluation of all possible influences affecting newcomers throughout the employment life-cycle, and as a result, structural and occupational
perspectives have not been included in the final operational model for empirical testing purposes.

**Organizational perspective.** According to organizational perspective, there are many factors under the direct control of the organization that serve to influence employee mobility (Malos & Campion, 2000). Examples cited by Feldman and Ng (2007) include staffing and compensation policies, pension and insurance benefits’ structures, and socialization practices. As an illustration, the degree to which an organization tends to promote from within its existing ranks versus looks outside the company for hiring purposes is likely to impact employees’ decisions to remain with the organization. Similarly, compensation policies that favor the highest performers versus those that distribute rewards equally across a range of performance levels will have implications for who stays and who goes. In the current study, the structural perspective is represented in the form of socialization practices, specifically training, orientation, and mentoring (i.e., training & social support box). To the extent that socialization practices such as the provision of training are successful at increasing role understanding, the structural perspective posits that newcomers will be less likely to leave the organization.

**Social support & group cohesiveness perspective.** The social support and group cohesiveness perspective proposes that aspects of the work group experience, including the degree of demographic similarity among group members, the level of task interdependence, and the degree of person-group fit tend to exert considerable influence on employees’ turnover considerations (Feldman & Ng, 2007). As an example, research has shown that employees who are demographically different from other work group members exhibit increased tendencies to leave their organizations (Tsui, Egan, &
O’Reilly, 1992). Separately, high task interdependence among group members has been positively associated with increased commitment to the organization and increased willingness to remain (Bishop & Scott, 2000). This second mobility perspective is captured in the current socialization model in the form of supervisor and co-worker social support. In this vein, newcomers who perceive a high level of support from co-workers and/or supervisors will exhibit less mobility than those individuals who feel relatively isolated and unsupported.

**Personality & personal style perspective.** The personality and personal style perspective is reflected in the current model in the form of proactive behaviors. According to this third perspective, stable employee dispositional factors (e.g., attachment styles, personality traits, career interests) can have a noticeable impact on employees’ decisions to seek employment elsewhere. Employees with fearful attachment styles for example, may engage in frequent job-changing behavior as a way to avoid committing to various work relationships (Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000; Wolfe & Betz, 2004), while securely attached employees may experience greater upward mobility within the same organization due to their tendencies to view themselves and others more positively (Blustein, Prezioso, & Schultheiss, 1995). Although I did not propose and subsequently test a personality trait per se in the current study, I felt that ‘proactive behaviors’ served as a valid representation of the personality and personal style perspective, given that the exhibition of proactive behaviors can be indirectly tied to various personality variables such as proactivity, for example. In the spirit of the personality and personal style perspective, it is therefore expected that information-
seeking and relationship-building behaviors on the part of the employee will decrease mobility outside the organization.

*Structural perspective.* According to the structural perspective, employee mobility is largely seen as a consequence of factors tied to the labor market. Extensive sociological research has provided evidence to support vacancy-driven mobility at the individual level (e.g., DiPrete, De Graaf, Luijks, Tahlin, & Blosfeld, 1997; Fujiwara-Greve & Greve, 2000; Haveman & Cohen, 1994). In other words, employees are more likely to leave if there is a wide array of jobs available in the marketplace, and correspondingly less likely to leave if job availability is scarce. Macroeconomic conditions in particular, are one example of a structural factor that has been linked to employee mobility (as cited in Feldman & Ng, 2007). Specifically, when economic conditions are prosperous organizations are in a better position to expand, thereby increasing workforce capacity (Inkson, 1995). Additionally, advanced resources tied to economic development within a geographic region are also likely to attract potential workers as a greater number and variety of job opportunities become available (VanHam, Mulder, & Hooimeijer, 2001).

*Occupational perspective.* The occupational perspective posits that firms, industries, and occupations have their own unique characteristics, which in some cases make it easier and in other cases make it more difficult for employees to switch to alternative firms, industries, and/or occupations. Ng and colleagues (2007) propose that it is in fact these characteristics which can have a direct influence on whether employees switch jobs (i.e., different organization, same occupation) or whether they switch occupations (i.e., different organization, different occupation). A few of the more visible
differences among occupational groups include gender distribution levels and structure rigidity/permeability (Feldman & Ng, 2007). Some industries and occupations are more heavily dominated by males (e.g., construction), while other industries and occupations are much more difficult to break into. Professional athletes and cardiologists for example, undergo tremendous amounts of training and testing in order to be admitted into their respective occupations. There are such high levels of training specificity associated with these two occupations that a majority of workforce members could not suddenly and unexpectedly decide to switch from a prior occupation into one of these two roles.

*Personal life perspective.* In a perfect world individuals would self-select into the organizations in which they felt most at ease. That is to say, they would seek out and join organizations that espoused similar personalities and/or values. However, in the real world individuals are often prompted to accept employment in organizations that fall short of their idealized work settings. Not surprisingly, all individuals are influenced to a certain extent by their immediate friends and family, as well as the larger community in which they are embedded. This corresponds to the personal life perspective (Ng et al., 2007). Although this degree of influence may vary from person to person, the fact remains that employment seekers must often balance the needs and desires of those around them with their own personal organizational preferences. In extreme cases individuals are forced to enter into organizations that are completely at odds with their personal values and/or personalities in order to be able to meet some higher order obligations. Take for example, the bread-winning husband whose family has been forced to relocate to be able to care for ailing parents. This husband may have no other choice than to accept employment in the only organization that currently has a job opening,
regardless of the extent to which this man can “relate” to the organization. Thus, it is important to take these employee contextual influences into account when examining attitudes and behaviors throughout the employee life-cycle. Based upon past research that has shown newcomers’ perceptions of fit with their external communities to be predictive of newcomer turnover above and beyond the influence of other adjustment variables, the current study seeks to examine the family and community influences that affect newcomers’ decisions to terminate employment. Specifically, I will make the case using theory and findings from the job embeddedness literature that newcomers’ perceptions of fit with their external communities (i.e., off-the-job embeddedness), as well as their levels of kinship responsibility can be used to predict both actual turnover and preceding intentions to leave the organization. In order to make this case, a review of the job embeddedness literature is necessary.

**Embeddedness**

According to Lewin’s (1951) field theory, behavior is the product of a complex interaction between all the physical, psychological, social, and environmental forces in a person’s field (Allen, 2006). Every organizational newcomer is embedded within a field comprised of work and non-work domains. Forces within each domain are in a constant state of interaction as they work to influence behavior within that respective domain. In terms of understanding forces inside the workplace, individuals’ behaviors are influenced for example, by (a) long hours on the job (i.e., physical forces), (b) satisfaction with work (i.e., psychological forces), (c) positive interactions with supervisors (i.e., social forces), and (d) heavy traffic in extended commutes to work (i.e., environmental forces). Separately, (a) home maintenance responsibilities, (b) marriage happiness, (c) extended
support networks in close proximity, and (d) unsafe neighborhoods are some examples of forces that constantly impact behavior outside the workplace. Further complicating matters is the fact that forces from one domain are continually spilling over into the other domain despite the best of efforts to keep them apart. Work forces spill over into the non-work domain while non-work forces spill over into the work domain. As an illustration of spillover from work to family, long hours spent on the job may reduce the amount of time spent with a spouse and result in decreased marriage fulfillment. Conversely, staying home to care for a sick child may prevent an individual from attending a mandated training session at work, thereby resulting in negative supervisor feedback. This is an example of family-to-work spillover.

The construct of embeddedness – the strength of forces within one’s work and non-work domains – was originally introduced by Mitchell and colleagues in 2001 in an effort to improve the prediction of turnover in organizational settings. According to these researchers, embeddedness is comprised of three components – fit, links, and sacrifice – which can each be discussed in terms of work and non-work environments. On-the-job embeddedness is a composite of fit to the organization, links to the organization, and organization-related sacrifice dimensions. Off-the-job embeddedness represents fit to the community, links to the community, and community-related sacrifice.

**Fit.** As described by Mitchell et al. (2001), fit to the organization relates to employees’ perceptions that their skills and abilities are well-matched to organizational needs and that their goals and values are congruent with the goals and values underlying the organization’s mission. In essence, the fit to organization dimension is a combination of person-job and person-organization fit perceptions. As described in an earlier section
in the paper, fit perceptions do indeed impact turnover. Employees are more likely to leave an organization when they feel as though their goals and values do match up to those of the organization. Similarly, perceptions of *fit to the community* are derived from an employee’s sense that he is a viable member of the community and that he is able to participate in social groups and perform activities and hobbies that he enjoys within his community. Given the limited amount of research looking at specific facets of off-the-job embeddedness, it is not that surprising that direct relationships between fit to community and turnover have yet to be found.

*Links.* A significant, negative relationship was uncovered however, between the off-the-job embeddedness facet of *links to community* and actual turnover by Mitchell et al. (2001). Both *links to the organization* and links to the community involve the size and strength of personal connections that an employee has within his organization and community, respectively. For example, being a member of multiple work committees or interacting with an extensive network of superiors, peers, and subordinates will result in a sizable number of personal ties to the organization. The greater number of work ties, the less likely an employee is to leave the organization. In terms of links to the community, having a spouse who is employed within the community is one possible link. Because he would not only be forced to break his own community ties, but also those of his spouse, an employee with a working spouse might be less likely to leave his organization than one who was not married or whose spouse was not employed.

*Sacrifice.* As the names would imply, organization-related and community-related sacrifice are centered around organization and community attributes that would be lost if an employee were to leave the organization and possibly the community. The
more an employee stands to lose by severing ties with an organization, the more likely he/she is to reconsider their turnover intentions (Shaw, Delery, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1998). Leaving an organization might involve giving up excellent benefits or vast promotional opportunities for example. Organizational departure might further result in departure from the surrounding community, thus incurring additional sacrifices. Having to give up a safe neighborhood or a high level of respect among community members might cause an employee to think twice about leaving his/her job.

Predicting turnover. As previously mentioned, job embeddedness was largely conceived in an attempt to better understand why employees decide to leave an organization. In their original study, Mitchell et al. (2001) did in fact find that embeddedness was predictive of turnover above and beyond other antecedents such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. There has been minimal research conducted since Mitchell and colleagues’ (2001) unveiling of the job embeddedness construct however; and of the three most prominent studies that have been conducted, there have been somewhat conflicting results. In the 2006 study conducted by Allen, on-the-job embeddedness was a strong negative predictor of turnover, while off-the-job embeddedness exhibited no relationship to turnover. Conversely, Lee and colleagues (2004) found off-the-job embeddedness to be a strong negative predictor of turnover, while on-the-job embeddedness exhibited only a slight, negative correlation with turnover. Finally, results from the Mitchell et al. (2001) study indicated that both on-the-job and off-the-job embeddedness were negatively correlated with turnover. However, they only examined the overall construct of embeddedness (rather than the on-the-job and off-the-job dimensions) as a direct antecedent to turnover. Also, the study by
Mitchell and colleagues (2001) was the only study of the three to examine the relationship between embeddedness and turnover intentions. Although both on-the-job and off-the-job dimensions of embeddedness were negatively correlated with turnover intentions, embeddedness measures and turnover intentions were collected concurrently. Therefore, these researchers could not establish whether embeddedness actually predicted employees’ intentions to leave the organization.

The current study represents an attempt to not only clarify these earlier findings but to also examine the predictive ability of job embeddedness by collecting embeddedness measures and turnover intentions on separate occasions. As mentioned earlier, the focus in this study was primarily to understand the impact of contextual features on the employee influence side. In keeping with this focus, I elected to measure only off-the-job embeddedness. Additionally, I chose to represent off-the-job embeddedness as a single construct in the current study. As somewhat low reliability estimates that have been uncovered in previous research when individual facets have been measured, I opted not to segment off-the-job embeddedness into three separate facets. Based on previous research linking off-the-job embeddedness to turnover intentions and turnover, I predict that increased perceptions of community fit will reduce the likelihood that newcomers leave or even consider leaving the current organization. The reader is referred to Figure 7 for a graphic overview of contextual influence hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 33:** Community fit will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

As a final note on the depiction of contextual influences within the conceptual model of employment life-cycle socialization (see Figure 1), I would like to point out that
both employee and organizational influences are positioned within the same box to reflect the fact that organizations not only influence employees, in terms of their attitudes and behaviors (i.e., the focus of the current paper), but that employees also influence organizations. For example, a high rate of turnover within a particular organization during the first year of employment may be an indicator of ineffective recruitment and/or training practices. In response, an organization may opt to redesign the methods by which they recruit and/or train new employees. Using similar rationale, I’ve positioned community and industry influences within the same box. For example, a geographic region populated with many different types of industries is more likely to experience greater inhabitant diversity and increased community resources than a region with only one major industry. Additionally, I have positioned the employee and organizational influence boxes within the community and industry influence box to not only indicate that employees are impacted by the community and industry within which their organization is embedded (as described earlier in the paper), but to also reflect my belief that organizations themselves are impacted by industry and community forces. To illustrate, in response to dwindling community resources (owing in part to economic instability), organizations may begin to offer a wide array of benefits in an effort to retain valued employees. Likewise, organizations may offer increased incentives to applicants in response to rising levels of incentives being offered by direct industry competitors. Ultimately, all of the aforementioned forces are situated within the larger society influence box. From natural disasters to war involvement to national political power struggles, societal forces can exert a wide range of influence upon multiple aspects of the employment socialization experience. While the scope of the current paper limited my
ability to test all of the aforementioned relationships, I was able to directly examine the proposed impact of community forces on employee attitudes and behaviors. It is my hope that future researchers will opt to explore the additional relationships depicted in the conceptual model of employment life-cycle socialization. For a graphic overview of all relationships tested in the current study, the reader is referred to the measurement model of employment life-cycle socialization in Figure 8.

COMPENSATORY RELATIONSHIPS

The current dual influence model positions newcomer adjustment as the product of personal and organizational influences. I propose that in many cases these personal and organizational influences will not be completely balanced. Some newcomers may perceive that they are at the complete mercy of the organization and thus have little influence or control over their own adjustment. Conversely, others may minimize the importance of organizational interventions and instead feel empowered to take charge of their own socialization experiences. In either case, I propose that these influences will act in a compensatory manner, such that strong, positive employee influences will compensate for low or inadequate organization influences and vice versa (see Figure 9). For each proposed interaction, I anticipate that the most desirable employment life-cycle stage criteria (e.g., high pre-entry expectations during anticipatory socialization) will occur when both employee and organizational influences are strong and positive, while the least desirable outcomes will occur when both employee and organizational influences are weak and/or negative. For example, the combination of extensive prior occupational experience and highly positive evaluations of the recruitment process will likely result in the highest possible level of newcomer pre-entry expectations.
Conversely, minimal prior experience and weak and/or negative evaluations of the recruitment process are likely to result in the lowest possible level of newcomer pre-entry expectations. The remaining two interactive conditions however, are of greater interest in the current study. Specifically, I aim to investigate whether (a) strong(er) employee influences and weak(er) organizational influences or (b) weaker(er) employee influences and strong(er) organizational influences, lead to more desirable employment life-cycle outcomes. To my knowledge, no other study has examined the impact of employee and organizational influences on newcomer adjustment from a compensatory perspective. Thus, there is no empirical base upon which to support a specific direction of influence. Therefore, the remaining six hypotheses are strictly exploratory in nature.

*Hypothesis 34:* The interaction of prior occupational experience and (a) recruitment source, (b) recruitment process, and (c) initial compensation will be related to the level of pre-entry expectations.

According to the same logic outlined in the anticipatory stage, employee and organization influences are proposed to act in a compensatory manner during the early adjustment stage. High(er) levels of one influence will act to counter-balance low(er) levels of the other influence.

*Hypothesis 35:* The interaction of proactive behaviors and (a) training, (b) orientation, (c) mentors, and (d) supervisor and co-worker social support will be related to the level of job satisfaction.

*Hypothesis 36:* The interaction of proactive behaviors and (a) training, (b) orientation, (c) mentors, and (d) supervisor and co-worker social support will be related to the level of P-O fit perceptions.

*Hypothesis 37:* The interaction of proactive behaviors and (a) training, (b) orientation, (c) mentors, and (d) supervisor and co-worker social support will be related to the level of role clarity.
Similar to the anticipatory and adjustment stages, employee and organization influences within the final outcomes stage are proposed to act in a compensatory manner. High(er) levels of one influence will compensate for low(er) levels of the other influence.

*Hypothesis 38:* The interaction of household responsibility and (a) performance recognition and (b) career development will be related to turnover intentions.

*Hypothesis 39:* The interaction of household responsibility and (a) performance recognition and (b) career development will be related to actual turnover.

**SUMMARY**

The current study begins to bridge the existing recruitment-socialization gap by synthesizing respective findings from these two domains in an effort to more accurately model newcomer socialization from beginning to end. Through the use of the proposed dual influence socialization model, consisting of employee and organizational influences working in a compensatory manner to influence newcomer socialization, I attempt to model the socialization experiences of newcomers by examining relevant criteria at the anticipatory, adjustment, and outcomes stages. I conclude by defining the broader context in which the newcomer socialization experience is embedded and examining the degree to which newcomer retention is directly influenced by factors beyond the boundaries of the organization.
METHODS

Overview of Data Collection

Archival survey data collected from the HR records of a U.S. multinational pharmaceutical company tracked the progression of 1709 individuals hired between January 2004 and December 2006 from pre-entry employment acceptance through employment termination. In an effort to maximize the amount of data available in the analysis of each employment stage, while simultaneously mitigating the problems associated with missing responses, data was partitioned into one of three temporally distinct phases: anticipatory socialization (phase 1), early adjustment (phase 2), and final outcomes (phase 3). Data from respondents who had completed surveys from all three phases was included in subsequent phase 4 analyses. The reader is referred to Figure 10 for a visual overview of data collection phases and relevant measures.

Phase 1 – Anticipatory socialization stage. Upon acceptance of an offer of employment with the current organization, individuals received a pre-entry survey in the mail. They were instructed to return the survey prior to their first day on the job. Constructs and variables measured in the pre-entry survey included (a) prior occupational experience, (b) recruitment/interview process effectiveness, (c) recruiter/interviewer effectiveness, (d) initial compensation, and (e) overall expectations concerning future employment with the current organization.

The phase 1 sample consisted of 581 respondents. The average age of these individuals was 30 (range = 21-55, mode = 22). Fifty-nine percent of respondents were female, while 83% of the entire sample was white. Sixty percent of the sample reported having a spouse or partner and 27% indicated that they had one or more children under
the age of 18 still living at home. The largest percentage of respondents (81%) were employed in the sales and marketing division. Furthermore, 78% of the respondent sample served as sales representatives. More than 85% of participants had been employed by at least one other organization prior to accepting employment at the current company.

**Phase 2 – Early adjustment stage.** The early adjustment survey was administered at three points in time during the first year of employment. Beginning in March 2004, employees who had reached the 8-week tenure mark (i.e., those hired in January 2004), received an email requesting completion of an online survey pertaining to early-stage socialization experiences (e.g., training) and subsequent early adjustment (e.g., role clarity). Employees were requested to complete an identical early adjustment survey at the six-month tenure mark and again at the one-year mark. There were multiple variables and constructs measured with the early adjustment survey, including (a) demographic characteristics, (b) proactive behaviors, (c) training/orientation effectiveness, (d) involvement with a mentor, (e) social support, (f) role clarity, (g) P-O fit perceptions, (h) met expectations, (i) job satisfaction, (j) household support and responsibility, and (k) employee embeddedness within the community setting.

There were 1510 respondents included in phase 2 analyses. Participants ranged in age from 19 to 62 (mean = 31). Similar to phase 1, the mode age for this sample was 22. Fifty-four percent of respondents were female and 81% were white. Sixty-three percent of the sample indicated having a spouse or partner, while 34% reported having at least 1 child under the age of 18 still living at home. The largest percentage of respondents were employed in the sales and marketing division (60%). The next highest percentage (18%)
reported working in the science and technology division. Fifty-seven percent of the phase 2 sample worked as sales representative, while 12% worked as scientists (e.g., biologist, chemist). Like the phase 1 sample, more than 88% of survey participants had been previously employed by at least one other company prior to joining the current organization. Furthermore, more than one-third of the sample (36%) reported having worked for at least three organizations prior to accepting their current position.

**Phase 3 – Final outcomes stage.** Between June 2005 and August 2007, employees were randomly chosen (among a sample of all current organizational members) to participate in an online survey pertaining to latter stage socialization experiences (e.g., career development). Employees did not receive more than one email invitation per 12-month period. For those employees who completed more than 1 survey across this 26-month period, only the most recent survey was included in the current analyses. Additionally, the responses from employees who completed the final outcomes survey prior to completing the 8-week adjustment survey were not included in the current analyses. Demographic characteristics and three additional constructs were measured in the outcomes survey, including (a) performance recognition, (b) career development, and (c) turnover intentions.

The phase 3 sample consisted of 1442 respondents, 53% of whom were female. The age demographics of phase 3 participants were identical to those observed in phase 2 (mean = 31, range = 19-62, mode = 22). Within this sample, 82% identified themselves as white, 65% reported having a spouse or partner, and 36% indicated having at least one dependent child (under the age of 18) still living at home. In terms of functional areas, 56% of the sample was employed in the sales and marketing division, while 20% was
directly involved in science and technology. More than half of the respondent sample (53%) worked as sales representatives, while about 13% were employed as scientists. Thirty-eight percent of participants had worked for at least three previous organizations prior to joining the current company. Only 12% of the sample had no formal organizational experience upon acceptance of their current position.

**Phase 4 – Employment life-cycle.** The survey responses of employees who completed not only the pre-entry survey (January 2004 through December 2006), but also the 8-week early adjustment survey (March 2004 through June 2007), and the final outcomes survey (June 2005 through August 2007) were linked for additional analyses. The impact of pre-entry expectations on turnover intentions and actual turnover, as mediated by early adjustment attitudes and perceptions (e.g., role clarity), was evaluated during this phase. HR records were used to determine which of these respondents had left the current organization between January 2004 and August 2007.

The fourth and final sample consisted of 308 individuals, 86% of whom were white. Sixty-one percent of respondents were female. Separately, 61% indicated having a spouse or partner and 29% reported having at least one dependent child at home. The average age within the sample was 30 (range = 21-53, mode = 22). Eighty-two percent of these participants worked in the sales and marketing division, while 79% of the sample specifically worked as a sales representative. About 12% of respondents had no formal organizational experience at the start of their current job. Conversely, at least 31% of the sample indicated having worked for three or more organizations in the past.
Organizational Context

Industry background. As one of the largest producers and consumers of biopharmaceutical medicines in the world, the U.S. pharmaceutical industry has been responsible for bringing more than 300 new drugs to market since 1990 to treat over 150 conditions (Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, 2007). Billions of dollars in research costs are spent each year by leading organizations within the industry in attempting to make but a handful of some 2000 developmental-stage drugs available for patient use. The organization currently under investigation is one of the top-ten largest producers of these cutting-edge pharmaceutical medicines.

Wage levels. Generally speaking, wage levels in the pharmaceutical industry have been higher than national cross-industry levels. For example, the hourly mean wage levels for pharmaceutical sales personnel in 2004, 2005, and 2006 were $32.03, $33.19, and $34.28, while the corresponding cross-industry hourly sales wage averages were only $15.49, $15.77, and $16.52, respectively. Geographically speaking, cross-industry sales wages in the current organization’s surrounding region have been lower than in competitors’ regions. For example, the average hourly wage level for cross-industry sales personnel in the current geographical region was $17.48 in 2006. Correspondingly, cross-industry sales personnel in the geographic regions of the current organization’s five largest competitors were employed at hourly rates falling between $18.66 and $22.58 during 2006. Non-sales wage levels have followed similar trends over the last several years, in terms of both industry-specific wages and cross-industry wages across geographical regions.
Employees. The current organization employs approximately 41,500 individuals worldwide. Of the organization’s 21,000 U.S. employees, roughly 4,500 are employed within the sales division. The remaining U.S. employees work within a variety of occupations, including administration, marketing, research and development, and information technology. Except for those individuals directly affiliated with the sales division, the majority of U.S. employees work at one of two facilities (i.e., the corporate or U.S. headquarters), both of which are situated within the same major metropolitan city. Sales personnel on the other hand, are dispersed throughout the U.S., as they are responsible for selling pharmaceuticals to physicians and hospitals within every state.

Reward structure. There is a substantial difference in terms of the reward structure between sales and non-sales employees. Although both groups are salaried, sales employees are in a position to receive quarterly incentive pay (contingent upon their performance level), while non-sales employees do not have such opportunities. Non-sales employees however, are in position to receive yearly bonus pay (contingent upon individual performance levels, as well as company profitability).

Training. Upon organizational arrival, all sales division newcomers are mandated to participate in extensive on-site formal training which lasts approximately two weeks (Note: the proprietary nature of sales force training at the current organization precluded the inclusion of any training content descriptions in the current paper). Conversely, non-sales newcomers generally do not receive any type of formal organizational training at the start of employment.

As there was only one type of formal training in place at the current organization, which was given exclusively to sales employees, respondents were assigned to either the
institutionalized or the individualized tactics category (see Jones, 1986), according to their job division. The socialization efforts employed by the organization toward sales newcomers have been classified using Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) terminology as formal, sequential, and fixed (i.e., institutionalized tactics). Sales newcomers are formally trained off-the-job, wherein they must attend highly structured sales training sessions. Likewise, they are required to pass through a well-defined sequence of activities and events according to predetermined timelines before they are permitted to engage in on-the-job tasks. By default, organizational newcomers not employed in the sales division are socialized according to individualized tactics, specifically informal, random, and variable tactics (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Unlike their sales counterparts, non-sales newcomers are not subjected to any formal task-relevant training, nor are they required to complete a pre-specified sequence of activities in order to officially begin working in the job roles for which they were initially hired. From the moment they enter the organization, non-sales’ newcomers are expected to engage in job-related behaviors and activities. While this categorization scheme did not enable me to gather newcomers’ perceptions of specific aspects of training, it did in essence nullify past measurement concerns that have resulted from the use of shortened or modified versions of Jones’ (1986) socialization tactics scales.

Orientation. All non-sales employees throughout the organization are given binders at the start of employment containing information related to parking availability, dining options, on-site banking, security system operations, personal ID badge requirements, computer-network set-up instructions, etc. Additionally, non-sales newcomers participate in a multi-day new employee orientation session that covers,
among other things, HR policies and procedures. Separately, non-sales newcomers also attend department-specific orientation sessions that are intended to orient employees with respect to the internal structure and functioning of their particular business unit. Unlike non-sales personnel, newcomers employed in the outside sales division are not subject to separate orientation activities. Rather, all relevant HR policies and business unit information is covered within the context of their formal two-week training session.

Measures

When possible, modified versions of previously validated measurement scales were incorporated into the current study. However, the measurement of many well-known constructs fell short of the ideal, due to the inherent limitations of this type of field research. Not surprisingly, organizational surveys are often bound by time and resource constraints. By that I mean that an organization’s desire and attempt to collect as much pertinent employee data as possible often precludes their ability to collect this data well. Measures are often shortened or severely modified to enable the assessment of policies and structures that are unique to that particular organization. For each construct measure presented below, a list of one or two sample items is included for descriptive purposes. For a complete list of constructs and all corresponding survey items used in the current study, the reader is referred to Appendix A.

Control variables. Employees’ demographic characteristics were assessed with specific survey items. Questions pertaining to age, gender, race, functional area, job type, number of supervisors since the start of employment, and community relocation were included in one or more surveys. For each respondent, data gathered from one survey was matched to data from the remaining two surveys.
Anticipatory Stage

Prior occupational experience. Two pre-entry survey questions addressed prior occupational experience. Individuals were asked to indicate how many years of professional experience they had before joining the current organization. Response options included: a) less than 1 year, b) 1+ to 3 years, c) 3+ to 6 years, d) 6+ to 10 years, and e) more than 10 years. Additionally, respondents were asked to indicate why they had left their most recent employer (when applicable). The following response options were provided: a) I was dissatisfied with my circumstances at my previous employer, b) I was satisfied with my circumstances at my previous employer, but the current organization presented me with an opportunity that was too good to pass up, c) I decided to make a change from my current career/life direction, d) I left because of personal/family reasons, e) I was not previously employed.

Recruitment/interview process. Respondents’ subjective perceptions of the recruitment process were measured with nine items from the pre-entry survey, eight of which were anchored on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items included, “My needs, requirements, and concerns were considered throughout the recruiting process, and “I have a good understanding of this organization’s culture and values.” Although the ninth item, “Overall, how would you rate this organization’s recruiting and hiring process?” was measured on a 5-point scale, its anchors differed significantly from those used to measure the other recruitment process items. The following scale anchors were used: 1 (among the worst I’ve seen), 2 (below average), 3 (average), 4 (above average), and 5 (among the best I’ve seen).
Recruiters/interviewers. Twelve items (adapted from Harris & Fink, 1987) were taken from the pre-entry survey and used to assess perceptions of the organization’s recruiters and/or interviewers. “The recruiters/interviewers conveyed an honest, realistic impression of the organization” and “The recruiters/interviewers made and communicated decisions in a timely manner,” were two sample items. All 12 items were measured with a 5-point strongly disagree-strongly agree response format.

Initial compensation. Four items taken from the pre-entry survey were used to assess respondents’ perceptions of the compensation package they had been offered at the start of employment. “How do you rate the total compensation package you have received at this organization?” was rated using a 1 (very poor) to 5 (very good) scale. For the remaining three items, respondents were asked to compare various aspects of the proposed compensation package (i.e., starting compensation, benefits, and long-term compensation potential) with compensation packages offered by other organizations. Response options ranged from 1 (strong disadvantage) to 5 (strong advantage).

Pre-entry expectations. Expectations prior to the official start of employment with the current organization were assessed with multiple measures taken from the pre-entry survey. Using a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale, twelve items measured pre-entry expectations pertaining to issues such as training (e.g., “I will receive the training necessary to do a quality job”), work-life balance (e.g., “Employees efforts to balance work and family/personal needs will be supported”), and P-O fit (e.g., “I am confident that I will fit into this organization’s culture”).
Early Adjustment Stage

Proactive behaviors. Respondents’ proactive efforts to obtain organization-relevant information were measured using four adjustment survey items (adapted from Ashford & Black, 1996). Questions such as, “I feel comfortable asking my supervisor for feedback on how I am doing in my job” and “I have established a professional network at the organization,” were measured using a 5-point response format, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Training participation. Participation in formal training was coded according to respondents’ job classification, as identified in HR records. All new hires who were employed in the outside sales division were coded with a number 2, as they had been mandated to participate in formalized training at the start of employment. The remaining new hires were coded with a 1 as they were not given access to intensive, formalized, company-sponsored training.

Mentors. A single item taken from the early adjustment survey asked respondents to indicate (yes/no) whether they had been assigned a mentor or peer coach.

Orientation effectiveness. Three items taken from the early adjustment survey were used to gauge new employees’ perceptions of orientation within the organization. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had participated in each of the three types of company-sponsored orientation programs. If so, they were asked to rate the effectiveness of the orientation program(s) to which they had been exposed. Each orientation effectiveness item was measured on a 5-point scale, where 1 = very ineffective and 5 = very effective.
Social support. Newcomers’ relationships with supervisors and members of their work group were assessed with seven items taken from the early adjustment survey. Four items pertaining to one’s perceived level of support and acceptance within the work group, including, “People I work with listen to what I have to say” and “My co-workers have helped me understand how to get things done in this organization” were measured along a 5-point, strongly disagree-strongly agree format. Supervisory support was evaluated with three items along the same 5-point measurement scale. An example included, “My supervisor has discussed with me how things get done in this organization.”

Role clarity. Four adjustment survey items including, “I am clear on what my roles and responsibilities are in my job,” were used to assess role clarity on the early adjustment survey. Several items were adapted from Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman’s (1970) role ambiguity scale. Each item was measured using a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

P-O fit perceptions. Respondents perceptions of fit within the organization were measured with four items (adapted from Cable & Judge, 1996). All four items, including “I believe I fit well into this organization’s culture,” were assessed using a standard 5-point agreement scale.

Job satisfaction. A three-item measure of job satisfaction taken from the early adjustment survey was used in the current study. Each item, including, “Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?” measured respondents’ level of (dis)satisfaction on a standard 5-point scale.
Community fit. The degree to which respondents were seemingly embedded in their surrounding community environments was assessed with eight items taken from the early adjustment survey. In the original Mitchell et al. (2001) 2-sample study, off-the-job embeddedness reliabilities for each of the three dimensions were somewhat problematic. Community fit reliabilities were .78 and .79, community links were .77 and .50, and community-related sacrifice reliabilities were .61 and .59. Therefore, I opted to devise new measures. In the current study, the original fit to community and community-related sacrifice facets were combined and then adapted to form a new measure labeled community fit. Seven of the items including, “I believe I fit well into the culture of the community in which I live,” were measured on 5-point scales, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). An eighth item, “Overall, how satisfied are you with the community in which you live?” was measured on a 5-point dissatisfaction-satisfaction scale.

Kinship responsibility. Two items from the early adjustment survey (adapted from Blegen et al.’s, 1998 kinship responsibility measure) were used to capture each employee’s level of kinship responsibility. For the first item, employees indicated whether they currently had childcare responsibilities for one or more children under 18 years of age. The second item asked individuals to indicate (yes/no) whether they had a spouse/partner.

Final Outcomes

Performance recognition. Four items taken from the final outcomes survey were intended to elicit respondents’ ratings of the performance recognition system. These items were adapted from a future prospects measure collected by Bigliardi, Petroni, and
Dormio (2005). Three items, including the item, “Promotions go to those who best deserve them,” were measured on a 5-point strongly disagree-strongly agree scale. The fourth item, “How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?” was measured on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied).

Career development. Respondents’ perceptions of career development opportunities were measured with two items taken from the final outcomes survey. Similar to the measure of performance recognition, these two items were adapted from Bigliardi et al. (2005). A sample item included, “I am confident that I can achieve my career goals at the current organization.” Both items were measured on a 5-point strongly disagree-strongly agree scale. Additionally, two demographic measures, tenure in current position and overall tenure in the organization, were used to determine whether respondents had experienced one form of career development – a transfer and/or promotion to a new position – while employed in the current organization. When tenure in current position and overall tenure were found to be non-equivalent, respondents were coded with a number 1, signifying that they had experienced at least one job/career transition within the current organization. Respondents were coded with a 0 when tenure in their current position was equivalent to overall tenure in the organization. A 0 signified that they had not experienced career development in the form of a job transfer and/or promotion.

Turnover intentions. A 2-item measure of employees’ intentions to leave the current organization was collected on the final outcomes survey. The following item was measured on a 5-point extremely unlikely to extremely likely scale, “If you have your
own way, will you still be working for the current organization 12 months from now?"

This item was reverse coded to reflect a newcomer’s likelihood of leaving the organization, rather than the likelihood that they would remain. For the second item, “I am seriously considering leaving the current organization within the next 12 months” (taken from Hom, Griffeth, & Sellaro, 1984), respondents rated their level of (dis)agreement along a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

**Turnover.** HR records were used to generate a list of respondents (i.e., hired on or after January 2004) who had left the organization prior to the end of August 2007. Additionally, employees’ reasons for departure, having previously been coded in HR turnover records, were gathered.
RESULTS

*Multivariate Non-Normality*

A majority of the measures employed in the current study did not have previously established psychometric properties. Thus, as a starting point to establishing the construct validity of these measures, I examined the measurement properties of each of the individual items associated with the various scales. Extremely skewed and kurtotic items which compromised the overall normality of their respective scales were dropped. Specifically, the following items were dropped: recruitment process (items 1, 6-8), recruiters (items 5, 8-12), pre-entry expectations (items 1-4, 6-7), social support (item 4), role clarity (item 1), and community fit (item 1).

Subsequently, I examined both the within- and between-factor inter-item correlations, as the second and third steps respectively in the scale modification process. The following items exhibited extremely low within-factor correlations and were thus dropped from further consideration: recruitment process (item 9), recruiters (item 7), pre-entry expectations (items 5, 8), social support (items 5-6), P-O fit perceptions (items 2-4), and community fit (items 3-4). Additionally, items that exhibited exceptionally high between-factor inter-item correlations were deleted. This deletion step applied to the following items: recruiters (item 6), proactive behaviors (items 1-3), and P-O fit perceptions (item 1). Separately, a single proactive behavior item (#4) was dropped from its respective scale and combined with the existing social support scale items due to high inter-item correlations. Finally, construct relatedness and high inter-item correlations across the performance recognition and career development scales, resulted in the
formation of a combined recognition and development scale, comprised of the four original performance recognition items and two original career development items.

Despite the fact that this overall scale revision process resulted in the loss of two measurement scales (i.e., proactive behaviors; early adjustment fit perceptions), I felt that the current study would be best served by using slightly fewer measures with stronger psychometric properties, than by using a greater number of measures exhibiting weaker properties. Multicollinearity concerns prompted me to drop fit perceptions. They were highly correlated with role clarity and several other predictors. Separately, the proactive behaviors scale was dropped in favor of social support not only due to scale reliability concerns, but also due to the fact that social support – as a positive predictor of relevant employee attitudes and behaviors – has received considerably more theoretical support in the existing literature than proactive behaviors. Ultimately, if many of the current scales had been validated in previous research, I might have opted for a reduction in psychometric rigor in favor of theoretical development. The reader should note that dropped items are starred in Appendix A. Corresponding estimated reliabilities for each of the revised measures are listed in parentheses. Additionally, the reader is referred to Appendix B for a complete list of revised hypotheses (necessitated by the aforementioned scale changes) and to Figure 11 for a revised graphical depiction of the overall measurement model.

Model Comparisons

Typically an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is performed once the overall scale measures have been determined to be normally distributed. At this point in the data analysis process I was presented with the following options: (a) perform a separate EFA
for each data analysis phase using the constructs contained within each respective phase, (b) perform a single EFA combining all constructs contained within the entire study, or (c) omit the EFA altogether and proceed directly with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). I opted to proceed directly with the CFA for several reasons. Conducting separate EFAs on the constructs contained within each data phase would preclude an assessment of the discriminate validity of each of these constructs in the larger context of the overall study. Conversely, performing a single EFA employing all constructs would necessitate a random split of the data set in order to be able to conduct a CFA on the remaining half. Despite the fact that almost 600 respondents completed surveys in phase 1, and well over 1000 respondents took part in phases 2 and 3, there were barely 300 participants who completed surveys across all three phases, and thus were viable candidates for inclusion in a single overarching EFA. Cutting this sample of 300 in half would have resulted in an EFA sample size of approximately 150, which was hardly representative of the overall sample population. Therefore, I chose to perform a CFA using full-information maximum likelihood (FIML) in order to take advantage of the large sample size across the entire data set and to establish discriminate validity across all constructs used in the current study. It should be noted that while widely recognized and routinely documented output fit indices (i.e., GFI, AGFI, CFI, NNFI) are not produced when this missing data routine is employed, statistical software developers, including those associated with Lisrel and Amos, are currently working on improving the software to be able to generate a more comprehensive list if fit indices under these missing data circumstances. I rationalized that this “loss” of fit indices data was justified, given my
alternative of discarding more than 80% of the data. For further discussion on the merits of missing data techniques such as FIML, the reader is referred to Newman (2003).

*Confirmatory factor analysis.* CFAs were conducted on a series of related models. It was not theoretically meaningful, nor was it practical to begin the testing series with 1-factor models. Note that four factors in the current study have been operationalized as single-indicator factors (i.e., prior experience, kinship responsibility, training participation, and mentors), and thus were not included in the following CFA analyses.

I began by creating and sequentially testing several alternative model comparisons prior to arriving at the 11-factor target model, which included (a) compensation, (b) recruitment process, (c) recruiters, (d) pre-entry expectations, (e) orientation, (f) social support, (g) job satisfaction, (h) role clarity, (i) community fit, (j) recognition and development, and (k) turnover intentions. As part of the initial 8-factor model, compensation, pre-entry expectations, orientation programs, performance recognition, and turnover intentions were included. Additionally, job satisfaction and role clarity were combined to form an overall job attitudes construct, work group support and community fit were combined to create an overarching social support construct (i.e., perceptions of support inside and outside of work), and recruitment process and recruiters were combined as facets of the overall recruitment experience. Similar to the 8-factor solution, social support and community fit were combined, as were recruitment process and recruiters, in order to form a 9-factor solution. As a third potential solution, a 10-factor oblique model combining the recruitment process and recruiters factors into an overarching construct was tested. Following a test of the targeted 11-factor oblique
solution, a 12-factor model was subjected to a CFA. This helped to determine whether the decomposition of recognition and development into two factors (i.e., performance recognition and career development) provided a cleaner representation of the data.

Inspection of the nested models revealed that an 11-factor oblique solution appeared to produce the best fitting model. Although a significant change in $X^2$ in moving from a 10-factor to a 11-factor solution, $X^2 = 436.99$ (10), $p<.01$, was followed by a significant change when moving to a 12-factor solution, $X^2 = 423.25$ (11), $p<.01$, it was reasoned that the size of this improvement in “fit” did not justify this reduction in parsimony by separating the recognition and development construct into two smaller factors, one of which was weakly represented by only two items. Thus, the 11-factor model was retained as the optimal solution. Tables 1 and 2 present a list of model fit indices and inter-factor correlations respectively. Individual item loadings are depicted in Figure 12.

**Structural equations modeling.** The current study employed structural equations modeling using Lisrel 8.80 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2006) in an attempt to test the overall model fit. The fit of the proposed model was compared with alternative empirical models, those that were both more and less constrained than the target. Given the inherent structure of the hypothesized model, coupled with the number and timing of different surveys analyzed in the current study, there were significant limitations to the alternative structural models that could be tested. The reader is referred to Table 1 for a comparison of fit indices and a description of model modifications.

Results revealed an adequate fit of the target model (see Figure 14) to the data ($X^2 = 3248.89$, $p < .01$, RMSEA = .04). Testing a more constrained model, thereby removing
additional pathways from the target model, was difficult for one main reason – a majority of constructs used in this study were hypothesized as having a direct impact on only one criterion. Thus, the removal of any of these pathways from the model would have necessitated the removal of the construct altogether from the overall structural equation. There were however, four predictors which were initially hypothesized as having an impact on two adjustment criteria (i.e., role clarity and job satisfaction). In an effort to test a more simplified model than the target, one pathway was removed from each of these four predictors, such that orientation, training, and mentors were now the three main predictors of role clarity, while social support was identified as the sole predictor of job satisfaction (see Figure 13). Comparison of models 1 and 2 resulted in a significant change in chi-square \[X^2 = 893.11 (5), p < .01\], thus indicating that the target model fit the data significantly better than model 1.

Alternatively, testing a less constrained model by adding additional pathways proved somewhat challenging, largely due to the fact that these constructs were measured across three different surveys administered at different points of time. It would be impossible, for example, to position orientation, training, mentors, and social support as having an impact on pre-entry expectations since these four constructs were measured several months after pre-entry expectations had already been measured. Separately, there was limited theoretical justification for the creation of additional pathways throughout the model. In the end two additional pathways were added: prior experience \(\rightarrow\) role clarity and social support \(\rightarrow\) turnover intentions (see Figure 15).

Beyond its more proximal impact on role clarity and job satisfaction, social support has also been linked with greater intentions to remain with an organization (Louis
et al., 1983). As a result, the link between social support and turnover intentions was added to the more complex model. Separately, prior experience was positioned to impact role clarity. When an employee’s current role largely mimics a role he/she held in a previous organization, prior experience is likely to have a significantly positive influence on current perceptions of role clarity, as the employee has already been primed with the appropriate skills or information and thus has considerably less novel information to learn than someone with no prior experience. Conversely, if previous positions were highly dissimilar to one’s current role, then prior experience can have a potentially negative impact on role clarity perceptions. An employee will essentially be working to “undo” what he has learned in the past while simultaneously attempting to acquire the skills needed for the current position. Comparison of models 2 and 3 resulted in a significant change in chi-square \( \chi^2 = 15.06 \) (2), \( p < .01 \), indicating an improvement in fit in moving from the target model to model 3. Despite this modest fit improvement, the target model (#2) was ultimately retained (see Figure 14). As evidenced by the equivalent RMSEA values, little would be gained in accepting model 3 that could contribute to the overall meaningfulness of the model. Ultimately, I felt the fit improvement exhibited by model 3 was not enough to offset a reduction in parsimony.

**Employment Life-Cycle: Hypotheses 1 – 5**

Multiple regression analyses were used to test the direct and indirect effects of employee expectations and attitudes on turnover intentions and behaviors. A complete listing of all possible effects can be found in Tables 4 and 5. The reader is referred to Table 3 for a listing of Phase 4 descriptive statistics and correlations. Initial regression analyses also revealed that none of demographic control variables contributed a
significant amount of variance toward explaining any of the dependent variables used throughout the study. As a result, these variables were not controlled in any of the analyses reported below.

**Direct effects.** According to Hypotheses 1a-d, pre-entry expectations were expected to positively predict (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity, and negatively predict (c) turnover intentions, and (d) actual turnover. In support, pre-entry expectations had a significant positive impact on job satisfaction ($\beta = .27, p<.01$) and role clarity ($\beta = .36, p<.01$), and a significant negative impact on turnover intentions ($\beta = -.32, p<.01$). These results support Hypotheses 1a-c. Conversely, pre-entry expectations did not significantly impact actual turnover, thus failing to support Hypothesis 1d.

Hypothesis 2a-b predicted that job satisfaction would negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover. Results provide full support for Hypothesis 2. Job satisfaction negatively impacted turnover intentions ($\beta = -.26, p<.01$) and actual turnover ($\beta = -.35, p<.01$).

Role clarity was hypothesized to negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) actual turnover according to Hypotheses 3a-b. Results partially support these hypotheses. Role clarity did in fact negatively impact turnover intentions ($\beta = -.13, p<.05$) as predicted by Hypothesis 3a, but did not impact turnover (3b).

**Indirect effects.** The procedures outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986) were used to test Hypotheses 4a-b, the mediating effects of (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity on the relationship between pre-entry expectations and turnover intentions. This is a three-step process in which (a) the independent variable must be significantly related to the mediators, (b) the independent variable must be a significant predictor of the dependent
variable, and (c) the effects of the independent variable are reduced (partial mediation) or become non-significant (full mediation) when both independent and mediating variables are included in the regression.

Satisfying the first two conditions, pre-entry expectations influenced job satisfaction and role clarity (step 1), as well as turnover intentions (step 2). In the final step, turnover intentions were regressed onto the mediators (i.e., job satisfaction and role clarity) and the independent variable, pre-entry expectations. Despite minor reductions in the beta weights, pre-entry expectations maintained a significant impact ($p<.01$) on turnover intentions in the presence of both job satisfaction and role clarity. Given that some researchers have cited the Baron & Kenny mediation procedure as being far too restrictive (see MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, & Sheets, 2002), an additional test was conducted in order to verify the absence of any mediated relationships. These researchers have demonstrated through statistical simulations that causal step mediation tests like Baron & Kenny’s approach are hindered by Type I error rates that are too low, and that of all the available mediation tests, they exhibit the lowest statistical power to detect small to medium effect sizes. Therefore, a sobel test was also performed on the current data. Results confirmed earlier findings in that mediation was not supported.

Similarly, Hypotheses 5a-b were not supported. For starters, the first condition of mediation testing was not met. Pre-entry expectations were not a significant predictor of turnover. Thus, neither (a) job satisfaction nor (b) role clarity could function as mediators under these conditions.
**Employee Influences: Hypotheses 6 – 8**

Multiple regression analyses were used to test the direct effects of employee influences (Phases 1 and 3) on pre-entry expectations, turnover intentions, and actual turnover. A complete listing of all possible effects can be found in Tables 7 and 9. Separately, descriptive statistics and correlations can be found in Tables 6 and 8.

Prior occupational experience was expected to positively impact pre-entry expectations as stated in Hypothesis 6. In partial support, prior experience was indeed a moderately significant predictor of pre-entry expectations ($\beta = -.07$, $p<.05$). Contrary to initial predictors however, prior experience had a negative, rather than positive, impact on these early expectations.

Hypothesis 7 predicted that kinship responsibility would negatively impact both (a) turnover intentions and (b) actual turnover. Both of these hypotheses were supported. Kinship responsibility was a significant negative predictor of both turnover intentions ($\beta = -.09$, $p<.01$) and turnover ($\beta = -.12$, $p<.05$).

According to Hypothesis 8, it was predicted that kinship responsibility would have a discernible impact on (a) turnover intentions in the presence of job satisfaction and role clarity. Similarly, it was expected that (b) actual turnover would be negatively influenced by kinship responsibility even when job satisfaction and role clarity were taken into account. Contrary to these predictions, kinship responsibility was no longer a significant negative predictor of turnover intentions when job satisfaction and role clarity were being considered. Thus, Hypotheses 8a was not supported (see Table 10). Likewise, actual turnover was not significantly impacted by kinship responsibility in the
presence of job satisfaction and role clarity. Therefore, Hypotheses 8b was also not supported.

**Organizational Influences: Hypotheses 9 – 20**

Multiple regression analyses were used to test the direct effects of organizational influences (Phases 1, 2, and 3) on pre-entry expectations, job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction, role clarity), turnover intentions, and actual turnover. A complete listing of all possible effects can be found in Tables 7 and 9. The reader is further referred to Tables 6, 8, and 11 for descriptive statistics and correlations.

Hypothesis 9 predicted that perceptions of (a) the recruiter, as well as (b) the recruitment process would positively impact respondents’ pre-entry expectations. Both hypotheses were supported. Perceptions of the organization’s recruiters ($\beta = .38$, $p<.01$), as well as perceptions of the recruitment process ($\beta = .18$, $p<.01$), positively impacted pre-entry expectations.

Initial compensation was hypothesized to positively impact pre-entry expectations, according to Hypothesis 10. Results support this hypothesis ($\beta = .21$, $p<.01$).

Hypotheses 11, 12, and 13 predicted that post-entry organizational influences, including participation in formalized training, orientation effectiveness, and mentors, respectively, would positively impact both (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity. All but one of these hypotheses was supported. Training participation positively impacted both job satisfaction ($\beta = .13$, $p<.01$) and role clarity ($\beta = .16$, $p<.01$), as did orientation effectiveness (job satisfaction: $\beta = .26$, $p<.01$; role clarity: $\beta = .23$, $p<.01$). The
assignment of a mentor on the other hand, impacted job satisfaction ($\beta = .08, p<.01$), but not role clarity.

Going one step further, Hypotheses 14, 15, and 16 predicted that the impact of these organizational influences (i.e., training, orientation, mentors) would remain significant even after pre-entry expectations were taken into account. While training did not impact job satisfaction above and beyond pre-entry expectations as predicted by Hypothesis 14a, it did continue to impact role clarity even after accounting for pre-entry expectations ($\beta = .08, p<.05$), thereby supporting Hypothesis 14b. Full support was found for Hypothesis 15 on the other hand, in which orientation was predictive of both (a) job satisfaction ($\beta = .31, p<.01$) and (b) role clarity ($\beta = .14, p<.01$) even after taking pre-entry expectations into account. Only partial support was found for Hypothesis 16. When pre-entry expectations were simultaneously considered, mentors had a positive impact on respondents’ (a) job satisfaction levels ($\beta = .09, p<.05$), but not on their (b) role clarity perceptions (see Table 12).

Social support was also predicted to have a positive impact on job satisfaction and role clarity. In support of Hypothesis 17, social support positively impacted both (a) job satisfaction ($\beta = .38, p<.01$) and (b) role clarity ($\beta = .57, p<.01$). Furthermore, Hypothesis 18 was supported in that social support continued to exert a positive influence on these two adjustment criteria (job satisfaction: $\beta = .27, p<.01$; role clarity: $\beta = .62, p<.01$) even after the impact from pre-entry expectations had been partialed out.

Hypothesis 19 predicted that recognition and development would negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover behaviors. Accordingly, current results indicated that recognition and development was indeed a negative predictor of both
intentions ($\beta = -0.60, p<.01$) and (b) behaviors ($\beta = -0.20, p<.01$), thereby fully supporting Hypothesis 19.

According to hypothesis 20, it was predicted that recognition and development would continue to negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) actual turnover, even after job satisfaction and role clarity were considered. Both hypotheses were supported. Recognition and development continued to have a significant negative impact on turnover intentions ($\beta = -0.58, p<.01$) and turnover ($\beta = -0.20, p<.01$), even after job satisfaction and role clarity were taken into account (see Table 13).

**Contextual Influences: Hypothesis 21**

Multiple regression analyses were used to test the direct effects of contextual influences – namely community fit – on turnover intentions and actual turnover (Phase 3). The findings are summarized below. Detailed regression results can be found in Table 7, while descriptive statistics and correlations can be found in Table 8.

Hypothesis 21, which proposed that community fit perceptions would serve to negatively impact (a) turnover intentions, as well as (b) turnover, was partially supported. Community fit perceptions appeared to have a negative effect on turnover intentions ($\beta = -0.07, p<.01$), but did not exert any significant impact on actual turnover decisions.

**Longitudinal Analyses: Hypothesis 22**

Multiple regression analyses were first used to determine whether organizational socialization tactics had a significant impact on employee job satisfaction and role clarity, when measured at 8 weeks, 6 months, and 1 year of tenure. For comparison purposes, the 8-week findings (i.e., Hypotheses 11-13 and 17) will be re-presented below, followed by a summary of findings at the 6-month and 1-year tenure mark. Correlations and
descriptive statistics for measures collected at 6-months and 1-year of tenure can be found in Tables 14 and 15. Complete regression results across all three time periods can be found in Table 16.

Participation in formalized training impacted job satisfaction at 8 weeks of tenure ($\beta = .13, p<.01$). However, training-satisfaction relationships measured at 6 months and 1 year did not yield significant findings. Cross-sectional measures of training participation and role clarity on the other hand, were significant at all three points in time (8 weeks: $\beta = .16, p<.01$; 6 months: $\beta = .12, p<.01$; 1 year: $\beta = .14, p<.01$). Perceptions of orientation effectiveness collected at each of the three time periods had a significant impact on corresponding measures of job satisfaction at 8 weeks ($\beta = .26, p<.01$), 6 months ($\beta = .21, p<.01$), and 1 year of tenure ($\beta = .17, p<.01$), as well as on role clarity at the 8-week ($\beta = .23, p<.01$), 6-month ($\beta = .25, p<.01$) and 1-year mark ($\beta = .19, p<.01$).

Results indicate that cross-sectional measures of mentors and job satisfaction were significant at 8 weeks ($\beta = .08, p<.01$), and 6 months ($\beta = .07, p<.05$), but not at 1 year. Alternatively, the assignment of a mentor failed to impact role clarity at 8 weeks and 1 year, but it did have a moderate impact at the 6 week mark ($\beta = .06, p<.05$). Finally, social support was a strong positive predictor of both job satisfaction and role clarity, when measured cross-sectionally at all three time periods. At 8 weeks ($\beta = .38, p<.01$), 6 months ($\beta = .49, p<.01$) and again at 1 year ($\beta = .51, p<.01$), social support exhibited a strong influence on job satisfaction. Similarly, cross-sectional measures of social support and role clarity yielded strong positive results (8 weeks: $\beta = .57, p<.01$; 6 months: $\beta = .50, p<.01$; 1 year: $\beta = .56, p<.01$).
Ordinary least squares regression was subsequently used to test Hypothesis 22, in which tactics-outcomes relationships measured at 8 weeks, 6 months, and 1 year of tenure were predicted to be significantly different. As shown in Table 19, results were partially supported. Only two tactics-outcomes relationships were shown to vary significantly across the three time periods, while the strengths of the remaining relationships remained consistent throughout the year. Specifically, the relationship between social support and job satisfaction rose significantly from the 8 week (t = 11.31, p<.01) to the 6 month (t = 16.09, p<.01) tenure mark, but then exhibited a modest, insignificant decline when measured again at the end of the first year (t = 13.68, p<.01). Separately, the relationship between orientation and perceptions of role clarity increased significantly when measured at 8 weeks (t = 5.94, p<.01) compared to 1 year (t = 10.32, p<.01). However, the strength increase of this tactic-outcome relationship in moving from 8 weeks to 6 months, and from 6 months to 1 year was not found to be significant.

Although not originally hypothesized, I also opted to examine the longitudinal relationships between each of the four predictors and the two early adjustment criteria. In particular, I was interested in seeing whether significant tactics-outcomes relationships measured cross-sectionally would yield similar significant findings across time. Regression results conducted using 8-week and 6-month socialization tactics as predictors were strikingly similar to the earlier cross-sectional findings. Except for the mentor-job satisfaction relationship, all other tactics-outcomes relationships between 8-week tactics and 6-month and 1-year outcomes were significant (see Table 16 for complete results). Furthermore, longitudinal relationships between 6-month tactics and 1 year outcomes were also highly similar to the aforementioned cross-sectional results.
Orientation effectiveness and social support impacted both job satisfaction and role clarity \((p<.01)\), while training participation impacted role clarity \((p<.01)\). Complete results can be found in Table 17.

**Compensatory Analyses: Hypotheses 23 – 25**

Multiple regression analyses were used to test several exploratory moderation hypotheses. Results are briefly summarized below. The reader is referred to Tables 20-22 for full value listings.

Hypothesis 23 proposed that prior occupational experience (as an employee influence) would interact with several organizational influences. In particular, prior experience was expected to moderate the impact of (a) recruiters, (b) the recruitment process, and (c) initial compensation on pre-entry expectations, such that higher levels of both employee and organizational influences would result in the highest levels of pre-entry expectations and lower levels of employee and organizational influences would result in the lowest levels of expectations. Hypothesis 23 was partially supported (see Table 18). Prior occupational experience did indeed moderate the impact of (a) recruiters \((\beta = .90, p<.01)\) and (b) the recruitment process \((\beta = .60, p<.05)\) on pre-entry expectations. As originally hypothesized, greater levels of previous occupational experience, coupled with strong positive perceptions of both the organization’s recruiters (see Figure 16) and its recruitment process (see Figure 17), resulted in the highest level of pre-entry expectations. Additionally, slope significance testing revealed that under both high and low levels of prior experience, recruitment process perceptions were predictive of pre-entry expectations \((\text{high: } \beta = .56, p<.01; \text{ low: } \beta = .37, p<.01)\). Likewise, recruiter
perceptions predicted pre-entry expectations when prior experience levels were high (β = .65, p<.01), as well as when they were low (β = .46, p<.01).

Contrary to the original hypotheses, minimal prior experience and low recruiter and recruitment process perceptions did not interact to produce the lowest level of pre-entry expectations. Rather the interaction was such that high levels of prior experience, coupled with low recruiter and recruitment process perceptions, resulted in the lowest levels of pre-entry expectations. Prior experience did not appear to moderate the compensation-expectations relationship. Thus, Hypothesis 23c was not supported.

According to Hypotheses 24 and 25, a second employee influence (i.e., kinship responsibility) was expected to moderate the impact of recognition and development on turnover intentions and actual turnover, respectively. Specifically, high levels of kinship responsibility combined with high levels of recognition and development were expected to result in the lowest possible levels of turnover intentions and behaviors, while low levels of both were predicted to result in the highest possible levels of turnover intentions and actual turnover. Neither hypothesis was supported. Kinship responsibility did not appear to influence the relationship between recognition and development and turnover intentions or behaviors.
DISCUSSION

Having transformed Saks and Ashforth’s (1997b) theoretical multi-level process model of adjustment into an empirically-testable dual influence model, I examined the extent to which various employee and organizational socialization factors, as well as extra-organizational factors, jointly impacted proximal and distal outcomes at the individual level. The overall findings and theoretical implications of the proposed dual influence model, along with relevant findings for each of the employee and organizational influences across the three socialization stages, will be discussed in greater detail below.

Employment Life-Cycle

Findings from the current study demonstrated that the proposed dual influence model (Figure 11), with added support from the retained structural model (Figure 14), appeared to adequately capture the direct causal effects between employee and organizational influences and relevant socialization criteria throughout the overall socialization process. Criteria within each of the three socialization phases were predicted by at least one organizational socialization tactic. Additionally, anticipatory socialization and final outcomes criteria were significantly impacted by separate employee influences. In terms of the relationships between each of the socialization criteria, the model supported the proposed links between the anticipatory socialization criterion and early adjustment criteria. Likewise, the direct links between early adjustment and final outcomes criteria were largely supported. Indirectly speaking, the current results do not support the positioning of early adjustment criteria in mediating roles between anticipatory socialization and final outcomes criteria.
To summarize the reported relationships among each of the socialization effectiveness criteria, pre-entry expectations (including P-O perceptions) were a strong positive predictor of job satisfaction and role clarity, as well as a negative predictor of turnover intentions. These results reinforce earlier findings by Holton and Russell (1999), as well as Wanous et al. (1992), in which pre-entry expectations were shown to positively predict job satisfaction and negatively predict turnover intentions. Likewise, they support Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg’s (2003) findings of a link between pre-entry knowledge and role clarity. However, as the Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg study measured pre-entry knowledge during a post-entry period, the present study serves as one of the first to explicitly examine the relationship between “true” pre-entry expectations and role clarity. The current results also provide additional support for research conducted by Cable and Judge (1996), Chao et al. (1994), and Kristof-Brown et al., 2005, whereby P-O perceptions were shown to be predictive of job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Unlike previous research by O’Reilly and colleagues (1991), pre-entry expectations were not a negative predictor of actual turnover in the current study.

Despite a small negative correlation between pre-entry expectations and turnover, there was no evidence from the current regression analyses to support the existence of any meaningful relationship between these two constructs. It is possible however, that sample size was largely responsible for these null findings. Out of a sample of 308 respondents (i.e., those who completed surveys in phases 1, 2, and 3), only 16 individuals (roughly 5%), exited the organization during the time period under examination.

Early adjustment criteria were also significant predictors of turnover attitudes and behaviors in the current study. More specifically, job satisfaction was a unique predictor
of both turnover intentions and actual turnover, thereby supporting previous meta-analytic findings by Griffeth et al. (2000). The legitimacy of the relationship between role clarity and turnover intentions was recently strengthened by meta-analytic findings from Bauer and colleagues (2007) and further supported by the current results. In spite of previous empirical evidence demonstrating a relationship between role clarity and actual turnover (Cable & Parsons, 2001) however, no such evidence was currently uncovered. One possible explanation for role clarity’s lack of impact on actual turnover may be that role clarity is better suited to function as a proximal adjustment variable – one that mediates the relationship between socializing influences/tactics and more distal adjustment outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment – rather than function as a direct antecedent to ultimate outcomes such as turnover. Previous single-study and meta-analytic research supports this contention (e.g., Bauer et al., 2007 meta-analysis; Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003; Saks et al., 2007 meta-analysis).

The placement of job satisfaction and role clarity as mediators of the expectations-turnover intentions relationship within the employment life-cycle model did not receive any empirical support. No evidence of mediation was uncovered for either of the two potential pathways (i.e., expectations → job satisfaction → turnover intentions; expectations → role clarity → turnover intentions). Despite a modest decrement in impact strength, pre-entry expectations continued to function as a significant negative predictor of turnover intentions when job satisfaction and role clarity were taken into account. These findings are in contrast to earlier research conducted by Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg (2003) in which role clarity functioned as a mediator of the pre-entry knowledge-withdrawal relationship. One possible explanation for these disparate
findings could be time differences in the collection of measures across the two studies. In the Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg study, the collection of pre-entry knowledge and turnover intentions was separated by approximately 8 months, while the collection difference between these two constructs ranged between 3 and 12 months in the current study. Likewise, role clarity and withdrawal measures were collected roughly 4 months apart in the Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg study, while presently the collection time period between these two measures ranged from 1 to 10 months.

**Employee Influences**

*Prior experience.* Findings from the current study supported the contention that prior experience significantly impacts pre-entry expectations (including P-O fit perceptions) during the anticipatory socialization period. However, unlike previous research in which prior experience has been shown to have a significant positive impact on pre-entry expectations and P-O fit perceptions (e.g., Carr et al., 2006), results from the current study suggest that prior experience is a negative predictor of pre-entry expectations. Although the direction of these results was somewhat unexpected, the results are nonetheless justifiable. As previously described in the introduction of this paper, employees with previous experience were expected to have developed more grounded and realistic pre-entry expectations than their inexperienced counterparts. Separately, the expectations of all newcomers (let alone experienced newcomers) were anticipated to be more positive than negative, assuming that in fact employees’ positive perceptions of the organization had been the primary motivators in prompting these newcomers to initially accept organizational offers of employment.
However, the biggest unknown at the start of this study was whether inexperienced newcomers would be more cautious or more optimistic than their experienced counterparts in making their pre-entry ratings, given that they had little to no pre-existing organizational benchmarks to use in making these early judgments. Despite predictions that prior experience would positively impact newcomer expectations’ ratings, one could easily argue that current findings in the opposite direction actually served to reinforce some of my earlier claims regarding the overall impact of prior newcomer experience. First and foremost, the pre-entry expectations ratings for all newcomers were relatively high, as evidenced by an overall mean rating of 4.66 out of 5. Additionally, the fact that experienced newcomers’ ratings were high (i.e., mean rating equal to 4.56 for newcomers with 10+ years of prior experience) – though not exceptionally high like inexperienced newcomers (i.e., mean rating equal to 4.71 for employees with less than 1 year prior experience) – supports the earlier proposition that experienced newcomers’ ratings would be somewhat tempered and more realistic prior to the start of employment.

*Kinship responsibility.* As the second proposed employee influence in the current model, kinship responsibility was a negative predictor of both turnover intentions and actual turnover in the final outcomes stage of the dual influence model. Employees with a spouse/partner and one or more children under the age of 18 living at home were less likely to consider quitting or to actually quit, than those employees who were single and childless. Although the current results reinforce earlier findings showing kinship responsibility to be predictive of reduced turnover intentions (Blegen et al., 1988) and actual turnover (Lee & Maurer, 1999), it is worth noting that the impact of kinship
responsibility was mitigated when job satisfaction was taken into account. Furthermore, it is important to reiterate that within the context of the current study, kinship responsibility served as an objective indicator of the number of types of relationships (i.e., spouse, parent) that existed in a newcomer’s household setting, rather than as a subjective indicator of family dynamics, similar to those that have been used in past work-family research contexts.

Despite the diminished impact of marital and parental status in predicting turnover attitudes and behaviors among current respondents, I would caution against the theoretical dismissal of these personal influences as relevant turnover predictors without first having considered the following. The rudimentary measure of kinship responsibility used in the current study may account for its diminishing impact on actual turnover in the presence of job satisfaction. Presently, kinship responsibility was calculated by simply adding “presence of a spouse/partner” (no = 0, yes = 1) and “household presence of at least one dependent under the age of 18” (no = 0, yes = 1). Therefore, total kinship responsibility values could only fall between 0 and 2. Although this scale proved adequate to capture at least minor differences in turnover intentions across the respondent sample (at least when job satisfaction was factored out of consideration), it may have been too generalized to capture more discrete differences among respondents. For example, a single mother caring for three young children would have only been assigned a kinship value equal to “1”, while a married father of a single teenager would have been assigned a value equal to “2”, using the current kinship formula. Intuitively, it would seem as though the single mother of three would have a kinship responsibility that was at least equal to, if not greater than, the married father of one. However, the current kinship
measure could not account for these types of significant household differences. I suspect that a more refined scale – one that could code for these familial structure differences – might be better suited to reveal potential differences in terms of how strongly employees’ turnover attitudes and/or behaviors might be impacted by their household settings.

**Contextual Influences**

From a career mobility standpoint, Feldman and Ng (2007) identified six perspectives which have helped further our understanding of why employees change organizations, in addition to careers. One of these perspectives – the personal life perspective – posits family, friends, and community as prime motivators of employee mobility. In other words, employee movements both in and out of organizations, as well as in and out of careers, can be influenced both directly and indirectly by the advice and support of family and friends. In addition, having strong ties to one’s community can inhibit an employee from leaving an organization and/or career when faced with the prospect of community relocation. One particular construct which was specifically developed to theoretically address and subsequently test the familial and communal influences which are often factored into employee mobility decisions is the construct of embeddedness. In the current study, community fit, as an indicator of the fit dimension of off-the-job embeddedness, was found to be a significant negative predictor of turnover intentions, but not of turnover behaviors.

**Organizational Influences**

*Recruitment.* There were several organizational predictors of pre-entry expectations during the anticipatory socialization period. Current results indicated that recruiters, the recruitment process, and initial compensation all functioned as unique
predictors of this socialization criterion. Although the relationships between these predictors and pre-entry expectations have received minimal attention in past research, the current findings are compatible with previous findings, whereby prospective employees interpreted various aspects of the recruitment process (including recruiter behaviors) as signals of organizational attributes. In turn, these signal interpretations influenced subsequent job attractiveness ratings and job acceptance behaviors (see Rynes et al., 1991).

Orientation. Although the use of orientation programs has been widely documented across organizations, the effectiveness of this particular socialization tactic has not necessarily been supported by existing empirical research (Wanous, 1993). The current study however, found that the use of orientation sessions was strongly related to increased job satisfaction and role clarity during the early adjustment socialization phase, thereby providing support for the continued use of this organizational tactic. Also worth noting was the fact that orientation effectiveness remained a significant predictor of these two criteria after having controlled for the influence of pre-entry expectations.

Social support. While studied less frequently than training or orientation as an example of an organizational socialization tactic, social support is nonetheless considered an important aspect of the newcomer socialization process. In fact, some researchers consider work group socialization to be more critical to newcomer development than socialization into the larger organizational environment (Moreland & Levine, 2001). Daily interactions with peers for example, have been found to be one of the most important factors in fostering the socialization experience (Louis et al., 1983; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Smith & Kozlowski, 1995). In the context of other work-related
domains, social support has also been positively linked to job satisfaction (e.g., Anderson & Thomas, 1996; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2005; Louis et al., 1983). The current study validated these previous results in finding a strong, positive relationship between work group social support and job satisfaction. Separately, the current study also found a positive link between work group support and role clarity, a finding that has not been well documented up to this point. Both relationships with early adjustment criteria remained significant in the presence of pre-entry expectations.

Mentors. More frequently than social support, researchers have examined the influence of mentors in the context of newcomer socialization. The current results not only support previous findings (e.g., Chao, 1997; Chao et al., 1992; Fagenson, 1989) in which mentors were shown to be positive predictors of job satisfaction, but they also validate more recent research (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004) ascertaining that mentors contribute positively to the broader construct of overall newcomer socialization. Conversely, they were not predictive of role clarity under any of the current circumstances. One explanation for the absence of this particular relationship may have been the specific measure used to assess mentors in the current study. Respondents were simply asked whether or not they had been assigned a mentor. No additional data had been gathered to assess the perceived effectiveness of these mentoring relationships. It is possible therefore, that “friendships” developed with their mentors contributed positively to newcomers’ overall job satisfaction assessments, without having helped them better understand how to perform their jobs. Numerous studies in fact support this contention that formal mentors tend to fulfill more psychosocial than career-related functions (Allen, McManus, & Russell, 1999; Chao et al., 1992; Noe, 1988). A second explanation may
have been role dissimilarity. Within organizational settings, mentors are not necessarily
chosen or assigned based on role similarity. It is considered normal and even desirable
for mentors and protégés to be in completely separate roles. Although the mentor may
have at one time in their career held a position that is similar to the employee’s current
role, role similarity is not normally a prerequisite to mentor assignment or selection.
Thus, many of the mentors may not have been technically qualified or otherwise willing
to advise their protégés on actual role requirements. Rather, mentors may have been
more focused on providing psychosocial support as described above.

Training. Without a doubt, training has been one of the most commonly studied
organizational socialization tactics. In many instances training and socialization have
been seen as synonymous (Feldman, 1989). Past researchers have measured the impact
of training based on the “amount,” as well as perceived “helpfulness” of training (e.g.,
Louis et al., 1983; Saks, 1996). Others have measured the effectiveness of training as a
prominent aspect of a broader institutionalized tactics policy (see Ashforth & Saks, 1996;
Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003; Mignerey et
al., 1995; Saks & Ashforth, 1997a). Despite only having measured whether or not an
employee was subjected to formalized training, the current results nonetheless reinforce
findings from the aforementioned studies. Training was a strong, positive predictor of
both job satisfaction and role clarity. However, its impact on job satisfaction was
attenuated to a level of non-significance when pre-entry expectations were jointly
factored in.

An important caveat to the conclusion that formally trained newcomers were
more satisfied and had clearer role perceptions than non-trained newcomers is that
training participation did not insulate these newcomers from experiencing a significant decline in job satisfaction and role clarity. This negative attitudinal shift was in fact observed across all newcomers throughout the first year of employment. Separately, the current training participation results did not allow me to rule out the possibility that the observed differences for trained (i.e., outside sales employees) versus untrained (i.e., non-sales) newcomers were due to actual job type differences, rather than due to training participation. One could easily make the case that there are significant differences between external sales and internal non-sales employees. First and perhaps foremost, outside sales personnel by virtue of their “outside” job description, do not have physical office space within the actual organizational setting. Generally speaking, they are in constant geographic transition as they drive back and forth between their home office settings and the medical offices and organizations they are expected to call upon. A second major distinction between these two groups is that sales personnel do not have daily physical contact with peer group members or supervisors like most internal employees do. In some cases, sales employees only have face-to-face interactions with their supervisors once a quarter. Additionally, they may only come in physical contact with their district sales peers several times per year. This lack of face-to-face interaction time among peers and supervisors has significant implications for the ways in which these newcomers can continue to learn once formal training has been completed.

Given the aforementioned differences across these two groups, I first tested to see whether this sales/non-sales variable was a significant predictor of the criteria within each of the data analysis phases. Post-hoc results revealed a significant sales/non-sales coefficient in Phases 1 and 2. There was no effect on turnover intentions or turnover in
Phase 3. Chow tests were next conducted on the dependent variables within Phases 1 and 2 to determine whether model estimates were significantly different for sales versus non-sales newcomers. This “sales” distinction did not account for any of the differences observed for the dependent variables in Phase 2 (i.e., job satisfaction and role clarity). Results did however, reveal a significant effect for pre-entry expectations in Phase 1. Recruiter and recruitment process perceptions, as well as initial compensation appeared to have a more positive impact on the pre-entry expectations of non-sales newcomers than on sales newcomers’ expectations. With regard to prior experience level, sales newcomers with extensive prior experience exhibited higher pre-entry expectations than their non-sales counterparts. The reader should be cautioned that the respondent sample in Phase 1 (from which these significant group differences were obtained) was highly skewed in favor of sales newcomers. Specifically, 79% of the sample (N = 453) classified themselves as outside sales newcomers while only 21% (N = 123) were considered non-sales newcomers. Thus, the significant sales/non-sales findings may have been more a function of group sample size than actual group differences.

Recognition & development. During the final outcomes period, recognition and development, as the sole example of organizational influence, functioned as a strong negative predictor of turnover intentions and actual turnover. Similar findings were uncovered in career development and performance recognition research conducted by Pare and Tremblay in 2007. It is worth noting that this relationship remained strong, even after the impact of job satisfaction had been partialed out.
Tactics-Outcome Stability

Organizational socialization tactics (i.e., training, mentors, orientation, and social support) and corresponding adjustment criteria (i.e., job satisfaction and role clarity) were measured at multiple points during the early adjustment period. Except for the impact of formalized training participation and mentors on job satisfaction, the remaining cross-sectional tactics-outcomes relationships (i.e., those deemed significant at eight weeks of tenure) remained significant throughout employees’ first year of tenure, as evidenced by results collected at the six month and one year tenure marks. The decreased impact of training and mentors on the outcome of job satisfaction however, is not surprising given the way in which these two constructs were measured. I suspect that the use of more in-depth measures for these two constructs would have yielded more consistent results.

Overall, organizational socialization tactics as a collective force had the strongest impact on job satisfaction at the six-month mark. Role clarity on the other hand, was most strongly affected at the eight-week mark. In all cases tactics-outcomes relationships measured cross-sectionally were stronger than those measured longitudinally, most likely due to common method bias. However, it is worth noting that most of these relationships remained significant when measured longitudinally, thus supporting Morrison’s (1993b) earlier claim that perceptions formed at the onset of employment are predictive of subsequent adjustment.

Individually, the only tactics-outcomes relationships that changed significantly over the course of year one were the social support-job satisfaction and orientation-role clarity relationships. The strength of the support-satisfaction relationship increased significantly between eight weeks and six months, presumably because newcomers
became better acquainted with work group members and felt more comfortable in their interactions with them. Separately, a significant increase in strength size was observed when comparing the orientation-clarity relationship collected at the eight weeks and one year tenure marks. This particular finding may be the result of inconsistent orientation implementation. Although orientation is ideally expected to occur during the first few days and weeks on the job, the sheer size and number of employees at the current organization made it practically impossible to follow a consistent timeline in administering newcomer orientation sessions. As a result, it is feasible that a greater number of newcomers participated in orientation sessions during the latter half of their first year of tenure rather than during their first few weeks on the job.

As a final note, the mean ratings for all tactics and outcomes measures declined across the three time periods. For example, job satisfaction ratings collected at eight weeks of tenure were significantly higher than those collected at six months, which in turn were significantly higher than those collected at the one year mark. There was also a decline in perceptions of role clarity throughout the year, although differences across the three time periods were not significant. These job satisfaction results lend additional support to the Kenexa (2007) study findings cited in the introductory section of the paper, whereby workers across North America and Europe exhibited a marked decline in job satisfaction levels at the mid-point of year one on the job. The current results seem to indicate that newcomers in the present organization also had reached the pinnacle of job satisfaction just immediately prior to the mid-point of their first year on the job, such that the second adjustment survey – administered at the six-month tenure mark – reflected the beginning of a decline in overall satisfaction, similar to the decline experienced by
Kenexa (2007) respondents. The decline in role clarity on the other hand, has not been so widely documented and thus was a bit more unexpected. It is possible that this decline in reported role clarity values is indicative of a beta and/or gamma change rather than an alpha change (Golembiewski, Billingsley, & Yeager, 1976). In the context of the current study, an alpha change would be characterized by an actual increase/decline in respondents’ perceptions of role clarity between Time 1 and Time 2. In contrast, respondents might experience difficulty in accurately recalling the benchmarks they had used in forming Time 1 ratings. Subsequently they might inadvertently end up using different internal scales in making Time 2 ratings, thus making it difficult to infer whether a change in actual role clarity perceptions had occurred. This represents an example of a beta change. Alternatively, a gamma change occurs when respondents’ definitions of role clarity are completely different at Time 1 and Time 2. In other words, a change in job responsibilities, supervisor, or work group formation between Time 1 and 2 could easily influence newcomers’ perceptions of how comfortable they were in performing their jobs. As a result, decreased role clarity ratings might be more reflective of changes in employees’ work environment circumstances, rather than of changes in employees’ role clarity perceptions regarding the jobs they were initially hired to perform. With respect to the current findings, it is quite feasible that respondents experienced significant work-related changes throughout year one which forced them to re-evaluate their definitions of role clarity during each of the subsequent rating periods.

**Compensatory Relationships**

The design of the current model was driven in large part by a desire to test the compensatory capabilities of employee and organizational influences. I was particularly
interested in whether a strong, positive employee influence could help alleviate the negative impact of an unfavorable organizational influence (and vice versa) on the stage-relevant socialization criteria. For example, would a highly experienced newcomer with negative perceptions of the recruitment process exhibit more positive pre-entry expectations than an inexperienced newcomer with negative recruitment process perceptions? In other words, was there evidence of an employee-organizational compensatory relationship in which high prior experience would compensate for low recruitment process perceptions and result in higher pre-entry expectations? Or would there simply be no interaction between these unique influences, such that low recruitment process perceptions would negatively impact pre-entry expectations irregardless of prior experience level? While I was able to test for the presence of compensatory relationships in the anticipatory socialization and final outcomes stages, this type of relationship could not be examined in the early adjustment stage (Phase 2), as no employee influence was positioned directly opposite the four proposed early adjustment socialization tactics.

As previously noted, prior experience had an unexpected negative impact on pre-entry expectation levels. This being the case, the absence of any compensatory relationships between employee and organizational variables would continue to result in less experienced newcomers exhibiting higher pre-entry expectations than their more experienced counterparts. This however did not occur. Two separate interactions between employee and organizational influences were in fact uncovered. Results essentially showed that the negative impact of increased experience could be off-set by strong, positive perceptions of recruiters and/or the recruitment process. However, high experience remained a liability when recruiter and/or recruitment process perceptions
were low. Under these conditions, experienced newcomers exhibited lower pre-entry expectations than their inexperienced peers.

Results failed to indicate the presence of an interaction among prior experience and initial compensation. As stated earlier, compensation may have been viewed as a non-compensatory factor by job applicants. In transitioning from applicant to newcomer, respondents may have been less focused on the objective attributes of pay, and more preoccupied with trying to interpret subjective signals from recruiters/interviewers and the recruitment/interview process. Essentially, applicants who were unsatisfied with the organization’s initial pay offerings would have already self-selected out of the recruitment/interview process. Furthermore, without existing empirical evidence to suggest that prior experience level affects the interpretation of compensation as a compensatory versus non-compensatory factor, there would be little reason to expect that the compensation judgments of respondents in the current study would have been differentially affected by their levels of prior experience.

Likewise, there did not appear to be any type of compensatory relationship between kinship responsibility and recognition and development during the final outcomes phase. Turnover intentions and turnover were separately impacted by these two variables. This absence of an interaction between kinship responsibility and recognition and development may have been more a function of the way in which kinship responsibility was currently measured (as described earlier in the employee influence section of the discussion) than evidence of a non-existent relationship between these two constructs.
Theoretical Implications

Employment life-cycle. Theoretically speaking, the implication to be drawn in having uncovered a strong relationship between pre-entry beliefs and post-entry attitudes and behaviors is that employees do not simply enter the organization as blank slates. They arrive at their first day on the job with preconceived notions of upcoming organizational experiences. Additionally, the accuracy and realism of these pre-entry beliefs can serve as powerful forces in affecting both the level of clarity and the level of satisfaction with which newcomers are able to perform their jobs. Upon entry, employees immediately begin to evaluate the extent to which initial expectations are in alignment with actual organizational experiences. Ultimately, those who perceive a high disconnect between initial beliefs and current experiences may begin to question their fit within the organization and consider their options for leaving. Practically speaking, organizations should be reassured by the current research which showed that not only are there pre-employment steps that can be taken to impact the initial expectations of these newcomers, but that there are also post-entry organizational initiatives that can be put into place to help off-set, or even completely alleviate any negative impact incurred from unmet expectations. These steps will be discussed in greater detail in the subsequent organizational influences section.

Separately, the absence of mediation in the current study does not necessarily imply that either the current results or those from the Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg (2003) study are inaccurate. Rather, if the timing of measure collection is indeed responsible for the observed differences in findings, it seems reasonable to conclude that we can view the current results as complementary to, rather than in complete contrast to
the earlier findings. On one hand, the current results would suggest that pre-entry knowledge is likely to have a strong impact on turnover intentions during the first few months of employment, as evidenced by the strong negative relationship uncovered in the current study when these two measures were collected as early as three months apart. On the other hand, the impact of pre-entry expectations may in fact be reduced to a negligible level with the passage of time as proximal adjustment outcomes like role clarity and job satisfaction become more prominent predictors of withdrawal behaviors. The existence of mediation in the Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg study when pre-entry knowledge and turnover intentions were measured 8 months apart supports this second conclusion.

However, the biggest contribution of the current study (regarding the relationships between employment life-cycle criteria) was not in demonstrating that job satisfaction and role clarity function as direct antecedents to turnover intentions and turnover (only supported in the case of job satisfaction). This has already been demonstrated in countless other studies as described earlier. More significant rather, is the fact that anticipatory expectations (above and beyond job satisfaction and role clarity) can be used to predict premature employee departure. In other words, if employees enter the organization with pre-entry beliefs that subsequently are not met, not only are they likely to experience job dissatisfaction and role ambiguity, but simultaneously they are likely to consider leaving the organization. Thus, these findings should serve to highlight the need for organizations to allocate greater resources to pre-employment initiatives such as recruitment.

Prior experience. In spite of being in the opposite direction as initially proposed, the results pertaining to the impact of prior experience on pre-entry expectations are
nevertheless highly relevant in the context of the current research. They support the overarching claim that pre-entry expectations are significantly impacted by employees’ prior experience levels. More importantly, the current study’s utilization of a sample characterized as having a wide range of previous organizational experience represents a major contribution to the socialization literature. Generally speaking, socialization researchers have opted to gather recruitment and socialization data from recent college graduates largely due to the ease with which this particular population can generally be contacted and surveyed. While newcomers with minimal career-related organizational experience (e.g., new graduates) represent an important segment of the workforce that needs to be studied, newcomers with little to no experience are no longer representative of the larger overall labor force (Carr et al., 2006). Years ago it may have been much more commonplace for workers to spend their adult work life employed by only one or two organizations. Today however, the boundaryless career model (see Feldman & Ng, 2007; Ng & Feldman, 2007; Ng et al., 2007) is more indicative of career-related attitudes. Workers are now entering the workforce cognizant of the fact that they will more than likely change employers every few years. As a result, organizations can now expect to be sorting through pools of applicants with diverse organizational experience levels. As an illustration of the current sample’s diversity, more than 75% of respondents in Phases 1, 2, and 3 reported having had at least one year of previous career-related experience prior to starting at the current organization, while more than 30% of respondents in Phases 2 and 3 reported at least 3 years of experience. Additionally, there were 95 respondents in Phase 1 who reported 10+ years of experience, compared to only 87 people who had no prior career-related work experience.
Contextual influences. Unfortunately, there has been limited previous research examining the relationship between off-the-job embeddedness and turnover. Furthermore, results from the studies that have been conducted have been conflicting. While Lee and colleagues (2004) found evidence to support a relationship between off-the-job embeddedness and turnover, Allen (2006) did not. Separately, it has proven difficult to directly compare results across various studies because the measures used to represent off-the-job embeddedness have been notably different. Some researchers have elected to measure the overarching construct of embeddedness, while others have chosen to divide the construct of embeddedness into on-the-job and off-the-job components. Still others have opted to break down these on-the-job and off-the-job embeddedness components even further into the more discrete dimensions of fit, links, and sacrifice.

In the current study, the inclusion of community fit as a measure of off-the-job embeddedness adds to our current understanding of newcomer adjustment by demonstrating that socialization can be impacted by the activities and processes that take place inside the organizational walls, as well as by people and activities outside these walls. Very few socialization studies to date have included any type of contextual influence factors, such as community fit, to help explain the process of newcomer adjustment. Despite researchers’ assertions that lack of embeddedness does not necessarily translate into employee attempts to leave the organization (Mitchell et al., 2001), this extra-organizational consideration is highly relevant to our understanding of the overall newcomer socialization process because lack of embeddedness may actually increase employee vulnerability to shocks and image violations. If and when these shocks/violations do occur, employees may find it easier to justify leaving the
organization because there will be no external forces influences keeping them tied to their present community.

**Recruitment.** Historically, much of the recruitment research has been focused on the ways in which recruiters and recruitment processes impact job attraction, choice, and acceptance intentions. Considerably less research has examined how recruitment efforts impact post-acceptance attitudes and behaviors. Chapman et al. (2005) conclude that this pre-acceptance focus is justified based on their meta-analytic interpretation of existing recruitment data. They suggest that recruiter and recruitment process signals appear to have less of an impact further along in the job search process, presumably because more job and organizational information becomes available to applicants as they get closer to actually receiving and accepting positions. The elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) has been offered up as an explanation as to why the impact of recruiters and the recruitment process may be attenuated over time (Larsen & Phillips, 2002). According to this model, individuals process information along a continuum of high versus low elaboration. Under conditions of high motivation and cognitive capability, applicants will process information centrally (i.e., high elaboration) – they will focus on message content in order to attach deeper meaning to the information prior to storing it for subsequent retrieval. Conversely, when individuals are not motivated and/or do not have the cognitive capability they will process information more peripherally – attitude formation will result from superficial perceptions of the information source for example (e.g., attractiveness or credibility of the informant), rather than from more meaningful analysis of the message content. In the context of job search activity, applicants may have reduced interest in an organization and thus not have the motivation to process
information at a deeper level. Alternatively, despite being highly interested in a particular organization, applicants who are evaluating multiple job opportunities may be cognitively unable to process highly meaningful information from so many different organizational sources. In both examples, applicants may be highly influenced by characteristics of the recruiter or more surface level aspects of the recruitment process as they rely on peripheral processing as a means by which to evaluate organizational opportunities.

In contrast to these earlier findings, the current results have significant implications for the impact of recruitment within the larger context of life-cycle socialization. Presently, these results seem to indicate that applicant perceptions of recruiters and recruitment process activities have a sustained impact. In transitioning from job applicant to organizational newcomer (as part of the anticipatory socialization phase), applicants appeared to carry their recruitment perceptions with them which they later used in forming their pre-entry expectations. Thus, the current study’s use of recruitment-related predictors in the context of anticipatory socialization represents a contribution to the literature. As an extension of earlier reported findings in which pre-entry expectations were found to influence both early adjustment indicators and turnover attitudes, we can assert with relative confidence that the way in which pre-entry expectations are shaped by recruiters and other recruitment processes represents an important organizational consideration within the context of newcomer socialization.

Compensation. As noted by Gerhart and Rynes (2003), there has been a lack of research looking at the effect of initial compensation on job attraction, let alone its effect on post-acceptance expectations. The current study may in fact be one of the first to
explicitly examine this particular link in the context of other proposed recruitment-expectations relationships. The present findings seem to indicate that compensation had less impact on newcomers’ pre-entry expectations than did recruiters, for example. Given the generalized measures that were used to obtain the current results however, I feel that more detailed conclusions with respect to compensation’s anticipatory impact are not warranted at this point. Separately, one possible conclusion to be drawn from these results may be that applicants tend to view compensation as a non-compensatory factor early in the job search process. In other words, applicants will not even consider working for an organization unless they perceive that their minimum compensation threshold is attainable. Once this threshold has been met applicants can proceed to evaluate other sources of organizationally-relevant information as a means by which to form subsequent pre-entry expectations. Ultimately, this conclusion cannot be drawn with notable certainty until more detailed compensation research has been conducted.

**Orientation.** Unlike much of the previous research that has addressed the influence of orientation sessions on employee socialization by way of objective orientation “access” or “participation” measures, the current study measured employees’ subjective perceptions of orientation “effectiveness.” Thus, the implications of the current findings are that the content of orientation sessions matters. The mere provision of orientation sessions does not guarantee improved socialization. Rather, employees must perceive having gained useful information from these sessions in order for the use of this organizational tactic to translate into positive employee outcomes.

**Social support & mentors.** The implications from the present work group social support and mentor findings are practically one and the same. Social support is a critical
element of newcomer socialization. Drawing upon the work of early learning theorists such as Bandura, it is easy to see why having an adequate social support structure would be so paramount to newcomer learning and development. According to social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), individuals learn various work behaviors and interaction patterns by being in close contact with others whom they can observe. Social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) further proposes that individuals evaluate the appropriateness of adopting newly learned behaviors based on the consequences associated with those behaviors. Similarly, researchers have found that individuals are more likely to learn and imitate behaviors for which they expect to be rewarded (Noe, 2002; Wexley & Latham, 1991). In the context of socialization, newcomers are frequently in a position to observe not only the behaviors exhibited by work group peers, but also the corresponding consequences. Additionally, they are positioned to observe how and when these behaviors are rewarded by both their supervisor and the larger organization. If newcomers observe for example, that their supervisor values mentoring, as evidenced by increased promotional opportunities offered to peers participating in these types of relationship, then newcomers themselves are more likely to actively pursue this type of developmental activity (e.g., Birdi et al., 1997; Mauer & Tarulli, 1994).

Consequently, employees who were motivated by perceptions of managerial support to participate in mentoring relationships have gone on to experience more positive career-related and psychosocial mentoring than those employees who perceived their managers to be unsupportive of such developmental activities (Eby, Lockwood, & Butts, 2006).

*Training.* One significant implication of the current training results is that they begin to address a practical issue as discussed by Saks and colleagues in the context of
their recent meta-analytic socialization findings (2007). These and other researchers (e.g., Ashforth & Saks, 1996) have pointed out that organizations may in fact choose to take a training contingency approach in using various types socialization tactics to induce particular outcomes amongst certain groups of newcomers. For example, the driving motivation behind the use of institutionalized tactics is typically to reduce uncertainty by providing very explicit and detailed instructions regarding acceptable work-related procedures. In essence, these newcomers are expected to act and think alike. Conversely, the informal, indirect nature of individualized tactics gives employees greater leverage in interpreting how their jobs might best be accomplished. Researchers like Saks and Ashforth (1997b) have suggested that the greater intellectual freedom accompanying the use of such individualized tactics likely leads to greater role innovation within the organization. A contingency approach appeared to be in play within the organization currently under investigation. Specifically, newcomers hired to work in the outside sales division were mandated to take part in intensive, formalized training while those hired to work in the remaining divisions were not given access to this type of formal training at the start of their employment. Purportedly, the rationale in using formalized training with sales personnel was to ensure that complex and detailed drug information was communicated to individuals and organizations throughout the medical community in a clear, and more importantly, consistent manner. By contrast, newcomers hired for non-sales positions within the immediate organizational setting were encouraged to be more creative in the implementation of their work responsibilities and for that reason received less formal, more indirect guidance and feedback from supervisors and work group peers in determining how to do their jobs.
Recognition & development. Similar to recruitment-related phenomena, recognition and development research within the socialization context has not been widely addressed. As noted by Buchanan (1974), employees are primarily concerned with learning the ropes and forming personal connections with others during their first year on the job. This has been the time period most commonly associated with socialization research. Considerably less attention has been focused on understanding what happens during the second year on the job and how this adjustment forms part of the overall socialization experience. Buchanan (1974) went on to point out that employees become more interested in “reinforcements” during year two. They become focused on the receipt of salary increases, promotional opportunities, and access to career training and development as organizational indicators that their contributions are valued and worthy of continuing support. Socialization researchers however, have frequently neglected this second year on the job. As result, little is known about how these reinforcements ultimately affect the overall socialization process. Therefore, one of the goals of the current research was to examine the importance of recognition and development, as a more generalized indicator of organizational reinforcements, in shaping newcomer life-cycle socialization.

Early in the paper I discussed the relative importance of psychological contracts as an evolving, motivating force behind newcomers’ early information-seeking behaviors (De Vos, Buyens, & Schalk, 2003). As part of this early adjustment evaluation process, newcomers look for cues within their work settings to signify that the organization is committed to maintaining its side of the “contract” by providing previously promised initiatives (e.g., formalized training; orientation). This evaluation process is significant in
that it sets the stage for newcomers’ reciprocal actions. If newcomers deem these early socialization experiences have essentially been fair (i.e., the organization has upheld its end of the psychological contract), subsequent attitudes and behaviors toward the organization are more likely to be positive (Van den Bos et al., 1998). Commonly known as the fair process effect (Folger, Rosenfield, Grove, & Corkran, 1979), this has been one of the most widely replicated findings in the social psychology literature. When perceptions of organizational support and fairness have been induced, research has consistently shown that newcomers repay their obligations to the organization in the form of increased job satisfaction (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998), affective commitment (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Korsgaard, Schweiger, & Sapienza, 1995), and decreased turnover intentions (Turnley & Feldman, 2000; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997).

Once early initiatives like training and orientation have concluded, newcomers look to further evaluate the organization’s fulfillment of the psychological contract in terms of providing more long-term reinforcements such as salary increases and career development assistance (Sturges, Conway, Guest, & Liefooghe, 2005). High involvement incentive practices like those just described, are designed to induce positive employee outcomes (Appelbaum, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000) and typically involve some form of competence development, recognition, and/or fair rewards (Pare & Tremblay, 2007). Researchers have argued that an organization’s use of these HR practices sends a purposeful signal to its employees of the desire to form some type of social exchange relationship (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003; Tsui, Pearce, Porter, & Hite, 1995). In the current study, the recognition and development construct was designed to capture aspects of competence development, recognition, and reward fairness, all of which have been
found by Pare and Tremblay (2007) to be positively related to procedural fairness and negatively related to turnover intentions.

The introductory section of the paper referenced more recent research which has suggested that employees are no longer wed to the traditional career path model, but rather are exhibiting behaviors and attitudes consistent with a boundaryless career perspective (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996). What this essentially means is that employees’ inter-organizational and inter-career movements have substantially increased. Consequently, the terms of the psychological contract have changed. Employees have begun to take on more responsibility in terms of managing their own careers largely because they have reduced expectations of remaining with a single firm for more than a few years (Brousseau et al., 1996; Hall, 1996). The theoretical implications of the current findings however, support Sturges et al. (2005) contention that we must not be too quick to assume that most employees have simply abandoned all expectations of organization-sponsored career development in the process of revising their psychological contracts. In fact, respondents in the current study indicated that they were largely impacted by multiple aspects of the psychological contract they maintained with the organization (including fair rewards, adequate recognition, and career development support). In response to these recognition and development provisions, current newcomers subsequently repaid the organization in the forms of increased commitment and intentions to remain.

**Practical Implications**

Starting work in a new organization is without a doubt a stressful experience for newcomers, regardless of their prior experience levels. To some extent the ambiguity
and resulting discomfort brought on by entering into an unfamiliar environment is an
unavoidable reality of a new job. In turn, this discomfort can be further compounded by
organizational socialization tactics that are either ineffective or simply not available.
Fortunately, numerous streams of socialization research have identified steps that
organizations can take to minimize newcomer maladjustment. With respect to the current
findings, I have segmented these steps into two main focal areas which organizations
should seek to address if they are to continue improving upon their overall newcomer
socialization strategies.

Recruitment. As demonstrated by the current findings, both recruiters and the
recruitment process impact the beliefs and perceptions that employees carry with them
when entering into new organizations. From a practical standpoint, these findings beg
the questions: “Who should provide recruitment information?” along with “what, when,
and how should this information be provided?” Earlier I described how personal
characteristics of recruiters may send certain signals to job applicants. Incumbents for
example, are seen as being more credible than formal, full-time recruiters (Coleman &
Irving, 1997). Separately, the use of recruiters representing minority ethnic groups may
send signals of organizational diversity (Highhouse, Stierwalt, Bariochi, Elder, & Fisher,
1999). As a result, those organizations looking to increase their overall level of diversity
may need to actively select or train ethnically diverse recruiters in order increase the
diversity of candidates initially attracted to the organization. Additionally, organizations
may look to train more incumbents to assist with recruitment activities in order to be
perceived as an organization that is forthcoming and honest, as evidenced by its
willingness to place current employees in direct contact with potential newcomers.
The *what, when, and how* of recruitment information provision is frequently tied to the issue of realistic job previews (RJPs). According to Phillips (1998, p. 673), “No recruitment issue has generated more attention than realistic job previews, the presentation by an organization of both favorable and unfavorable job-related information to job candidates.” The premise behind most RJP models is that job applicant expectations formed using realistic job information are more likely to result in post-entry met expectations and perceived role clarity, than expectations formed using overly positive and/or unrealistic information (Breaugh & Starke, 2000). Interestingly, research has further found that applicants with previous job-related experience are more likely to focus on negative aspects of the job when evaluating organizational RJPs (Meglino et al., 1997). Although it is not known to what extent the current organization provided any sort of RJP to prospective newcomers, results show prior experience as having a similar directional effect on pre-entry expectations. Newcomers with greater prior experience exhibited less positive expectations than their inexperienced counterparts. Across all levels of experience, meta-analytic findings (Phillips, 1998) have since shown that RJPs generally result in lowered initial expectations. The upside to these lowered expectations however, is that they are possibly more accurate, as evidenced by a decrease in turnover levels among newcomers who had been exposed to RJPs (Phillips, 1998).

The take-away message for organizations looking to increase recruitment effectiveness in the context of newcomer socialization is to select and train recruiters who exhibit the characteristics the organization is looking to attract, as well as to provide a certain level of straightforward and honest information (i.e., good and bad aspects of the organization) in order to induce positive, yet slightly tempered expectations among
prospective newcomers. Only future recruitment research conducted within a socialization context will be able to determine exactly how straightforward and honest that information must be.

Mentors & social support. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) published a 2006 research report which cited more than 40% of U.S. employees rating their jobs as “very” or “extremely” stressful, with at least 26% feeling “burned out” at work (as cited in Grawitch, Trares, & Kohler, 2007). In attempting to examine the efficacy of various workplace practices and environments in alleviating or reducing stress, researchers have found that social support functions as one of the most important employee coping mechanisms (Anderson et al., 2002). Social support from supervisors, co-workers, and subordinates has been linked to reductions in perceived work stress (Carlson & Perrewé, 1999). These forms of informal support have also helped to reduce thoughts of quitting among emotionally exhausted employees (Koeske & Koeske, 1993; Lee & Ashforth, 1993). Additionally, formal mentor-based social support has been linked indirectly to reductions in work stress (Allen et al., 1999). In sum, mentor support leads directly to increased newcomer socialization which in turn helps to reduce work-stress perceptions.

In response to current and previous findings, organizations must take proactive steps toward creating socially supportive work environments, both in terms of encouraging the formation of mentoring relationships (Eby et al., 2005) and in terms of training supervisors and co-workers to informally assist in the socialization of newcomers (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). Eby and colleagues (2005) recommended three organizational initiatives that could make a substantial difference in helping to foster the
creation of an overall supportive mentoring environment: (a) top management communications prioritizing employee development, (b) managerial role modeling of appropriate mentoring behaviors, and (c) rewards given to those involved with mentoring. Allen et al. (1999) have further pointed out that organizations must now re-conceptualize their definitions of mentoring relationships. With the flattening of organizational hierarchies and subsequent transitions to more team-based settings, it may no longer be as effective to primarily encourage one-on-one dyadic relationships between a single mentor and a single protégé. Organizations may need to implement alternative forms of social support and employee development. Mentoring alliances have been proposed as one such alternative form. In an alliance setting, two or more veteran work-group members jointly assume responsibility for simultaneously mentoring multiple newcomer peers in order for all group members to benefit from the combined support and experience of the team.

Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations of the current study are readily apparent. With regard to the overall model, as well as each of the three socialization phases, I will discuss several prominent shortcomings and highlight promising areas for future research.

Overall model. The current research was designed in such a way to be able to address three of the more commonly identified socialization phases. In doing so however, I was unable to capture more of the discrete steps and processes that continually occur within these broader phases. For example, current anticipatory phase data was collected after newcomers had formally accepted their positions. This timeline fails to address the newcomer processes leading up to that point (e.g., organizational attraction,
formation of acceptance intentions, etc.). Similarly, early adjustment phase criteria captured a combination of proximal (i.e., role clarity) and distal (i.e., job satisfaction) learning outcomes at the expense of failing to capture information acquisition as part of the actual learning process. Finally, performance is undoubtedly an important outcome of socialization. Yet it was not included in the current context. Future research should attempt to parcel out the more discrete processes within the overarching phases in an effort to more clearly delineate the points at which employee and organizational influences have significant impacts. Along the same lines, researchers need to begin explicitly focusing on latter stage socialization process. As few studies have collected meaningful socialization data beyond year one – the exceptions being turnover intentions and turnover – it has been difficult to accurately model how the socialization process unfolds after the one-year tenure mark has passed. Ultimately, we cannot fully understand the two-year itch until we begin addressing socialization during year two.

Separately, the current study utilized a measure of community fit as an indicator of external socialization influence. Contextual influences however, can originate from many other sources, including the broader society (e.g., economic conditions, war-time participation), as well as particular industries. For example, the intense downsizing of many U.S. car manufacturers is presently having a tremendous impact on workers who have only been trained to work in this one particular field. An additional contextual feature worthy of future research consideration is workplace technology. Despite having witnessed a dramatic increase in the use of technology to conduct organizational training, establish virtual work spaces, and expedite the flow of information across time and space, socialization researchers have not kept pace in examining the impact that this technology
may in fact be having on newcomer socialization. However, an increase in the number of companies that have been steadily moving from using traditional face-to-face orientation to computer-based sessions prompted at least one team of researchers (Wesson & Gogus, 2005) to examine technology’s impact within the socialization context. Specifically, these researchers were interested in whether the computer’s reduced ability to transmit socially rich information – involving the socialization content areas of *people, politics,* and *goals/values* (Chao et al., 1994) – would negatively impact newcomer job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Results did in fact show that the use of computer-mediated orientation sessions to transmit more socially-driven information led to declines in newcomer job satisfaction and affective commitment. However, these computer-based sessions were found to have essentially no impact on satisfaction and commitment ratings when the content of these orientations sessions was more information-based (i.e., areas of *language, history,* and *performance proficiency* – Chao et al., 1994). Based on these initial findings, it would appear as though much more research is needed to address this rising use of information technology as a socialization medium.

*Anticipatory stage.* A Phase 1 limitation was the lack of detailed information gathered with respect to newcomer prior experience. The current study assessed the number of years of career-related organizational experience that had been gained prior to starting on the job. However, vastly different amounts and types of information can certainly be gathered within an identical time period. To illustrate, one newcomer may have acquired pharmaceutical industry experience working for three separate drug companies over a five-year span, while another person may have worked for five years
employed as a hospital pharmacist within a single organization. Despite both having worked in pharmaceutical-related areas, these two individuals would likely have gained significantly different skill sets as a result of their previous work locations and responsibilities. Thus, researchers should make concerted efforts to gather considerably more detailed information pertaining to newcomer prior experience. Duration of previous experience, number of jobs held, termination reason(s), previous industry/occupational setting(s), and previous job/role types represent just a few of the additional details that might be gathered.

We also need to begin to address newcomers’ source(s) of pre-hire knowledge. As noted by Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg (2003), future researchers should examine how much pre-entry organizationally relevant information newcomers proactively seek out. Findings may indicate significant differences in pre-entry expectations for example, between applicants who obtain information from organizational incumbents and those who rely exclusively on information provided by formal recruiters. Along these same lines, Breaugh and Starke (2000) have pointed out that research will be well-served in focusing more closely on who is doing the recruiting. Is an organization primarily using formal, external recruiters, or is it sending out incumbents in order to increase applicants’ perceptions of recruiter credibility (Coleman & Irving, 1997)? Ultimately, answers from these types of research questions have practical implications in terms of the ways in which organizations devise their recruitment strategies.

*Early adjustment stage.* One of the original intentions in designing this study was to include a comprehensive list of major employee and organizational influences, shown by past research to be influential in the newcomer socialization process. In doing so, I
had hoped to compare and contrast the relative strength of employee and organizational influences, as well as examine how these two dimensions potentially interacted – something that has not been done up to this point. Furthermore, my initial plan involved creating a model that examined how these employee and organizational influences affected socialization criteria that have been deemed pivotal by past researchers. Unfortunately, two prominent constructs were dropped early in the analytical process owing in part to validity concerns. Post-entry fit perceptions (i.e., an early adjustment criterion) were dropped, as were proactive behaviors (i.e., an early adjustment employee influence). As Saks and Ashforth (1997a) pointed out, it is not enough to simply measure pre-entry fit perceptions. Post-entry fit perceptions must also be measured in order to accurately assess the degree of fit change that has occurred once a newcomer has entered the organization. Meta-analytic findings (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006) linking fit perceptions to turnover represent yet another reason as to why the continued examination of this construct in the context of socialization is important.

Historically speaking, newcomers have been studied as recipients of organizational socialization efforts. However, Miller and Jablin’s (1991) model of newcomer information seeking and early work by Ostroff and Kozlowski (1992) and Morrison (1993a, b) paved the way for researchers to begin positioning newcomers as socialization agents who were actively engaged in affecting their personal socialization outcomes. In the current decade, researchers like Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg (2003) have gone on to explicitly state that newcomers play an important role in shaping their own socialization experiences and therefore should not be assigned a passive role. Had proactive behaviors been a viable construct in the current study, I would have
examined the extent to which proactivity levels might have been a function of veteran incumbent accessibility. In other words, would I have observed a significant difference in the proactivity levels of sales newcomers (compared to their non-sales counterparts) as a result of being physically located outside the confines of the organization? In their earlier work, Major and Kozlowski (1997) did in fact suggest that future researchers evaluate “access” to organizational insiders as an important component of newcomer information-seeking behaviors.

In the current study, respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they had been assigned a mentor. They were not asked to specify whether the assigned mentor had been a co-worker, supervisor, or some other organizational member. Separately, newcomers may have sought out one or more informal mentors during their first year on the job. This information however, could not be captured using the current mentor measure. Given the noted differences among socialization outcomes associated with formal versus informal mentors (see Allen et al., 1999), future research needs to explore differences across each of the many types of mentor support, including peer versus supervisor mentors, informal vs. formal mentors, and assigned vs. self-chosen mentors. Additionally, as Saks et al. (2007) have pointed out, we generally know very little about how newcomers are affected by the presence of more than one role model. Does having two role models or mentors for example, impact newcomer adjustment twice as much as having just one role model? When possible, future research needs to try and systematically vary the types and numbers of role models/mentors to which newcomers are exposed in order to identify the most critical aspects of the mentor experience in the context of newcomer socialization (e.g., mentor interaction quality, variety, frequency).
Final outcomes stage. One of the biggest shortcomings of the current kinship findings was that they were obtained using a single 0 to 2 scale assessing the household presence of a partner/spouse and/or dependent children. I believe there is much to be gained from gathering more detailed household descriptions (e.g., number of dependent children, age of children, spouse/partner employment status, financial responsibility level, etc). Separately, more contextualized features of the community can and should be addressed. To what extent does relocation and adjustment to a new community affect newcomer socialization within the organization? Furthermore, how strong of an impact does family mal-adjustment in the context of a recent relocation affect a newcomer’s motivation to embed himself within a new organizational setting versus simply pick up and move back to his original community? These questions could be addressed with the collection of additional kinship and community-related information.

The current study did not include “reasons for departure” as part of the original turnover-related hypotheses. These departure reasons were however, collected by the HR department as per the organization’s employment exit policy, and as a result have been included for descriptive purposes in the current write-up (see Table 23). Departure reasons and employment tenure for both departed and current employees are included in the final table. In total there were 151 employees who had been hired and subsequently left the organization prior to the end of the 36-month data collection period. Future qualitative analyses performed using turnover departure reasons could help to isolate newcomers’ primary motivation(s) in leaving the organization after such a relatively short time period. As people often have multiple motivations for engaging in certain
behaviors, newcomers may also have multiple reasons for leaving. To address this issue, future surveys might ask respondents to rank-order their top three reasons for departure.

**Sample & data collection.** Owing in part to the limited age and ethnic diversity among the current sample, the generalizability of the current findings is possibly reduced. More than 80% of respondents within each of the four phases identified themselves as white. Separately, the sample as a whole was comprised of relatively young newcomers. The average age across the entire sample was 31. Interestingly, age variability was present within each of the phases corresponding to job type (see Table 24). In comparing sales versus non-sales newcomers, the average age of sales employees was roughly 29, while the average age of non-sales employees fell somewhere in the mid-30’s. Thus, future researchers might explore whether newcomer reactions to recruitment and the subsequent socialization efforts initiated by the organization are actually age-dependent. For example, earlier in the discussion section I mentioned the up-and-coming use of computers as a mechanism by which to administer orientation sessions. While initial results suggested that orientation content largely impacts the degree to which these electronic sessions are perceived as being effective, respondent age may also play a critical role in this computer-mediated context. Respondents currently in their 20’s who have essentially grown up in an era characterized by the pervasive use of multiple forms of electronic communication (i.e., cell phones, online chat rooms, etc.) may find it much easier to learn and communicate via computers than respondents currently in their 30’s and beyond who are somewhat less accustomed to electronic information transmission. In the context of the current study, age was an pre-determined control variable which did not appear to play a significant role in impacting any of the hypothesized relationships. It
is possible however, that segmenting future samples into age categories (e.g., 20-25 year olds, 25-30 year olds, 30-35 year olds, etc.) may yield notably different findings.

Additionally, the present sample was comprised primarily of white-collar workers employed in a single organization within a single industry. Generalization of these results to other occupational or industry settings may not be warranted. Future socialization researchers studies should attempt to gather data from ethnically diverse populations across an array of organizational and occupational settings (see Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003) in order to substantiate the generalizability of current and future organizational socialization findings.

As with any self-report field research involving predictors and criteria collected at concurrently, there was some initial concern as to whether common-method bias was responsible in accounting for the significant relationships observed among Phase 1 variables. However, the overall strength of longitudinal relationships within Phases 2, 3, and 4 helped to reduce the validity concerns for Phase 1 findings. Phase 2 involved both concurrent and longitudinal data collections. In Phase 3, only one cross-sectional relationship had been initially proposed and captured (i.e., recognition & development → turnover intentions). For the remaining Phase 3 relationships, predictors and criteria were collected at separate points in time. Finally, Phase 4 assessed the relationship between predictors collected during Phases 1 and 2, and criteria collected during Phases 2 and 3.

Conclusions

Newcomer socialization is not simply an inevitable consequence of organization-sponsored tactics (including training and orientation), intended to impact employees the minute they set foot in the door. Rather, newcomer socialization can be conceived as a
complex interaction among pre-entry, post-entry, and extra-organizational factors that manifests itself in the forms of fit, clarity, and satisfaction perceptions, while simultaneously impacting newcomer retention. Current findings demonstrate that pre-entry recruitment activities, as well as post-entry recognition and development interventions for example, play a significant role in affecting newcomer integration. Furthermore, results imply that household and communal supports represent important contextual considerations, theoretically and practically speaking, which can and should be incorporated into future models of newcomer socialization. Ultimately, socialization policies aimed at improving newcomer adjustment will likely be proven ineffective if put forth in name only. Organizations and their representatives must be perceived as highly supportive of employee learning and development if newcomers are to successfully utilize these policies and remain involved with the organization.
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Appendix A

Proposed survey measures

**Prior Occupational Experience**
1. Which of the following best describes why you left your previous employer?*
2. How many years of professional experience do you have?

**Initial Compensation** \( (\alpha = .76) \)
Rate how the current organization compares with other companies on the following factors…
1. Starting compensation.
2. Long-term compensation potential.
3. Benefits
4. How do you rate the total compensation package you have received at this organization?

**Recruitment Process** \( (\alpha = .82) \)
1. The amount of changes during the recruiting process (e.g., logistics, schedules) was what I would normally expect.*
2. I was kept up-to-date on the status of my employment candidacy.
3. I felt like the company negotiated the terms of my employment offer in good faith.
4. My needs, requirements, and concerns were considered throughout the recruiting process.
5. I felt comfortable asking questions throughout the recruiting process.
6. I have a good understanding of opportunities available at this organization.*
7. I have a good understanding of this organization’s culture and values.*
8. Overall, I felt like I was treated with respect throughout the recruiting process.*
9. Overall, how would you rate this organization’s recruiting and hiring process?*

**Recruiters/Interviewers** \( (\alpha = .87) \)
This organization’s recruiters/interviews…
1. Were knowledgeable about career options at this organization.
2. Conveyed an honest, realistic impression of this organization.
3. Gave me ample opportunity to present my strengths.
4. Fully explored my ability to do the job.
5. Seemed prepared and organized.*
6. Seemed genuinely interested in my career/professional growth objectives.*
7. Answered my questions fully, or followed up with answers quickly.*
8. Were responsive (returned calls promptly, sent out correspondence and materials promptly).*
9. Made and communicated decisions in a timely manner.*
10. Treated me in a courteous, professional manner.*
11. Demonstrated a sincere desire to have me join the company.*
12. Seemed to focus on the most relevant and appropriate recruiting and hiring criteria.*

* Dropped item.
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Pre-Entry Expectations ($\alpha = .83$)
1. I will receive the training necessary to do a quality job.*
2. I am confident that I will be able to achieve my career goals at this organization.*
3. I will be given a real opportunity to improve my skills at this organization.*
4. My work will give me a feeling of personal accomplishment.*
5. Employees’ efforts to balance work and family/personal needs will be supported.*
6. My job will make good use of my skills and abilities.*
7. My immediate supervisor will treat employees fairly.*
8. I am clear on what my roles and responsibilities will be in my job.*
9. My personal values align with this organization’s culture.
10. I am confident that I will fit into this organization’s culture.
11. I will be valued as an employee of this company.
12. I will be able to meet my career goals at this organization and still devote sufficient attention to my family/personal life.

Proactive Behaviors (dropped completely)
1. I have established a professional network at this organization.*
2. I have established a social network at this organization.*
3. I feel comfortable asking my supervisor for feedback on how I am doing in my job.*

Mentors
1. I have an assigned mentor or peer coach.

Orientation Effectiveness ($\alpha = .84$)
1. How effective was the New Employee Orientation program you attended on your first day at this organization?
2. How effective was the formal orientation process to help you get oriented into your organization?
3. How effective was the departmental orientation process to help you get oriented into your group/work area?

Supervisor & Co-worker Social Support ($\alpha = .89$)
1. People I work with listen to what I have to say.
2. In my work group, more experienced employees help less experienced employees learn processes and solve problems.
3. My co-workers have helped me understand how to get things done at this organization.
4. In my work group, everyone is made to feel comfortable regardless of their background.*
5. My supervisor has discussed with me how things get done at this organization.*

* Dropped item.
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6 My supervisor and I met or talked frequently the first few weeks to see how I was getting along.*
7 I feel comfortable asking my peers for feedback on my ideas. (formerly item #4 on proactive behaviors scale)

Job Satisfaction (α = .85)
1 How satisfied are you with your involvement in decisions that affect your work?
2 Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?
3 Considering everything, how would you rate your overall satisfaction in this organization at the present time?

P-O Fit Perceptions (dropped completely)
1 I believe I fit well into this organization’s culture.*
2 I am adjusting well to this organization’s culture.*
3 I feel valued as an employee of this company.*
4 My previous professional experience is valued at this organization.*

Role Clarity (α = .85)
1 I understand the importance of my contribution to achieving the goals and objectives of the company.*
2 I am clear on what my roles and responsibilities are in my job.
3 I have enough information to do my job.
4 I receive the training necessary to do a quality job.

Community Fit (α = .82)
1 I have a best friend outside of work.*
2 I have a social support system in the community where I live.
3 I am participating in social groups and/or groups related to my hobbies.*
4 My family participates in community/school activities.*
5 I believe I fit well with the culture of the community in which I live.
6 My transition into living in the community in which I live has been smooth.
7 For the most part, things in my community have met my expectations.
8 Overall, how satisfied are you with the community in which you live.

Kinship Responsibility
1 Do you have caregiving responsibilities for a child(ren) under the age of 18?
2 Do you have a spouse/partner?

Recognition & Development (α = .89)
1 How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?
2 In this company, people are rewarded according to their job performance.
3 My performance on the job is evaluated fairly.
4 Promotions go to those who best deserve them.
5 I am confident that I can achieve my career goals at this organization.
6 I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills at this organization.

* Dropped item.
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**Turnover Intentions**

1. If you have your own way, will you still be working for this organization 12 months from now? (R)
2. I am seriously considering leaving this organization within the next 12 months.
Appendix B

Revised hypotheses

**H1:** Pre-entry expectations will positively impact (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity, and negatively impact (c) turnover intentions and (d) turnover.

**H2:** Job satisfaction will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

**H3:** Role clarity will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

**H4:** (a) Job satisfaction and (b) role clarity will fully mediate the impact of pre-entry expectations on turnover intentions.

**H5:** (a) Job satisfaction and (b) role clarity will fully mediate the impact of pre-entry expectations on turnover.

**H6:** Prior occupational experience will positively impact pre-entry expectations.

**H7:** Kinship responsibility will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

**H8:** Kinship responsibility will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond job satisfaction and/or role clarity.

**H9:** Perceptions of (a) the recruiter and (b) the recruitment process will positively impact pre-entry expectations.

**H10:** Initial compensation will positively impact pre-entry expectations.

**H11:** Participation in formalized training will positively impact (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity.

**H12:** Orientation programs will positively impact (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity.

**H13:** Mentors will positively impact (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity.

**H14:** Participation in formalized training will positively impact (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity above and beyond pre-entry expectations.

**H15:** Orientation programs will positively impact (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity, above and beyond pre-entry expectations.

**H16:** Mentors will positively impact (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity, above and beyond pre-entry expectations.

**H17:** Social support will positively impact (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity.

**H18:** Social support will positively impact (a) job satisfaction and (b) role clarity, above and beyond pre-entry expectations.
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H19: Recognition and development will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

H20: Recognition and development will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover, above and beyond job satisfaction and/or role clarity.

H21: Community fit will negatively impact (a) turnover intentions and (b) turnover.

H22: (a) Tactics-adjustment relationships measured at 8 weeks of tenure will be stronger than relationships measured at 6 months and (b) tactics-adjustment relationships measured at 6 months will be stronger than relationships measured at 1 year.

H23a: Prior occupational experience will interact with recruitment source, such that higher levels of both will result in the highest levels of pre-entry expectations and lower levels of both will result in the lowest levels of pre-entry expectations.

H23b: Prior occupational experience will interact with recruitment process, such that higher levels of both will result in the highest levels of pre-entry expectations and lower levels of both will result in the lowest levels of pre-entry expectations.

H23c: Prior occupational experience will interact with initial compensation, such that higher levels of both will result in the highest levels of pre-entry expectations and lower levels of both will result in the lowest levels of pre-entry expectations.

H24: Kinship responsibility will interact with recognition and development, such that higher levels of both will result in the lowest levels of turnover intentions and lower levels of both will result in the highest levels of turnover intentions.

H25: Kinship responsibility will interact with recognition and development, such that higher levels of both will result in the lowest rates turnover and lower levels of both will result in the highest rates of turnover.
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Hypotheses’ outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPPORTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a: Pre-entry expectations will positively impact job satisfaction.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: Pre-entry expectations will positively impact role clarity.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c: Pre-entry expectations will negatively impact turnover intentions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1d: Pre-entry expectations will negatively impact turnover.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a: Job satisfaction will negatively impact turnover intentions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b: Job satisfaction will negatively impact turnover.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a: Role clarity will negatively impact turnover intentions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b: Role clarity will negatively impact turnover.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a: Job satisfaction will fully mediate the impact of pre-entry expectations on turnover intentions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b: Role clarity will fully mediate the impact of pre-entry expectations on turnover intentions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a: Job satisfaction will fully mediate the impact of pre-entry expectations on turnover.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b: Role clarity will fully mediate the impact of pre-entry expectations on turnover.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Prior occupational experience will positively impact pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7a: Kinship responsibility will negatively impact turnover intentions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7b: Kinship responsibility will negatively impact turnover.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8a: Kinship responsibility will negatively impact turnover intentions above and beyond job satisfaction and/or role clarity.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8b: Kinship responsibility will negatively impact turnover above and beyond job satisfaction and/or role clarity.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9a: Perceptions of the recruiter will positively impact pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPPORTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9b: Perceptions of the recruitment process will positively impact pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10: Initial compensation will positively impact pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11a: Participation in formalized training will positively impact job satisfaction.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11b: Participation in formalized training will positively impact role clarity.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12a: Orientation programs will positively impact job satisfaction.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12b: Orientation programs will positively impact role clarity.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13a: Mentors will positively impact job satisfaction.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13b: Mentors will positively impact role clarity.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14a: Participation in formalized training will positively impact job satisfaction above and beyond pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14b: Participation in formalized training will positively impact role clarity above and beyond pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15a: Orientation programs will positively impact job satisfaction above and beyond pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15b: Orientation programs will positively impact role clarity above and beyond pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16a: Mentors will positively impact job satisfaction above and beyond pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16b: Mentors will positively impact role clarity above and beyond pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17a: Social support will positively impact job satisfaction.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17b: Social support will positively impact role clarity.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18a: Social support will positively impact job satisfaction above and beyond pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18b: Social support will positively impact role clarity above and beyond pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H19a: Recognition and development will negatively impact turnover intentions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H19b:</td>
<td>Recognition and development will negatively impact turnover.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H20a:</td>
<td>Recognition and development will negatively impact turnover intentions above and beyond job satisfaction and/or role clarity.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H20b:</td>
<td>Recognition and development will negatively impact turnover above and beyond job satisfaction and/or role clarity.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H21a:</td>
<td>Community fit will negatively impact turnover intentions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H21b:</td>
<td>Community fit will negatively impact turnover.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H22a:</td>
<td>Tactics-adjustment relationships measured at 8 weeks of tenure will be stronger than relationships measured at 6 months.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H22b:</td>
<td>Tactics-adjustment relationships measured at 6 months of tenure will be stronger than relationships measured at 1 year.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H23a:</td>
<td>Prior occupational experience will interact with recruitment source, such that higher levels of both will result in the highest levels of pre-entry expectations and lower levels of both will result in the lowest levels of pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H23b:</td>
<td>Prior occupational experience will interact with recruitment process, such that higher levels of both will result in the highest levels of pre-entry expectations and lower levels of both will result in the lowest levels of pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H23c:</td>
<td>Prior occupational experience will interact with initial compensation, such that higher levels of both will result in the highest levels of pre-entry expectations and lower levels of both will result in the lowest levels of pre-entry expectations.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H24:</td>
<td>Kinship responsibility will interact with recognition and development, such that higher levels of both will result in the lowest levels of turnover intentions and lower levels of both will result in the highest levels of turnover intentions.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H25:</td>
<td>Kinship responsibility will interact with recognition and development, such that higher levels of both will result in the lowest rates of turnover and lower levels of both will result in the highest rates of turnover.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1
Fit Indices for Alternative Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Factor</td>
<td>5052.11**</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>Combined Role Clarity and Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Social Support and Community Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Recruitment Process and Recruiters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Factor</td>
<td>4089.52**</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>Combined Social Support and Community Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Recruitment Process and Recruiters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Factor</td>
<td>3080.84**</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>Combined Recruitment Process and Recruiters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Factor</td>
<td>2643.85**</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>TARGET MODEL (see note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Factor</td>
<td>2220.60**</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>Separated Recognition &amp; Development into 2 constructs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Performance Recognition and Career Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>4142.00**</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>Removed Orientation $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed Training $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed Mentor $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed Social Support $\rightarrow$ Role Clarity pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed Pre-Entry Expectations $\rightarrow$ Turnover Intentions pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>3248.89**</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>TARGET MODEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>3233.83**</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>Added Prior Experience $\rightarrow$ Role Clarity pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added Social Support $\rightarrow$ Turnover Intentions pathway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Factors include: (1) compensation, (2) recruiters, (3) recruitment process, (4) pre-entry expectations, (5) orientation, (6) social support, (7) role clarity, (8) job satisfaction, (9) community fit, (10) recognition & development, and (11) turnover intentions. **p < .01.
Table 2

Inter-Factor Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Compensation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Recruiters</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Recruitment Process</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pre-Entry Expectations</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Orientation Effectiveness</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Social Support</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Role Clarity</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Community Fit</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Recognition &amp; Development</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>- .31</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Correlation Matrix for Phase 4: Employment Life-Cycle Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Entry Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Turnover</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean       4.67  4.31  4.24  1.56  1.05  
Std. Dev.  0.42  0.60  0.63  0.87  0.22

Note. Coefficient alphas indicating estimated reliabilities are in parentheses. Sample size = 308.

**p < .01.
Table 4

Linear Regression Analyses for Testing Direct and Mediating Effects – Phase 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Role Clarity</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Mediation: Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Mediation: Role Clarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Effects β</td>
<td>Main Effects β</td>
<td>Main Effects β</td>
<td>Mediated Effects β</td>
<td>Mediated Effects β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Entry Expectations</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (8-wk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity (8-wk)</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R²</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F-test</td>
<td>24.16**</td>
<td>44.61**</td>
<td>20.48**</td>
<td>33.31**</td>
<td>28.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>1, 300</td>
<td>1, 304</td>
<td>2, 295</td>
<td>1, 300</td>
<td>2, 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-test for Δ R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
Table 5

Logistic Regression Analyses for Testing Direct Effects – Phase 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee &amp; Organizational Influences</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Entry Expectations</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $X^2$</td>
<td>10.04*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model DF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-2 \log$ likelihood</td>
<td>109.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo $R^2$</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
Table 6

Correlation Matrix for Phase 1: Anticipatory Socialization Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prior Experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compensation</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recruitment Process</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recruiters</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pre-Entry Expectations</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.05 4.30 4.47 4.64 4.66
Std. Dev.: 1.52 0.62 0.61 0.49 0.45

Note. Coefficient alphas indicating estimated reliabilities are in parentheses. Sample size = 581.

**p < .01.
Table 7

Employee & Organizational Influences: Linear Regression Analyses for Testing Direct Effects – Phases 1, 2, & 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee &amp; Organizational Influences</th>
<th>Adjusted Criteria</th>
<th>Pre-Entry Expectations β</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction β</th>
<th>Role Clarity β</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiters</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition &amp; Develop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F-test</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.17**</td>
<td>180.81**</td>
<td>381.55**</td>
<td>292.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td></td>
<td>4, 561</td>
<td>4, 1365</td>
<td>4, 1376</td>
<td>3, 1382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Table 8

Correlation Matrix for Phase 3: Final Outcomes Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Role Clarity</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community Fit</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kinship Responsibility</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recognition &amp; Development</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Actual Turnover</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.11 | 0.99 | 3.69 | 1.77 | 1.08 |
Std. Dev. | 0.62 | 0.72 | 0.68 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.27 |

Note. Coefficient alphas indicating estimated reliabilities are in parentheses. Sample Size = 1442.

**p < .01.
Table 9

Employee & Organizational Influences: Logistic Regression Analyses for Testing Direct Effects – Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee &amp; Organizational</strong></td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Fit</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition &amp; Develop</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $X^2$</td>
<td>17.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model DF</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–2 Log likelihood</td>
<td>764.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R$^2$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Influences</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Actual Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship Responsibility</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall R²</strong></td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>Model X²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted R²</strong></td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>Model DF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall F-test</strong></td>
<td>43.51**</td>
<td>–2 Log likelihood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Df</strong></td>
<td>3, 1358</td>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre-Entry Expectations</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training Participation</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Orientation Effectiveness</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mentors</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Support</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Clarity</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | 4.68 | 1.54 | 4.06 | 1.81 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.13 |
Std. Dev. | 0.41 | 0.50 | 0.83 | 0.39 | 0.66 | 0.63 | 0.73 |

Note. Coefficient alphas indicating estimated reliabilities are in parentheses. Sample Size = 1510.

**p < .01.
Table 12

Organizational Influences: Linear Regression Analyses for Testing Combined Effects – Phases 1 & 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Criteria</th>
<th>Organizational Influences</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction β</th>
<th>Role Clarity β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Entry Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F-test</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.94**</td>
<td>108.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td></td>
<td>5, 339</td>
<td>5, 340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Table 13

Organizational Influences: Linear & Logistic Regression Analyses for Testing Combined Effects – Phases 2 & 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Influences</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Actual Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition &amp; Develop</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall R²</strong></td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted R²</strong></td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall F-test</strong></td>
<td>288.62**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Df</strong></td>
<td>3, 1366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model X²</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model DF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>–2 Log likelihood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>761.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pseudo R²</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01.
Table 14
Correlation Matrix for Phase 2: Six-Month Early Adjustment Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Training Participation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Orientation Effectiveness</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mentors</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Support</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Role Clarity</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 1.50 3.92 1.77 4.28 4.09 4.08
Std. Dev. 0.50 0.87 0.42 0.61 0.71 0.73

Note. Coefficient alphas indicating estimated reliabilities are in parentheses. Sample Size = 894.

**p < .01.
Table 15
Correlation Matrix for Phase 2: One-Year Early Adjustment Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Effectiveness</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>(83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.46 3.79 1.71 4.18 3.96 4.08
Std. Dev.: 0.50 0.90 0.45 0.60 0.73 0.66

Note. Coefficient alphas indicating estimated reliabilities are in parentheses. Sample Size = 449.

**p < .01
Table 16
Regression Analyses for Testing Eight-Week Tactics-Outcomes Relationships across Time – Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Influences</th>
<th>8 weeks β</th>
<th>6 months β</th>
<th>1 year β</th>
<th>8 weeks β</th>
<th>6 months β</th>
<th>1 year β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 (8 weeks)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Participation</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Effectiveness</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall R²</strong></td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted R²</strong></td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall F-test</strong></td>
<td>180.81**</td>
<td>51.55**</td>
<td>27.31**</td>
<td>381.55**</td>
<td>67.52**</td>
<td>34.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Df</strong></td>
<td>4, 1365</td>
<td>4, 820</td>
<td>4, 403</td>
<td>4, 1376</td>
<td>4, 826</td>
<td>4, 407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Table 17

Regression Analyses for Testing Six-Month Tactics-Outcomes Relationships across Time – Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Criteria</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Role Clarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Influences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 (6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Participation</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Effectiveness</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R²</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F-test</td>
<td>135.52**</td>
<td>23.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>4, 822</td>
<td>4, 292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05. **p < .01.
Table 18

Regression Analyses for Testing One-Year Tactics-Outcomes Relationships across Time – Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Criteria</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Role Clarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Influences</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R²</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F-test</td>
<td>62.61**</td>
<td>110.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>4, 402</td>
<td>4, 404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01.
Table 19

Longitudinal Tactics-Outcomes Comparisons – Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization Tactics</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Role Clarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(non-sig.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>6.64&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8.30&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>11.31&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16.09&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(non-sig.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scores represent t-values. Different superscripts signify significant differences.

<sup>a</sup> vs. <sup>b</sup> = p < .05.

<sup>a</sup> vs. <sup>c</sup> = p < .01.
### Table 20

Linear Regression Analyses for Testing Moderating Effect of Prior Experience on Pre-entry Expectations – Phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Process</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiters</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Experience (PE)</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>-.65**</td>
<td>-.97**</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE X Recruitment Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE X Recruiters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE X Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall $R^2$</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F test</td>
<td>98.17**</td>
<td>80.61**</td>
<td>81.20**</td>
<td>79.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ increment</td>
<td>98.17**</td>
<td>80.61**</td>
<td>81.20**</td>
<td>79.53**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. 
Table 21

Linear Regression Analyses for Testing Moderating Effect of Recognition and Development on Turnover Intentions – Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Fit</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship Responsibility</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition &amp; Development (RD)</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
<td>-1.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD X Community Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD X Kinship Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall $R^2$</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F test</td>
<td>292.53**</td>
<td>178.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ increment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$.  ** $p < .01$.  

...
Table 22

Logistic Regression Analyses for Testing Moderating Effect of Recognition and Development on Actual Turnover – Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Fit</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship Responsibility</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition &amp; Develop (RD)</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD X Community Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD X Kinship Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model X²</td>
<td>17.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model DF</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log likelihood</td>
<td>746.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² increment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.  ** p < .01.
Table 23

Employment Tenure Comparisons and Turnover Reasons across the Entire Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure (months)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – 24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Turnover Reason = (1) Assigned work; (2) Organizational benefits/policies; (3) Career/education opportunities; (4) Personal reasons; (5) Unsatisfactory performance/behaviors; (6) Organizational restructuring; (7) Other. (N = 1709).
Table 24

Age Demographics’ Comparisons according to Job Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sales Newcomers</th>
<th>Non-Sales Newcomers</th>
<th>Overall Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev.</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev.</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev.</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev.</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean, standard deviation, median, and mode values are given in terms of “years”.
Figure 1. Overall conceptual model of employment life-cycle socialization.
Figure Caption

Figure 2. Adapted Multi-level Process Model of Organizational Socialization (Saks & Ashforth, 1997b).
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Figure 3. Employment life cycle criteria.
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*Figure 4.* Employee side socialization influences.
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*Figure 5.* Organization side socialization influences.
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Figure Caption

*Figure 6.* Tactics-outcomes stability during the early adjustment period.
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Figure Caption

*Figure 7.* Employee side contextual influences on turnover.
Final Outcomes

• Turnover Intentions
• Turnover (yes/no)
Figure Caption

*Figure 8.* Overall measurement model of employment life-cycle socialization.
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*Figure 9.* Dual influence model of newcomer socialization.
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Figure 10. Data analysis phases.
Figure Caption

*Figure 11.* Revised overall measurement model of employment life-cycle socialization with corresponding hypotheses.
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Figure Caption

*Figure 12.* Confirmatory factor analysis path diagram.
Figure Caption

*Figure 13. Path model 1. N = 1711. All numbers reflect standardized path coefficients. Error loadings of the 4 single-indicator factors (i.e., prior experience, training, mentor, kinship responsibility) were fixed at 0 in order to derive conservative estimates of the structural values. * = p < .05; ** = p < .01.*
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*Figure 14*. Path model 2 – target model. N = 1711. All numbers reflect standardized path coefficients. Error loadings of the 4 single-indicator factors (i.e., prior experience, training, mentor, kinship responsibility) were fixed at 0 in order to derive conservative estimates of the structural values. * = p < .05; ** = p < .01.
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*Figure 15. Path model 3. N = 1711. All numbers reflect standardized path coefficients. Error loadings of the 4 single-indicator factors (i.e., prior experience, training, mentor, kinship responsibility) were fixed at 0 in order to derive conservative estimates of the structural values. * = p < .05; ** = p < .01.*
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*Figure 16.* Phase 1: Interaction between recruiter perceptions and prior experience on pre-entry expectations.
Interaction between recruiter perceptions and prior experience on pre-entry expectations

![Graph showing interaction between recruiter perceptions and prior experience on pre-entry expectations. The graph plots recruiter perceptions on the x-axis and pre-entry expectations on the y-axis. Two lines are shown, one for low experience and one for high experience. The line for high experience shows a higher increase in pre-entry expectations compared to low experience.](image_url)
Figure Caption

*Figure 17.* Phase 1: Interaction between recruitment process and prior experience on pre-entry expectations.
Interaction between recruitment process perceptions and prior experience on pre-entry expectations
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