Proactivity During Organizational Entry: The Role of Desire for Control

Susan J. Ashford
University of Michigan

J. Stewart Black
Thunderbird University

This study described the various ways that newcomers proactively attempt to gain feelings of personal control during organizational entry and examined their longitudinal effects on self-reported performance and satisfaction in a sample of organizational newcomers. The results suggest that individuals engage in proactive activities such as information and feedback seeking, relationship building, job-change negotiating, and positive framing during entry and that individual differences in desired control were related to 6 proactive entry tactics. However, only some of these tactics were related to self-reported performance and job satisfaction.

The socialization literature describes the ways in which organizations mold and shape individual behavior (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). The literature has focused on stages of socialization and on situational factors that influence individuals during the entry period (Reichers, 1987). More recently, researchers have begun to examine the role that individual dispositions might play in the entry process, arguing that dispositions such as self-efficacy and growth-needs strength moderate the impact of organizational socialization efforts on outcomes (Ashforth, Saks, & Lee, 1994; G. R. Jones, 1983, 1986). Recent work has also begun to focus on what individuals entering organizations actually do during socialization to facilitate their own adaptation (Bauer & Green, 1994; Morrison, 1993a, 1993b; Saks & Ashforth, 1995; Smith & Kozlowski, 1995). Ashford and Taylor's (1990) general theoretical model on individual adaptation is helpful in describing and organizing this recent research. Ashford and Taylor proposed that individuals undertake active adaptation to maintain three conditions necessary for response: adequate information, adequate internal

conditions (e.g., self-esteem), and flexibility or freedom of movement. Much of the recent research on individual activity during entry has emphasized the first concern. This emphasis shows up in research on the cognitive-sensemaking processes by which newcomers learn the ways of the new organization (Louis, 1980) and information seeking as the primary behavioral manifestation of these sensemaking processes (Miller & Jablin, 1991; Morrison, 1993a, 1993b). Also in this vein, Saks and Ashforth (1995) showed how organizational socialization tactics affect the ways that individuals actively learn their jobs.

However, research in this area has also begun to articulate and examine individual-level entry behaviors reflecting Ashford and Taylor's (1990) other necessary conditions. Specifically, reflecting a need for adequate internal conditions for response, Feldman and Brett (1983) focused on strategies newcomers use to cope with stress, and Saks and Ashforth (in press) examined how a set of self-management activities facilitated adaptation. Reflecting needs for flexibility and freedom of movement, Bauer and Green (1994) and Reichers (1987) showed how newcomers' attempts to get involved in task and social relationships during entry facilitated adaptation. At a general level, Ashford and Black (1992) proposed that the more active individuals were throughout the entry process (i.e., the more effort they expended to ensure their own survival), the more successful they would be in their adaptation to the organization. Adaptation success would be manifested in outcomes such as satisfaction with the work setting and enhanced job performance as well as more intermediate outcomes such as task mastery and social integration. Empirical evidence for this proposition was found in Morrison's (1993a) and Ostroff and Kozlowski's (1992) research on information seeking and in Bauer and Green's recent research on newcomers.

What is less known from this body of work are the factors that motivate activity during entry. We propose that entry into a new organizational environment can be thought of as a process by which individuals temporarily lose and proactively attempt to regain feelings of control. We argue that the actions that newcomers engage in during entry can be viewed, in part, as manifestations of a desire to gain control in that setting in order to maximize their performance and increase satisfaction. The control-seeking perspective suggests a set of entry tactics that go beyond the information and feedback seeking typically studied and suggests that desired control is an important individual difference in the entry process.

Research on individual differences and their role in the socialization process is quite sparse (Fisher, 1986; Saks, 1995). The research that exists has examined the direct role of individual differences on outcomes or as a moderator variable in the socialization process. Adkins (1995) found that one individual difference, prior work experience in a similar setting, had little effect on socialization outcomes. Similarly, Bauer (1995) found that such experience positively affected acceptance by the newcomers' manager and coworkers but was unrelated to performance. Finally, Major, Kozlowski, Chao, and Gardner (1995) found that unmet expectations about the new setting affected commitment, satisfaction, and turnover intent. Testing moderator effects, Jones (1986) showed that the effects of organizational socialization tactics on outcomes were moderated by individual differences in self-efficacy. Saks found similar results for training efforts during entry.

These studies show that individuals differ in their reactions to organizational socialization efforts during entry. However, in addition to differing in their reactions, individuals are also likely to differ in their motivation to actively engage their new environments. No studies exist that show whether and how any individual differences promote or deter activity during entry. Are some individuals destined to be more active in navigating through the new environment? Do differences in desired control predict activity levels during entry? What results accrue to the active navigator? This study examined these questions. Although a comprehensive model of the entry process would need to include variables beyond those suggested by a desire for control (e.g., including organizational actions during socialization and other individual differences such as tolerance for ambiguity and general cognitive ability), the literature that we describe below suggests that there is value in examining hypotheses based on the logic of control seeking during entry.

Proactive Socialization and the Desire for Control

Van Maanen (1977) described entry into an organization as a job transition that "thrust(s) one from a state of certainty to uncertainty; from knowing to not knowing; from the familiar to the unfamiliar" (p. 16). Schein (1978) noted the pervasiveness of reality shock and "upending" experiences (e.g., embarrassment or failure) during the entry process. Katz (1985) described the entry experience for many as one fraught with frustration, anxiety, and stress. Several authors have described organizational entry as a period of uncertainty (Feldman & Brett, 1983; G. R. Jones, 1986; Miller & Jablin, 1991). Uncertainty is thought to be a function of (a) the number of possible responses to a stimulus that are available to an individual and (b) their equipotentiality (Berlyne, 1960). During entry, given the newcomers' level of knowledge, a number of possible equally plausible responses to the set of task, social, and cultural demands confront newcomers. Other researchers have defined uncertainty as a function of the sheer number of things that can happen and their equiprobability (E. E. Jones & Gerard, 1967). These descriptions suggest that the entry experience places individuals in situations that engender feelings of low control. The situation is unfamiliar, troubling events can occur, and the new entrant can experience high levels of uncertainty regarding what is appropriate and how to respond. These realities are typically associated with low perceived control (Greenberger & Strasser, 1986) or lack of mastery (deCharms, 1968; White, 1959).

These feelings are likely to be at odds with individuals' generalized desire for mastery or perceived control (Bell & Staw, 1989; Greenberger & Strasser, 1986; White, 1959). Theory and research suggest that individuals want to feel in control in the environments in which they find themselves (Bell & Staw, 1989; Greenberger & Strasser, 1986; Rothbaum, Weisz, & Snyder, 1982) and will be active in attempting to attain that state. For example, deCharms (1968) suggested that people need to feel a sense of mastery and personal competence in their environments. Indeed, Sutton and Kahn (1986) noted that the importance of control in organizational settings is "a persistent theme in the behavioral sciences" (p. 276). In support, Rothbaum et al. (1982) traced the motivation for perceived control back to Groos (1901) and noted its prevalence (along with its corollary, the aversiveness of perceived uncontrollability) in psychological thought up through the early 1980s. Although certainty and control are related, they are not identical concepts. Individuals can attain a certainty and feel out of control (e.g., when they are certain that they will lose their jobs). Bell and Staw (1989) proposed that achieving certainty gives individuals a degree of control (as compared with uncertainty) but that higher levels of control are attained when individuals gain control over the behaviors demanded of them or over the disbursement of outcomes in their settings.

The presence of a strong motivation for perceived control and the relative uncontrollability of entry situations, as described above, should provide new organizational entrants

with a motivation for action (Greenberger & Strasser, 1986). They should be motivated to undertake a variety of actions aimed at regaining control in the service of promoting successful job performance and creating a situation that gives them more satisfaction (Greenberger & Strasser, 1986; Katz, 1985). This argument mirrors White's (1959) proposal that individuals have a motivation to interact with their environments to achieve a sense of mastery (control). However, not all individuals have identical needs for control; consequently, one would expect that individual differences in the desire for control will influence the extent to which individuals devote effort toward actively trying to regain control during organizational entry.

These theoretical arguments suggest a general model that can be summed up in three statements: First, the greater the organizational newcomers' desire for control in the new setting, the more active they will be in the socialization process. Second, the more active newcomers are in the socialization process, the higher their satisfaction and performance levels will be. Finally, newcomers' desire for control will have its effects on these outcomes through its effects on these activities (a mediated model). We examined these general propositions by analyzing the role of a control motive in prompting a variety of activities in the socialization process. We now turn to a specification of the forms that the activity might take.

We chose individual socialization tactics to examine on the basis of three criteria: (a) the tactics' links to the personal-control literature (can each tactic logically be construed as a control-seeking mechanism, given current writing in the control literature?), (b) their precedence in the entry literature (have past researchers testified to the importance and the prevalence of this activity?), and (c) the existence of adequate scales to measure the tactic (we built on the work of Ashford and Black, 1992, who developed scales measuring a set of socialization tactics suggested by the literature and by newcomers themselves). By using these three criteria, several ways in which high-control individuals might be proactive during organizational entry include sensemaking and information seeking (Louis, 1980; Morrison, 1993a, 1993b), relationship building (Reichers, 1987), and attempts to change their jobs to better fit their skills and abilities (Nicholson, 1984). Engaging in these tactics should be useful in developing a sense of control and, thereby, should enhance performance and satisfaction with the environment.

Sensemaking

Newcomers face a dramatic learning task upon organizational entry. Even if they have been proactive in learning about the organization prior to their arrival, surprises are inevitable (Louis, 1980). Surprises create uncertainty for newcomers about what they should do to suc-

ceed and how well they are currently performing. These surprises are thought to promote conscious thought (sensemaking) and information seeking in the service of that thought. As newcomers gain knowledge about their new settings, they make sense out of surprises, reduce uncertainty, and are better able to act and gain influence within the new domain (Smith & Kozlowski, 1995). While surprises are thought to occur to all newcomers (Louis, 1980), individual predispositions should also affect the level of information seeking in which individuals engage in response to those surprises (Louis, 1980). Specifically, uncertainty is thought to be an especially aversive state for individuals who desire control. These individuals are particularly likely to respond to the surprises associated with entry with increased information- and feedback-seeking behaviors. Information tells them what they should be doing to survive in their new role and setting, and feedback (a subset of information) tells them how they are viewed by others. Thus, information reduces uncertainty about appropriate behaviors, and feedback gives individuals information about how to alter their behaviors to increase their chances of obtaining rewards. As Greenberger, Strasser, and Lee (1988) stated, "Persons may seek feedback as a mechanism to obtain control" (p. 35). Information and feedback seeking should yield what Bell and Staw (1989) labeled *cognitive control*. It increases control by increasing individuals' knowledge of the factors affecting their roles or outcomes. Given these arguments, we hypothesized the following:

> *Hypothesis 1:* The greater organizational newcomers' desire for control in their new organization is, the greater their information- and feedback-seeking behaviors will be.

Relationship Building

Reichers (1987) argued that socialization is affected by how proactive individuals are in "seeking out interaction opportunities" (p. 281). Proactive behaviors such as stopping by other people's offices or work areas to talk, initiating social opportunities, and participating in formal social activities can give newcomers a situational identity and help them acquire appropriate skills and role behaviors and gain a sense of organizational policies and procedures (Morrison, 1993b; Reichers, 1987). These behaviors also build friendship networks and social support (Nelson & Quick, 1991). Indeed, network researchers have noted the instrumental and expressive benefits of networks (cf. Ibarra, 1993; Tichy, 1981). The ability to gain access to such instrumental and expressive benefits should lead to a heightened sense of being in control. Uncertainty is reduced, the situation is more thoroughly understood, and the social support that is oftentimes necessary for responding is obtained. As such, differences in desired control should motivate the proactive relation-

ship-building behaviors that Reichers described. As is the case for information and feedback seeking, the payoff of building relationships at work should be particularly attractive to newcomers desiring control upon entry. Thus, we hypothesized the following:

> *Hypothesis 2:* The greater organizational newcomers' desire for control in their new organization is, the greater their active steps to build relationships within those settings will be.

Job-Change Negotiating

Although the reduced uncertainty and social support sought in the aforementioned tactics may give individuals some sense of control, certainty and control are not synonymous (indeed, information that gives certainty about the fact that one is not in control will not yield control perceptions). Rather, research on control suggests that individuals can also undertake activities to attempt to explicitly alter the environment (Bell & Staw, 1989). These tactics, while not increasing certainty, are thought to leave individuals more in control because they create what Bell and Staw labeled *behavior control*. Behavior control refers to control over one's own work behavior or input to the production process. Examples include control over work methods, pace, or amount of effort. This logic suggests that one control-seeking tactic might be explicit attempts to change one's job. Individuals entering new work situations are thought to either change their jobs or change themselves to create a better fit between them and their new jobs (Dawis & Lofquist, 1978; Nicholson, 1984). Nicholson described several factors that might lead newcomers to attempt job changes rather than to mold themselves to fit in better. One factor is individuals' desire for control (Nicholson, 1984). Individuals with a particularly strong desire for control when entering an organization should be especially motivated to push for job changes aimed at creating jobs that better suit their skills and abilities. If these individuals are able to negotiate job changes, then they will participate in decisions about how their jobs are structured, thereby achieving a degree of behavioral control. Given that such control is particularly attractive to those high in desire for control, we hypothesized the following:

> *Hypothesis 3:* The greater organizational newcomers' desire for control in their new organization is, the greater their attempts to negotiate job changes will be.

Framing

The proactive tactics mentioned up to this point allow newcomers to better understand the new context; to relate to the people within it; or, through negotiating job changes, to influence decisions about the behaviors demanded in the new environment. In addition to these tac-

tics aimed at understanding or influencing others, research in psychology suggests that individuals also engage in self-control or self-management to gain control in various situations (Kanfer & Karoly, 1972; Manz & Sims, 1980). These tactics also emerged in Ashford and Black's (1992) exploratory research on newcomer proactivity.

Saks and Ashforth (in press) recently examined the role that behavioral self-management might play in the socialization process. They found that behavioral self-management (i.e., self-observing, goal setting, rewarding, and punishing) yielded greater learning, reduced stress, and lower uncertainty. In this article, we broadened the concept of self-management to include not only behavioral self-management but also what we might call cognitive self-management as a mechanism to gain control. For example, Kelley (1971) argued that attributions should be seen "as a means of encouraging and maintaining [the individual's] effective exercise of control in the world" (p. 22). One particularly potent cognitive self-management tactic occurs when individuals' attempt to alter their understanding of a situation by explicitly controlling the cognitive frame they place on the situation. Folkman (1984) labeled such framing as *primary appraisal* and argued that in stress situations, such appraisals influence subsequent coping responses. Taylor and Brown (1988) labeled these cognitive frames as *positive illusions* and noted their beneficial effects on individuals' stress levels, recovery from illness, depression, and capability of creative and productive work. Like seeking information to gain cognitive control, new organizational entrants' attempts to positively frame their new situations alter how they understand the situation. The actual situation and their actual level of control within the situation remain unchanged. However, the logic of this tactic as a control tactic suggests that it gives people a sense of control by increasing their self-confidence and sense of efficacy with respect to the situation. Given the attractiveness of these outcomes to individuals with a high desire for control, such individuals will be more likely to engage in this tactic than will those individuals with a lower desire for control. Thus, we proposed the following hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis 4:* The greater organizational newcomers' desire for control in their new organization is, the greater their attempts to positively frame their situations will be.

Proactive Socialization and Outcomes

In the discussion above, we referenced several outcomes of individuals' proactivity during organizational entry. If, as hypothesized, these tactics serve to reduce aversive uncertainty and give newcomers feelings of control, then they should be instrumental in enhancing job performance and job satisfaction. In this research, we made the assumption that correlations between proactive

socialization tactics and outcomes occur because these activities are useful in producing feelings of control for the active individual. We also assumed that the more frequently the tactics are undertaken, the greater their likelihood of success will be. We now make specific arguments linking each tactic to these outcomes.

Seeking information and feedback are means of gaining greater clarity about how things work in the organization and what others expect of the newcomer (Katz, 1985; Morrison, 1993b). The more newcomers understand how things work and what is expected, the more likely it is that they will be able to meet those expectations and perform well in their jobs. Feedback also allows newcomers to make corrections in their performance over time. Individuals who seek feedback should be better able to tailor their performance behaviors to the unique demands of their setting, thereby attaining higher performance evaluations. Furthermore, given the positive relationship between role clarity and job satisfaction (Fisher & Gittleson, 1983), newcomers who attain such clarity through information and feedback seeking should also experience greater job satisfaction. Morrison (1993b) found positive associations between information and feedback seeking and job performance and satisfaction. On the basis of her findings and the logic presented here, we hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 5a: The more organizational newcomers engage in information and feedback seeking, the higher their job performance will be.

Hypothesis 5b: The more organizational newcomers engage in information and feedback seeking, the higher their job satisfaction will be.

At least two mechanisms potentially link performance to active steps toward interacting with others and building relationships in the new setting. Reichers (1987) suggested that it is in interactions with others that work skills are developed and appropriate role behaviors are learned. As such, they should be positively related to performance. In addition, given that much managerial work often requires the cooperation of others to attain high performance (Tsui, 1984, 1994), newcomers who take active steps to build relationships with significant others should achieve higher performance than those who do not take such steps. Attempts to build relationships should also be associated with higher job satisfaction. Relationships give meaning to situations. Job satisfaction and quality of life generally stem from both how we experience work and our relationships with other people (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Relationships also provide the social support shown to be related to job satisfaction (Nelson & Quick, 1991). In support, Louis, Posner, and Powell (1983) found that organizational newcomers rated interaction with peers and interaction with superiors as the most and the next most helpful socialization prac-

tices, respectively. Both of these interactions were correlated with job satisfaction. Given this finding, we expected that proactive attempts to seek out interactions and build relationships would be similarly related to job satisfaction. Thus, we proposed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 6a: The more organizational newcomers attempt to increase social interactions and build relationships, the higher their job performance will be.

Hypothesis 6b: The more organizational newcomers attempt to increase social interactions and build relationships, the higher their job satisfaction will be.

The arguments for the importance of building relationships for attaining job performance and satisfaction blur conceptually with those concerning information seeking. Indeed, the literature suggests (cf. Ibarra, 1993; Morrison, 1993b; Smith & Kozlowski, 1995) that one way to obtain information is by building relationships. Bauer and Green's (1994) finding that professional involvements (attending social events and seminars) tend to reduce role ambiguity substantiates that information is exchanged during these relational episodes. However, information clearly can be obtained in other ways (e.g., by observation), and relationships do more for individuals than serve as information conduits. Therefore, we see relationship building and information seeking as separate but correlated constructs.

Individuals' attempts to negotiate job changes not only adjust the task set to more favorably suit their skills and abilities (e.g., Nicholson, 1984) but also alter the means by which that task set is to be accomplished. Consequently, attempts to negotiate job changes should be positively related to job performance. These arguments suggest the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 7: The more organizational newcomers attempt to negotiate job changes, the higher their job performance will be.

Finally, if individuals cognitively frame events as challenges and opportunities rather than as problems or threats, they are more likely to feel able to meet those challenges or take advantage of opportunities (Taylor & Brown, 1988). To the extent that cognitively framing the environment in this manner leads to proactive performance behaviors, enhanced job performance should follow.

By framing their situations as opportunities, newcomers should also become more satisfied with them. The opportunity frame should make the situation seem more controllable (Dutton & Jackson, 1987); should leave individuals feeling more able to cope with stresses that may arise (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980); and, in general, should help the newcomers generate positive affect toward their job situation. These feelings and perceptions

in turn should increase job satisfaction. Thus, we hypothesized the following:

> Hypothesis 8a: The more organizational newcomers attempt to frame their situation as an opportunity rather than a problem, the higher their job performance will be.

> Hypothesis 8b: The more organizational newcomers attempt to frame their situation as an opportunity rather than a problem, the higher their job satisfaction will be.

Finally, given the general model that underlies this research, we also explicitly specified a mediation hypothesis. This hypothesis captured our argument that the effect of desire for control on job satisfaction and performance would occur because desire for control prompts individual activities during socialization that yield these outcomes. Thus, we proposed the following:

> Hypothesis 9: Newcomers' proactive socialization attempts will mediate the relationship between desire for control, job performance, and job satisfaction.

In sum, the purpose of this study was to examine (a) the relevance of desire for control for explaining the frequency with which a variety of proactive socialization behaviors are undertaken during the first year on the job; (b) the impact of desire for control on two distal socialization outcomes (satisfaction and performance), as mediated by the frequency of proactive socialization behaviors; and (c) the direct effect of proactive socialization behaviors on the two distal outcome measures. This study's contribution lies in its test of the direct effects of an individual difference on individual activity (rather than examining individual differences as moderators of individual reactions to organizational activity), in its examination of proactive socialization behaviors beyond information and feedback seeking (and, in particular, the expansion of the domain of these tactics to include cognitive framing as well as behavioral activity), and in its test of the impact of these activities over time on two outcomes of importance to both individuals and organizations—satisfaction and performance.

Method

Sample

We tested the nine hypotheses using a sample of practicing managers drawn from a recent graduating class of a small northeastern graduate school of business. Of the class of 165, 103 individuals completed the Time 1 questionnaire, yielding a 62% response rate. Of these 103 individuals, 83 and 69 completed a Time 2 and a Time 3 survey, respectively (representing respective response rates of 81% and 83%). Sixty-nine respondents provided data at all three time points, representing a 42% overall response rate (69 out of 165).

All participants in the sample earned master of business administration (MBA) degrees. Of the participants, 32% were female

and 68% were male; 93% were White and 7% were Black, Asian including Indian, or Hispanic. The mean age was 27.23 years (SD = 2.04), and the average length of full-time work experience was 3.53 years (SD = 1.65). Participants entered the following industries: financial services (27%), business services (e.g., consulting; 22%), computer (7%), manufacturing (6%), marketing (6%), nonprofit organizations (4%) and other (28%).

There were no differences between those who participated in the study at Time 1 (62% of the total graduating class) and those who did not participate on several dimensions. First, approximately 93% of the graduating class had job offers at graduation. Thus, it was not the case that a disproportional percentage of nonparticipants did not have jobs. Second, the mean age and the mean years of work experience of the participants did not differ significantly from those of nonparticipants at Time 1. Furthermore, participants and nonparticipants were similar in the percentages of employment by industry. Thus, it seems reasonable to assert that the 62% of the graduating class that participated in the study were representative of the entire group.

Design and Procedure

We used a longitudinal design to examine the role of desire for control during organizational entry. Data were collected at three points: Data on desired control were collected after respondents had accepted positions and approximately 2–3 months prior to organizational entry, data on proactive socialization tactics were collected 6 months after entry, and data on outcomes were collected 12 months after entry. This time line is consistent with several previous studies on the entry process (cf. Nelson, Quick, & Eakin, 1988).

We used the following procedure to collect the data: We solicited volunteers by means of a memo. Participation was not associated with any particular course and was not part of any course requirement. Volunteers were interviewed following their acceptance of full-time positions to get a sense of their job-search process and to explain the nature of the study and the time commitments involved. At that time, participants were given a questionnaire to complete that measured their desire for control. Participants were contacted 6 months and 12 months after the start dates for their jobs and were asked to complete a second and a third survey. In all cases, the respondents returned the surveys directly to Susan J. Ashford. Surveys were coded with an identification number to facilitate the matching of the respondents' surveys over time. Confidentiality was also assured throughout the research process.

There is no consensus in the socialization literature regarding the appropriate time lags for measurement (Ashforth et al., 1994). Fisher (1986) stated that 1 year has traditionally been noted as the primary time frame for socialization. We chose our data collection times on the basis of past research practice and common sense. We wanted to measure desire for control before the respondents were in their new environments (to avoid contamination) but close to the entry period to maximize causal impact. For Time 2 data collection, we knew that we had to let enough time pass to give newcomers the opportunity and the need to engage in some of the entry activities. We also collected Time 3 data shortly after the year-end performance review. We tied our data collection to the new entrants' start dates

for their jobs so that the time lags around the 6-month and 1-year point for data return were minimal.

Measures

Desire for control. Desire for control was measured at Time 1 using an 11-item Likert-type scale developed by Greenberger et al. (1988). Greenberger et al. provided evidence for the scale's validity and reliability. The items asked respondents how much control they would like to have in a wide variety of work-related areas in their new jobs using a 7-point response format ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). These areas included the variety of tasks performed, decisions as to when things would be done in a work unit, performance standards in the work unit, and the way that desks and other equipment were arranged in the work area. This scale has shown adequate psychometric properties in previous studies (e.g., alphas consistently in the high .80s, means typically at 1 point above the scale's midpoint, and adequate variation; Greenberger, Strasser, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989; Greenberger et al., 1988). Cronbach's alpha in this study was .85 (see Table 1 for the scale characteristics of all study variables). This scale taps desire for control by summing respondents' ratings of their desire for control over various aspects of this specific situation. That is, this scale does not tap an individual's generalized desire for control across many settings (e.g., in a family, at work, and in a civic setting). Rather, D. B. Greenberger (personal communication, October 1, 1995) argues that generalized feelings of control will manifest themselves in specific desires for control in specific situations. Thus, this measure taps the variable of prime importance in this study, the individuals' desire for control in their new work setting. By measuring desire for control in this way, we also allowed individuals to draw on what they knew about the situations that they were entering and the importance that they placed on the work setting in specifying their level of desired control.

Proactive socialization tactics. Proactive tactics that individuals might use during organizational entry to increase their feelings of control in the new situation were measured at Time 2. These scales underwent substantial development work prior to their inclusion in this study.

First, we generated items by asking a separate sample of MBA graduates (*N* = 84) to answer open-ended questions about what they did to get hired within their new companies. Respondents mentioned tactics relating to information seeking, relationship building, job-change negotiating, and framing. From this open-ended effort, the ideas raised by our newcomer respondents were incorporated into scale items for subsequent pretesting. Items were generated, scales were created, and close-ended pretest data were collected from a separate set of newcomers. This second sample consisted of 587 recent college graduates employed in a variety of organizations. These respondents were asked to describe their entry experiences by responding to items tapping each of the tactics described above. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they had engaged in each tactic by circling a number from 1 (*to no extent*) to 5 (*to a great extent*). Respondents were also given a *not applicable* option for each item.

The factor analysis of these items provided the input for this

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Desire for control	4.87	0.77	(.85)									
2. Information seeking	3.60	0.84	.30**	(.76)								
3. Feedback seeking	3.53	0.94	.14	.20*	(.92)							
4. General socializing	3.33	1.04	.24*	.09	.13	(.84)						
5. Networking	3.35	0.92	.29**	.25*	.09	.34***	(.82)					
6. Build relationships–boss	3.52	0.82	.07	.49***	.34***	.18*	.32**	(.78)				
7. Negotiation of job changes	2.98	0.91	.24*	.26**	.48***	.19*	.08	.27**	(.90)			
8. Positive framing	4.07	0.87	.22*	.13	.16	.20*	.33*	.27**	.17	(.82)		
9. Job performance	75.51	17.69	.26*	.22*	.23*	.09	.16	.56***	.05	.40**	(.91)	
10. Job satisfaction	4.25	1.52	.02	-.09	-.04	.32**	.23*	.17	-.14	.39***	.33**	(.88)

Note. *N*s ranged from 69 to 103. Entries along the diagonal are alpha coefficients.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

study. For the tactics of interest here, 29 items were generated for the pretest. Eight of these items were dropped because of low loadings or significant cross loadings. Four new items were written and added to the Information-Seeking (2 items), Build Relationships–Boss (1 item), and Socializing (1 item) scales that were used in the current study to increase scale breadth and reliability.

For information seeking, the open-ended pretest data suggested that a central focus of newcomers' information seeking was the larger firm context (e.g., the firm's strategy and trends affecting it) and the internal context more directly relevant to the newcomers' jobs (e.g., firm politics, policies and procedures, and organizational structure). Given the nature of the arguments that generated the proposed hypotheses, we chose to examine only the internal-context Information-Seeking scale. To do so, the close-ended pretest incorporated three information-seeking items representing this domain. A two-item scale created from an exploratory factor analysis of these items showed good reliability (alpha = .78). To bolster scale breadth, two new items were generated and added to the pretested items. This four-item scale was used in this study. It asked respondents about the extent to which they sought information regarding the politics, policies and procedures, and internal structure of the firm using the response format described above. The scale had a reliability of .76 in the current sample.

Feedback seeking was measured with a four-item scale generated by the pretests. These items used the same response format as that for information seeking. In the pretest, these items loaded together on a single factor and loaded separately from the information-seeking items. The coefficient alpha in the pretest was .95 and in the current sample .92. These items asked respondents to what extent they sought feedback about their performance during and after assignments, solicited critiques from their bosses, and asked their bosses' opinion of their work.

Since 1991, when the Time 2 data were collected, Morrison (1993a, 1993b) has published research examining, in depth, the role of information and feedback seeking during entry. To put the current research effort in the context of her work, Morrison (1993b) assessed seeking about more types of information (technical, referent, performance feedback, normative information, and social feedback) and gathered more specific information about how such seeking was conducted (e.g., by asking, observing, or consulting written sources). The current research did not specify how newcomers obtained their information and asked only about information seeking from what would be Morrison's (1993b) performance feedback domain and a second domain that is a mix of Morrison's (1993b) technical and normative information scales. In addition, this study's goal was to examine a broad range of tactics rather than to provide an in-depth portrait of one tactic (i.e., information seeking).

Relationship-building tactics were assessed with items raised by respondents in the open-ended study and assessed in the second pretest. Several factors emerged. Individuals discussed getting onboard within their social environment by socializing in general, by building relationships with interdepartmental colleagues, and by building relationships with their boss. Thirteen items generated to assess these aims loaded on three separate factors. Scales created from these items had pretest reliabilities of .61, .82, and .61 for the General Socializing, build relation-

ships with interdepartmental colleagues (labeled Networking), and Build Relationships–Boss scales, respectively. To create more reliable scales, six items were dropped (one item from General Socializing, three items from Networking, and two items from Build Relationships–Boss scales), and one new item was generated for the General Socializing and Build Relationships–Boss scales. All items for these scales used the same response format as that described above. Sample items with a stem of "to what extent have you" included "attended office parties" (for General Socializing), "tried to get to know as many people as possible in other sections of the company on a personal basis" (for Networking), and "worked hard to get to know your boss" (for Build Relationships–Boss). Coefficient alphas in the current sample were .84, .82, and .78 for the General Socializing, Networking, and Build Relationships–Boss scales, respectively. These were all three-item scales. Note that we were not measuring attempts to seek information about the people in the environment (i.e., as measured in the study by Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992) but rather explicit attempts to build relationships with various people in the new environment.

Scales for the two remaining tactics, Negotiation of Job Changes and Positive Framing, were also developed in the pretest. Five items were assessed as a measure of Negotiation of Job Changes and three for Positive Framing. These items loaded on separate factors. One item, "left the procedures of your job unchanged," was dropped because of its low factor loading. Scales based on the remaining items had coefficient alphas of .80 and .72 in the pretest and .90 and .82 in the current study for the Negotiation of Job Changes and Positive Framing scales, respectively. These scales used the same response format as that described above. Sample items included "to what extent have you negotiated with others (including your supervisor and/or coworkers) about your task assignments" (for Negotiation of Job Changes) and "to what extent have you tried to see your situation as an opportunity rather than a threat" (for Positive Framing). Note that we are not talking about seeking information about the people in the environment or about the job (i.e., as measured in the study by Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992) but rather about explicit attempts to build relationships with various people in the new environment, to change the nature of the job, or both.

Outcomes. Two outcomes, job performance and job satisfaction, were measured at Time 3. Job performance was measured by a five-item scale developed by Pearce and Porter (1986) and used by Black and Porter (1991). These items asked respondents to recall their last actual performance evaluation. They were asked to report how they were rated relative to others on a percentage basis (e.g., 40th percentile or 90th percentile). Respondents were asked to make this assessment for their overall performance, their ability to get along with others, their ability to get the task done on time, the quality of their performance, and the achievement of work goals. The percentile judgment response format was used because respondents were located in different organizations that used quite different performance appraisal systems. Any more specific wording in the response format may have been appropriate for some respondents and quite foreign for others. In addition, to be maximally applicable to respondents in various situations, the performance dimensions used in this scale were quite general (e.g., "overall quality"

and "achievement of work goals"). This measure has been shown to correlate highly with supervisors' ratings of performance (Pearce & Porter, 1986) because respondents are asked to recall their actual performance evaluation rather than simply to provide their own assessment of their performance. Cronbach's alpha for this sample was .91.

Job satisfaction was measured with the five-item General Satisfaction Scale from the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). This scale uses a 7-point Likert format, with responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha was .88 for this sample.

Results

We conducted two preliminary analyses. First, to assess whether sample attrition was systematically biasing our results, we conducted a series of t tests and chi-square tests to examine whether the two groups (Time 1 and Time 3) were similar or different in terms of their race, sex, amount of full-time work experience, desire for control, and optimism. These tests indicated that there were no differences between the groups.

The 24 items measuring the seven proposed proactive socialization tactics were factor analyzed using principal-components analysis to assess the degree of discrimination between the tactics as measured in the current sample. We used varimax rotation, listwise deletion, and the sample of 89 Time 2 respondents in this analysis. The factor analysis was conducted simultaneously on all of the items developed for the proactivity scales. All factors with eigenvalues greater than one were retained. Items were retained on the basis of loadings of greater than .50 on their primary factor, no appreciable cross loadings, and theoretical meaningfulness. As Table 2 suggests, items measuring the seven tactics loaded on separate factors, as intended. These seven factors explained 75% of the total variance. These results suggest that the items measure distinct tactics. On the basis of these results and the theory proposed above, we retained seven scales to measure proactive socialization tactics in this study.[1] Of the seven proactive socialization tactics examined, the means presented in Table 1 suggest that positive framing was undertaken most frequently by newcomers ($M = 4.07$) and negotiation of job changes was undertaken least frequently ($M = 2.98$).

Main Effects Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1–4 predicted relationships between the desire for control and subsequent proactive socialization tactics. We tested these hypotheses with a multivariate regression (Dwyer, 1983) that accounts for multiple dependent variables. The results are presented in Table 3. As shown in Table 3, there was support for the hypotheses in the omnibus test for significance (Rao's approximate

$F = 3.01, p < .01$), suggesting that desire for control predicted a significant amount of variance in the set of tactics. This test also suggested that it was appropriate to examine the univariate effects. The univariate effects supported Hypothesis 1 in the significant beta for the Desire for Control and Information-Seeking scales ($\beta = .30$, $p < .01$). However, Desire for Control was unrelated to Feedback Seeking ($\beta = .14$, ns).

Hypothesis 2 proposed that the desire for control would be related to proactive efforts to interact with others and to build relationships in the new setting. This hypothesis was supported by positive betas for General Socializing ($\beta = .24$, $p < .05$) and Networking ($\beta = .29$, $p < .01$). Inconsistent with Hypothesis 2 was the nonsignificant beta for the Build Relationships–Boss scale ($\beta = .07$, ns).

Hypothesis 3 suggested that those who desire control would be more proactive in negotiating job changes. Hypothesis 3 was supported ($\beta = .24$, $p < .05$).

Hypothesis 4 proposed that self-control in the form of cognitively framing the situation in a positive light would also be related to newcomers' desire for control. This hypothesis was supported by the positive beta for the Positive Framing scale ($\beta = .22$, $p < .05$).

Hypotheses 5–8 focused on the relationship of proactive socialization tactics and the job performance and satisfaction outcomes. The results in Table 4 suggest the following pattern: First, in contrast to Hypothesis 5a, information seeking was negatively related to job satisfaction ($\beta = -.28$, $p < .05$) and was negatively, but nonsignificantly, related to self-reported performance ($\beta = -.11$, ns). Second, the extent of feedback seeking was unrelated to either dependent variable (βs = .10 and .07, both ns).

Hypotheses 6a and 6b suggested that proactive steps to increase interactions and to build relationships would increase job performance (Hypothesis 6a) and job satisfaction (Hypothesis 6b). Hypothesis 6a was strongly supported for the Build Relationships–Boss scale ($\beta = .56$, $p < .001$) but was not supported for either of the other means of seeking interactions (βs = −.05 for General Socializing and −.08 for Networking, both ns). In support

---

[1] A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on these data specifying seven factors. The results indicated an adequate fit of the model, with a root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990) of .07, an incremental fit index (Bollen, 1989) of .92, a Tucker–Lewis Index (Tucker & Lewis, 1973) of .90, and a comparative fit index (Bentler, 1990) of .91. The latter fit indices met the .90 or higher criterion for adequate fit suggested by Bentler and Bonett (1980). The RMSEA met the reasonable fit criterion of .08 suggested by Browne and Cudeck (1993). All factors loadings were significant and in the expected direction. In addition, all factor correlations were modest, suggesting adequate discriminant validity. These results should be interpreted with caution, however, given the small sample size for this test.

Table 2
Results of Factor Analysis of Proactive Socialization Tactics

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
To what extent have you							
1. Sought feedback on your performance after assignments?	.88	.03	.08	-.01	.14	.07	-.04
2. Solicited critiques from your boss?	.87	.18	.13	-.06	.09	.13	.01
3. Sought out feedback on your performance during assignments?	.81	.25	.02	.01	.06	-.06	.08
4. Asked for your boss's opinion of your work?	.89	.23	-.02	-.05	.05	-.06	-.04
5. Negotiated with others (including your supervisor and/or coworkers) about desirable job changes?	.13	.85	-.04	.05	-.18	.11	.05
6. Negotiated with others (including your supervisor and/or coworkers) about your task assignments?	.12	.85	.17	.16	.07	-.00	-.06
7. Negotiated with others (including your supervisor and/or coworkers) about the demands placed on you?	.28	.60	.18	.17	.24	-.14	.04
8. Negotiated with others (including your supervisor and/or coworkers) about their expectations of you?	.29	.75	.04	.06	.12	.11	.10
9. Tried to see your situation as an opportunity rather than a threat?	.02	.21	.90	.07	.01	.07	.05
10. Tried to look on the bright side of things?	.13	.11	.86	.01	.09	.12	.01
11. Tried to see your situation as a challenge rather than a problem?	.02	-.06	.81	.09	.19	.17	.06
12. Participated in social office events to meet people (i.e., parties, softball team, outings, clubs, lunches)?	.3	.31	.09	.56	.30	.36	-.04
13. Attended company social gatherings?	-.02	.15	.01	.90	.07	.16	.07
14. Attended office parties?	-.04	.07	.07	.93	.08	.13	.05
15. Tried to spend as much time as you could with your boss?	.23	.01	.12	.02	.79	.20	.09
16. Tried to form a good relationship with your boss?	-.01	.09	.14	.16	.81	-.05	.20
17. Worked hard to get to know your boss?	.17	.04	.04	.10	.79	.19	.28
18. Started conversations with people from different segments of the company?	-.01	.07	.17	.08	-.01	.82	.04
19. Tried to socialize with people who are not in your department?	-.02	-.07	.10	.26	.07	.82	.28
20. Tried to get to know as many people as possible in other sections of the company on a personal basis?	.12	.08	.08	.13	.26	.76	.04
21. Tried to learn the (official) organizational structure?	.16	-.08	.06	.13	.09	.00	.84
22. Tried to learn the important policies and procedures in the organization?	.16	.12	.20	.40	.11	.15	.66
23. Tried to learn the politics of the organization?	-.14	.19	-.18	.10	.20	.03	.65
24. Tried to learn the (unofficial) structure?	-.01	-.01	.15	-.11	.19	.11	.83
Variance explained	24	15	10	9	7	6	5

Note. Factor 1 = Feedback Seeking; Factor 2 = Job-Change Negotiating; Factor 3 = Positive Framing; Factor 4 = General Socializing; Factor 5 = Build Relationships—Boss; Factor 6 = Networking; Factor 7 = Information Seeking.

Table 3

Multivariate Regression Analysis for Proactive Socialization Tactics on Desire for Control

Tactic	β	$t(78)$
Information seeking	.30	2.79**
Feedback seeking	.14	1.24
General socializing	.24	2.20*
Networking	.29	2.75**
Build relationships–boss	.07	0.60
Negotiation of job changes	.24	2.17*
Positive framing	.22	1.98*

Note. Rao's approximate $F(1, 75) = 3.01, p < .01$.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

of Hypothesis 6b, General Socializing was related to job satisfaction ($\beta = .31, p < .05$). However, both Networking and Build Relationships–Boss were unrelated to job satisfaction (βs = $-.06$ and $.15$, respectively, both ns).

The hypothesized relationship between the Negotiation of Job Changes scale and job performance was not supported (Hypothesis 7a). Negotiation of job changes was unrelated to self-reported job performance ($\beta = -.03, ns$).

Hypotheses 8a and 8b linked newcomers' efforts to positively frame their situations to job performance (Hypothesis 8a) and job satisfaction (Hypothesis 8b). These hypotheses were supported. Positive Framing was positively related to self-reported job performance ($\beta = .31, p < .05$) and job satisfaction ($\beta = .44, p < .001$). These results suggest that newcomers' explicit efforts to positively frame their situations contributed to the socialization outcomes that they experienced.

The proactive socialization tactics undertaken in the first 6 months on the job, in total, explained 33% of the variance in self-reported job performance, $F(7, 55) =$

4.64, $p < .001$, and 33% of the variance in self-reports of job satisfaction, $F(7, 58) = 5.27, p < .001$, measured after 1 year on the job.

Mediation Analyses

Hypothesis 9 proposed that the proactive socialization tactics would mediate the relationship between desire for control, job satisfaction, and self-reported job performance. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), three conditions must be met in order to establish mediation. First, the independent variable (desire for control) must be related to the mediator(s). As indicated in Table 3, this condition was met for all mediators except feedback seeking and build relationships–boss. Second, the independent variable must be related to the dependent variable. As shown in Table 1, this condition was met only for the self-reported performance variable. Job satisfaction was unrelated to desire for control. Thus, the second requirement was supported only for the self-reported performance outcome; therefore, the mediation analyses could be conducted only for this outcome variable.

The third condition suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986) is to show that the independent variable's effect on the dependent variable is reduced significantly or disappears when considered jointly with the mediator variables. Table 5 presents the results of multiple regression analyses in which self-reported performance was simultaneously regressed on all of the mediators and desire for control. These results suggest that one entry activity, positive framing, operates as a mediator for the effect of desire for control on self-reported performance. When the tactics were added to the equation, the effect of desire for control became nonsignificant, and positive framing was still significantly related to performance. Not surprisingly, given the results presented in Tables 1 and 4, medi-

Table 4

Results of Regression Analyses of Effects of Entry Tactics on Job Performance and Job Satisfaction

Tactic (Time 2)	Job performance (Time 3)[a]		Job satisfaction (Time 3)[b]	
	β	$t(55)$	β	$t(58)$
Information seeking	$-.11$	-0.82	$-.28$	$-2.19*$
Feedback seeking	.10	0.77	.07	0.59
General socializing	$-.05$	-0.34	.31	2.47*
Networking	$-.08$	-0.62	$-.06$	-0.52
Build relationships–boss	.56	3.89***	.15	1.06
Negotiation of job changes	$-.03$	-0.25	$-.34$	$-2.70**$
Positive framing	.31	2.49*	.44	3.76***
F	4.64***		5.27***	
Adjusted R^2	.33		.33	

Note. For job performance, $dfs = 7, 55$ for the F value. For job satisfaction, $dfs = 7, 58$ for the F value.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.
[a] $N = 63$. [b] $N = 66$.

Table 5
Analysis of Mediation for Self-Reported Performance

Tactic	β	t(54)
Desire for control (Time 1)	.23	1.78
Information seeking	−.17	−1.23
Feedback seeking	.05	0.42
General socializing	−.08	−0.63
Networking	−.12	−0.90
Build relationships–boss	.62	4.27***
Negotiation of job changes	−.07	−0.59
Positive framing	.27	2.23*
F(8, 54)		4.66***
Adjusted R^2		.36

*$p < .05$. ***$p < .001$.

ation was not established for the remaining tactics (the other mediators were unrelated to desire for control or were unrelated to the dependent variable, self-reported performance, even without considering them simultaneously with desire for control).

Discussion

This study's findings provide general and specific insights into the nature of individual proactivity during the organizational entry process. At the most general level, the results suggest that the desire for control is related to newcomers' activity level during their first 6 months on the job. In particular, as compared with individuals with a low desire for control, individuals with a high desire for control sought more information, socialized more, networked more with interdepartmental colleagues, negotiated more job changes, and tried to put a positive frame around their situations. To an extent, then, these activities appear to reflect the newcomers' desires to attain control in their new settings. These results support Hypotheses 1–4. The finding of a positive relationship between desire for control and negotiation of job changes also supports previous theorizing (Nicholson, 1984).

Other evidence is inconsistent with the control-seeking perspective that informed our research. First, the correlations between desire for control and each of the seven proactive socialization tactics were only moderate (mean $r = .21$). A fuller understanding of newcomer proactivity will likely require the inclusion of other individual and organizational characteristics.

Second, two tactics, feedback seeking and build relationships–boss, were unrelated to individual differences in desire for control. It appears that individuals do not view these tactics as a means of gaining control. It may be that although these tactics are potentially valuable to newcomers in their own right, they are not prompted by individual control needs. The build relationships–boss tactic, in particular, may be undertaken for other instru-

mental reasons (e.g., to secure positive performance evaluations). Indeed, newcomers who explicitly attempted to build relationships with their bosses reported receiving higher performance ratings from their bosses than did those who did not. Newcomers who understand this instrumental payoff may thus be motivated to attend to this important relationship independent of their desire for control. Similarly, if feedback has instrumental value to newcomers interested in succeeding in the new environment, they may seek it whatever their level of desire for control. Alternatively, it may be that feedback seeking is not viewed as a way to get control over issues like schedules, the variety of tasks demanded, or the physical layout of the workplace. Given this possibility, desire for control, as measured in this study, was not associated with feedback seeking. A more general measure of desire for control might show a greater association.

Third, the mediation hypothesis was not supported in this research. Tactics that were related to desire for control were not related to outcomes or vice versa. The exception was for cognitive framing. Here, mediation was established: Individuals who desired control tended to positively frame their situations, and such framing was associated with higher reported performance ratings.

Taken together, these results suggest that control seeking is not a complete explanation for proactivity during entry. Other variables need to be considered. For example, tolerance for ambiguity may cause newcomers to be more proactive during organizational entry in an attempt to reduce the uncertainty and ambiguity associated with the new work setting. Furthermore, other variables such as generalized cognitive ability (g; Gottfredson, 1986; Hunter, 1986) may be predictive of both proactivity and outcomes. For example, O'Reilly and Chatman (1994) recently showed, with a similar sample, that g is related to performance in organizations. Future research may also benefit from examining more of the situational factors that can affect individual activity. For example, the organization's cultural sanctioning (positive or negative) of the newcomer proactivity in general and of the specific socialization tactics in particular may be an important variable to include. Control seeking still may play a role during entry, however. Future research may profitably consider more specific hypotheses relating level of desired control to the form that control seeking may take. For example, Bell and Staw (1989) related levels of control sought to levels of control desired. Hypotheses that predicted the use of tactics representative of the various levels might be tested. This subsequent research will have to deal with some thorny theoretical questions regarding the differences between the various levels of control articulated in the literature (cf. Bell & Staw, 1989; Rothbaum et al., 1982) and which proactive socialization tactics exemplify which control levels.

This study's third purpose was to examine the impact of proactive socialization on two outcomes, job performance and job satisfaction. We note first that explicit attempts to seek feedback were unrelated to either socialization outcome. The lack of feedback-seeking findings is in contrast to both previous research (cf. Morrison, 1993b) and theorizing (cf. Ashford & Cummings, 1983). In this study, newcomers who sought feedback were not better off, in terms of job performance and satisfaction, than those who did not seek feedback. The contrast between these findings and Morrison's results is troubling. She found that feedback seeking through inquiry, monitoring, and consulting with written sources was related to job satisfaction. The latter two means of feedback seeking were also related to job performance. Several factors may account for the discrepancy between these findings and Morrison's. First, Morrison's results were bivariate correlations. The results presented in Table 1 suggest that at the bivariate level, feedback seeking was significantly related to performance ($r = .23$, $p < .05$) in this sample at about the same level as in Morrison's study (feedback seeking in this study was unrelated to satisfaction at the bivariate level, however). Second, Morrison's study looked at information seeking only, whereas this study tested, in the same regression equation, several different types of proactive socialization tactics. It may be that feedback seeking is an important activity but of relatively less importance during entry than are relationship building, negotiation of job changes, and positive framing. Thus, Morrison's findings may overstate the importance of feedback seeking in producing socialization outcomes.

Newcomers' attempts to seek information about policies and procedures in the organization were negatively related to job satisfaction, in contrast to Hypothesis 1. This finding also contradicts Morrison's (1993b) finding of a positive relationship between many modes of information seeking and satisfaction. It may be that newcomers in this sample, in contrast to Morrison's accountant sample, did not like what they found when seeking information or were unable to obtain the desired information, thereby creating dissatisfaction. It is also possible that this negative coefficient may reflect reverse causality. Specifically, newcomers who were dissatisfied or not performing well at Time 3 might have been dissatisfied or suffering performance problems at Time 2 as well, which might have prompted them to seek more information.

Past literature also suggests that building relationships and negotiating job changes are related to socialization outcomes. The findings of this study, however, suggest a more complex portrait. Relationship-building attempts had some effect on the outcomes: General socializing was associated with subsequent job satisfaction, and attempts to build a relationship with the boss were associated with self-reported performance. Building a relationship with the boss

may lead to information and clearer expectations that, in turn, facilitate job performance. In contrast, explicit attempts to engage in general socializing may build positive emotions toward the firm, resulting in more job satisfaction, but may not contribute to performance over the time frame measured. However, general socializing may help develop contacts that enhance future performance. The lack of a significant relationship between networking with interdepartmental peers and performance was surprising given recent theorizing about the importance of creating and maintaining a broad network and about the strength of weak ties for career success (cf. Granovetter, 1985). It may be that the payoff of these cross-departmental relationship-building attempts shows up only over a longer time span than that measured here.

The results for the negotiation of job changes did not support Hypothesis 7. Negotiation was unrelated to self-reported performance. This finding may suggest that newcomers were unsuccessful in their negotiating attempts (were unable to modify their jobs in a way that would enhance performance). It is also possible that this negative relationship may reflect reverse causality. Newcomers who were not performing well at Time 3 might have been suffering from performance problems at Time 2 as well, which might have prompted them to try to negotiate job changes. Future studies would benefit from examining both the extent to which newcomers try to negotiate job changes and the extent to which they are successful in their attempts. They may also benefit from trying to capture levels of performance at multiple times during organizational entry.

A third possibility for future research is to include more proximal outcomes in socialization models. For example, this study did not explicitly measure role clarity, job understanding, or self-efficacy. These more proximal outcomes may mediate the relationships between proactive socialization and the outcomes measured here. Outcomes like these have been included in several recent studies (e.g., Adkins, 1995; Bauer & Green, 1994; Morrison, 1993a), and their inclusion in subsequent studies may shed more light on the process by which these tactics result in outcomes of importance to the organization.

Our final discussion points relate to the new proactive socialization tactic examined in this study. In addition to newcomers trying to get information regarding work settings and to build relationships and negotiate with others, we argued that newcomers also can seek control within themselves by focusing on how they frame their situations. The study's findings provide support for this proposition. Individuals who desired control were more likely to engage in this self-focused control tactic, and their attempts to positively frame their new situations were positively related to self-reported performance and job satisfaction. It appears that this self-focused coping

strategy pays off for individuals entering new situations. Future research may profitably continue to explore the role that self-focused control plays during organizational entry, particularly as this process unfolds in contrast to, or as a complement of, the more other-oriented tactics examined here. Future research should also examine a broader set of self-oriented tactics than positive framing. For example, newcomers may also gain feelings of control and keep themselves on track in their new situations by setting standards for their own behavior, rewarding themselves when they obtain those standards, and punishing themselves when they do not (Kanfer, 1980; Kanfer & Karoly, 1972).

The results of this study need to be considered in light of the study's limitations. Several methodological limitations are noteworthy. First, the study used all self-report, same-source data. The data might not reflect what individuals actually did in their organizational situations or that individuals may be motivated to maintain consistency in their survey responses. We hope that our instructions to report accurately, our assurances of confidentiality, our detailed explanations of the research purpose (given during the initial interview), and the long time lags between survey administrations reduced any self-report bias. Nevertheless, such bias, particularly unconscious bias, cannot be ruled out. Second, given the longitudinal nature of our design, our final sample size was small. This fact might have made it difficult to detect relationships between the socialization tactics and the outcome variables measured at Time 3. Third, this study tested a model based on a theoretical process deemed relevant to the entry process, that of control seeking within the organization. We selected variables for inclusion in this study, in large part, on the basis of their fit with this process. Thus, our model was not comprehensive. This necessary selection certainly omitted important additional variables, and the pattern of findings may differ somewhat with those variables included. In particular, it may be useful to simultaneously examine situational and individual variables. For example, Saks and Ashforth (1995) began looking at the influence of organizational socialization tactics on individual proactive efforts. Finally, we did not measure individuals' level of control in this study. Thus, although we hypothesized that the relationships between proactive socialization tactics and outcomes are due to the fact that these tactics yield control, this was an untested assumption in this research. It would be useful to explicitly test this assumption in future studies. It may also be important to examine individuals' level of control early on as well. It may be that if individuals already feel in control, they will not undertake the hypothesized activities in the first place. A second untested assumption was that individuals held the same jobs throughout the study period. Although we asked respon-

dents to report any changes in their situations and none noted job or supervisor changes, we did not explicitly track this throughout the study period. A final study limitation was our sample. It solely consisted of MBA graduates. As such, it was homogeneous and might not be representative of other newcomers. Therefore, some caution should be used in generalizing the study findings.

In the context of these limitations, we believe that this study contributes to our knowledge of socialization. At the most general level, this study is one of only a few to examine individual rather than organizational activities during the entry period and is notable in its examination of individual tactics other than information seeking. Of these tactics, individuals' attempts to build relationships with their bosses, socialize generally, negotiate job changes, and positively frame the situation were significant predictors of job performance and job satisfaction. This study also examined the role of an individual difference not as a moderator of what the organization does during entry (as have previous studies; cf. Ashforth & Saks, 1995; G. R. Jones, 1986) but as a direct influence in its own right. It suggests that the desire for control is related to a variety of individual activities during socialization. Efforts to positively frame the new situation appear to be particularly important, given their significant relationships to both reported performance and satisfaction. Framing attempts also mediate the effect of desire for control on performance. It may be useful for future socialization research to consider the ways in which individuals are cognitively and emotionally active during entry, not just behaviorally active. However, in this study, we learned that control is only a partial explanation for activity during entry. A complete understanding of such activity may come only when we consider other drivers of proactive socialization. For example, individuals' assessments of the instrumental benefits of various activities in the organizational entry process may affect their behavior (i.e., newcomers may ask "will it lead to valued rewards" when considering various activities). Future research might also examine feedback loops in this process. It may be that as individuals feel their performance improve or their stress level decline, they will do less of these activities. Longitudinal data with several measurement points are needed to sort out these and other questions.

References

Adkins, C. L. (1995). Previous work experience and organizational socialization: A longitudinal examination. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 839–862.

Ashford, S. J., & Black, J. S. (1992, August). *Self-socialization: Individual tactics to facilitate organizational entry.* Paper presented at the meetings of the Academy of Management, Las Vegas, NV.

Ashford, S. J., & Cummings, L. L. (1983). Feedback as an in-

dividual resource: Personal strategies of creating information. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32,* 370–398.

Ashford, S. J., & Taylor, M. S. (1990). Adaptation to work transitions: An integrative approach. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (Vol. 8, pp. 1–39). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ashforth, B. E., & Saks, A. M. (1995). *Socialization tactics: Longitudinal effects on newcomer adjustment.* Unpublished manuscript, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Ashforth, B. E., Saks, A. M., & Lee, R. T. (1994, August). *Socialization and newcomer adjustment: The role of organizational structure and job design.* Paper presented at the meetings of the National Academy of Management, Dallas, TX.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51,* 1173–1182.

Bauer, T. N. (1995, May). *Newcomer socialization: The influence of prior work experience, pre-entry contact, early newcomer performance, and managerial behavior.* Paper presented at the meetings of the National Academy of Management, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Bauer, T. N., & Green, S. G. (1994). Effect of newcomer involvement in work-related activities: A longitudinal study of socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 211–223.

Bell, N. E., & Staw, B. M. (1989). People as sculptors vs. sculpture: The role of personality and personal control in organizations. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), *The handbook of career theory* (pp. 232–251). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin, 107,* 238–246.

Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin, 88,* 588–606.

Berlyne, D. E. (1960). *Conflict, arousal and curiosity.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Black, J. S., & Porter, L. (1991). Managerial behaviors and job performance: A successful manager in Los Angeles may not succeed in Hong Kong. *Journal of International Business Studies, 22,* 99–114.

Bollen, K. A. (1989). A new incremental fit index for general structural equation models. *Sociological Methods & Research, 17,* 303–316.

Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136–162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience.* New York: Harper & Row.

Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1978). A note on the dynamics of work adjustment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 12,* 76–79.

deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior.* New York: Academic Press.

Dutton, J. E., & Jackson, S. E. (1987). Categorizing strategic

issues: Links to organizational action. *Academy of Management Review, 12,* 76–90.

Dwyer, J. H. (1983). *Statistical models for the social and behavioral sciences.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Feldman, D. C., & Brett, J. N. (1983). Coping with new jobs: A comparative study of new hires and job changers. *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 258–272.

Fisher, C. D. (1985). Social support and adjustment to work: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Management, 11,* 39–53.

Fisher, C. D. (1986). Organizational socialization: An integrative review. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (Vol. 4, pp. 101–145). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Fisher, C. D., & Gittleson, R. (1983). A meta-analysis of the correlates of role conflict and ambiguity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64,* 533–540.

Folkman, S. (1984). Personal control and stress and coping processes: A theoretical analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 839–852.

Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1980). An analysis of coping in a middle-aged community sample. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 21,* 219–239.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1986). Societal consequences of the *g* factor in employment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 29,* 379–410.

Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology, 91,* 481–510.

Greenberger, D. B., & Strasser, S. (1986). Development in application of a model of personal control in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 11,* 164–177.

Greenberger, D. B., Strasser, S., Cummings, L. L., & Dunham, R. B. (1989). The impact of personal control on performance and satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43,* 29–51.

Greenberger, D. B., Strasser, S., & Lee, S. (1988). Personal control as a mediator between perceptions of supervisory behaviors and employee reactions. *Academy of Management Journal, 31,* 405–417.

Groos, K. (1901). *The play of man.* New York: Appleton.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hunter, J. E. (1986). Cognitive ability, cognitive aptitudes, job knowledge, and job performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 29,* 340–362.

Ibarra, H. (1993). Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review, 18,* 56–87.

Jones, E. E., & Gerard, H. B. (1967). *Foundations of social psychology.* New York: Wiley.

Jones, G. R. (1983). Psychological orientation and the process of organizational socialization: An interactionist perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 8,* 464–474.

Jones, G. R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy and newcomers' adjustment to the organization. *Academy of Management Journal, 2,* 262–279.

Kanfer, F. H. (1980). Self-management methods. In F. H. Kanfer & A. P. Goldstein (Eds.), *Helping people change* (2nd ed., pp. 334–389). New York: Pergamon Press.

Kanfer, F. H., & Karoly, P. (1972). Self-control: A behavioralist excursion into the lion's den. *Behavior Therapy, 3,* 398–416.

Katz, R. (1985). Organizational stress and early socialization experiences. In T. A. Beehr & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Human stress and cognition in organizations* (pp. 117–139). New York: Wiley.

Kelley, H. H. (1971). *Attribution in social interaction.* Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense-making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 25,* 226–251.

Louis, M. R., Posner, B. Z., & Powell, G. N. (1983). The availability and helpfulness of socialization practices. *Personnel Psychology, 35,* 857–866.

Major, D. A., Kozlowski, S. W. J., Chao, G. T., & Gardner, P. D. (1995). A longitudinal investigation of newcomer expectations, early socialization outcomes, and the moderating effects of role development factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 418–431.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1980). Self-management as a substitute for leadership: A social learning theory perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 5,* 361–367.

Miller, V. D., & Jablin, F. M. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics and a model of the process. *Academy of Management Review, 16,* 92–120.

Morrison, E. W. (1993a). Longitudinal study of the effects of information seeking on newcomer socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 173–183.

Morrison, E. W. (1993b). Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 557–589.

Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. C. (1991). Social support and newcomer adjustment in organizations: Attachment theory at work? *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 12,* 543–554.

Nelson, D. L., Quick, J. C., & Eakin, M. E. (1988). A longitudinal study of newcomer role adjustment in U.S. organizations. *Work and Stress, 2,* 239–253.

Nicholson, N. (1984). A theory of work-role transitions. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29,* 172–191.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. A. (1994). Working smarter and harder: A longitudinal study of managerial success. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39,* 603–627.

Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. (1992). Organizational socialization as a learning process: The role of information acquisition. *Personnel Psychology, 45,* 849–874.

Pearce, J. L., & Porter, L. W. (1986). Employees' responses to formal performance appraisal feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 211–218.

Reichers, A. E. (1987). An interactionist perspective on newcomer socialization rates. *Academy of Management Review, 12,* 278–287.

Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J. R., & Snyder, S. S. (1982). Changing the world and changing the self: A two-process model of perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42,* 5–37.

Saks, A. M. (1995). Longitudinal field investigation of the moderating and mediating effects of self-efficacy on the relationship between training and newcomer adjustment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 211–225.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1995, May). *Socialization tactics and newcomer information acquisition.* Paper presented at the 10th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (in press). Proactive socialization and behavioral self-management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior.*

Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Smith, E. M., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1995, May). *Newcomer socialization: The effects of learning strategies and role relationships on learning outcomes.* Paper presented at the 10th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Steiger, J. H. (1990). Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 25,* 173–180.

Sutton, R. I., & Kahn, R. L. (1986). Prediction, understanding and control as antidotes to organizational stress. In J. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 272–285). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin, 103,* 193–210.

Tichy, N. M. (1981). Networks in organizations. In P. C. Nystrom & W. H. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organization design* (Vol. 2, pp. 225–248). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tsui, A. S. (1984). A role set analysis of managerial reputation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 36,* 64–96.

Tsui, A. S. (1994). Reputational effectiveness: Toward a mutual responsiveness framework. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 16, pp. 215–257). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Tucker, L. R., & Lewis, C. (1973). The reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 38,* 1–10.

Van Maanen, J. (1977). Experiencing organizations: Notes on the meaning of careers and socialization. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), *Organizational careers: Some new perspectives* (pp. 15–45). New York: Wiley.

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research for organizational behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 209–264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

White, R. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review, 66,* 297–333.