ABSTRACT

COSTELLO, ANNA BLAND. The Relationship between Socialization Content and Perceived Organizational Support. (Under the direction of Samuel B. Pond)

The purpose of this research has been to test a measure of socialization content and to examine the relationship between socialization content and perceived organizational support. The survey used for data collection combined the Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, and Gardner (1994) survey of socialization content with the Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986) survey of perceived organizational support. Data were collected via company intranet at one location of a large, multinational corporation (N = 304). The instruments did not factor as expected and further analysis could not be performed, but these results may be due to extreme environmental circumstances in the company during the data collection period and suggest that replication of the study is warranted.

The Relationship between Socialization Content

and Perceived Organizational Support

by

Anna B. Costello

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Department of Psychology

Raleigh

2003

Approved By:

_____   _____

_____   _____

Chair of Advisory Committee

BIOGRAPHY

Ms. Costello is a doctoral student in Industrial, Organizational, and Vocational Psychology at North Carolina State University.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Statement of the Problem

Organizational socialization is the "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" (Louis, 1980, pp. 229-230). In practical terms, socialization is the transition from being an outsider to being an insider in an organization. Successful socialization of new employees is crucial to an organization, and it does not happen automatically. An organization that does not actively manage the socialization of new employees invites problems ranging from low productivity to high turnover. Employee socialization has been linked to numerous outcome variables, including adjustment, role stress, motivation, job involvement, role clarity, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and performance, but the relationship between socialization and these variables is generally moderate to weak. Also, these variables are all mostly distal or long-term outcomes. Recent research has attempted to identify the proximal (immediate) outcomes of socialization. To do this, it is necessary to determine exactly what makes a new employee become an "insider," and how long it takes.

The two main areas of focus in employee socialization research are content and process. The *content* of socialization is what an employee actually needs to learn to become an effective member of an organization; socialization content might include learning new skills or procedures, learning the history and mission of the organization, gaining an understanding of the chain of command in the organization, and developing relationships with coworkers. Socialization *process* concerns the stages an employee

needs to go through to become socialized, how long the stages might take, and the best methodology for presenting content. Variations in process might include formal vs. informal instruction, group vs. individual training, peer vs. supervisor mentoring, etc. In other words, content is *what* a new employee needs to learn; process is *how* the employee should learn it.

The socialization of new employees has been a fertile area of study in the last twenty-five years. While theoretical models have been developed for both content and process of socialization, most of the empirical research has been in the process area. Only two studies have attempted to define and measure the content areas of socialization by developing and field-testing a survey (Taormina, 1997; Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, & Gardner, 1994), and only Chao et al.'s (1994) instrument has been used in other published studies (Allen, McManus, & Russell 1999; King & Sethi, 1998) and is recommended for further study (Saks & Ashforth, 1997a; Bauer, Morrison, & Callister, 1998).

Chao et al. (1994) developed and tested an instrument with six content areas they believe are necessary for successful employee socialization: 1) performance proficiency (acquisition of critical skills, such as the ability to use a particular computer program), 2) people (the successful development of work relationships), 3) organizational politics, 4) language (job- and organization-specific jargon, acronyms, etc.), 5) organizational goals and values, and 6) organizational history. Their instrument is a good starting point as a tool for assessing socialization content, but it is not assumed to cover all possible content areas. The authors suggest that further refinement of the survey is needed. Both Bauer et al. (1998) and Saks and Ashforth (1997a) concur. As a result of those recommendations,

this study tests the validity of the factor structure of Chao et al.'s (1994) survey on a new sample, and also examines another construct that may be predictive of successful employee socialization: perceived organizational support (POS). POS is the employee's belief in whether or not he feels valued by the organization (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). It is possible that POS overlaps with one or more content area measured in the Chao et al. (1994) instrument, but more likely it is a separate construct that contributes to or enhances successful employee socialization. If so, this is an important relationship, particularly since high POS can be proactively nurtured by an organization. Earlier research has established links between strong POS and desirable distal outcomes, such as low turnover intention. This study examines the relationship between Chao et al.'s (1994) dimensions of socialization content and POS. A survey combining the Chao et al. (1994) measure with a short form of Eisenberger et al.'s (1986) POS measure was administered to employees of a large corporation. The data were factor analyzed to test the validity of the scales, then correlations between the socialization content subscales and the POS scale were examined to determine if POS is related to socialization, and whether it replicates a subscale in the Chao et al. (1994) measure or stands alone as a separate construct.

Literature Review

There has been a strong call for increased empirical work on socialization content (Feldman, 1981; Fisher, 1986; Saks & Ashforth, 1997a; Bauer et al., 1998). However, part of the problem in doing this research is defining exactly what constitutes *content*. It is obviously easier to recognize a well-socialized employee than it is to determine

precisely how and why he or she became one. There have been several attempts in the literature to list the elements necessary for socialization; some are more detailed than others. The idea of exploring the content, or necessary elements, of socialization originally emerged in the business management literature pertaining to employee productivity and effectiveness. In one of the earliest discussions of the topic, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) define content as the "ideological mandate…and the general set of mandate-fulfilling actions that are supposed to be performed by the role occupant" (p. 226). They list three sub-areas of content: 1) knowledge for specific problem-solving, 2) the rules for problem solving, such as "cut costs" or "beat the competition" (p. 227), and 3) organization-level mission or purpose (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Beyond these three areas, there is no attempt to delineate the content elements. Their focus is on the processes used to socialize employees, not on the information itself.

Models of Socialization Content

In addition to the Van Maanen and Schein (1979) article noted above, several papers have listed categories of content necessary for successful socialization of new employees. Four models are described in detail below, and were chosen because they present specific information about the knowledge, attitudes and relationships an employee must possess or develop to be socialized within an organization. Although there is overlap between all four content models, each one was developed for a particular purpose and from a particular point of view, and it is useful to consider the development context, strengths, and weaknesses of all four models. Also, each model uses a somewhat different framework and terminology, but when examined in aggregate it is easier to see

the similarities between the models and the general agreement about some socialization content areas. However, each model also has some unique features that contributed to the design of the current study. The four models presented below, in chronological order, are drawn from Fisher (1986), Ostroff and Kozlowski (1992), Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, and Gardner (1994), and Holton (1996).

Fisher (1986)

Fisher (1986), in summarizing the literature to that date, lists four content areas: 1) organizational values, goals, and culture; 2) work group values, norms, and relationships; 3) skills and knowledge needed to do the job; and 4) personal change relating to identity, self-image, and motive structure. She also uses the words "content" and "learning" interchangeably, as do some other authors. This seems logical at first: *content* can be the same as *what is learned*. However, this presents a problem. Although there is considerable overlap between content and learning, they need to be defined separately when constructing a measure of socialization content. The term *content* should be reserved for the information and relationships that the newcomer needs from the employer (and its people) to become socialized, making it a subset of *what is learned*. Also, Fisher includes the development of relationships with co-workers in her model, and that is not learned behavior, per se, so the synonymous use of *content* and *learning* is misleading.

The first three content areas – 1) organizational values, goals, and culture; 2) work group values, norms, and relationships; and 3) task skills and knowledge -- are organization-driven, can be taught (except for work group relationships, which can be encouraged and developed), and demand some amount of "fit" from the employee

(Chatman, 1991). The fourth area, personal change, is internal to the employee and probably beyond the control of the organization. To describe this area, Fisher cites Schein's (1978) study on "career anchors" – the elements of one's self-image, developed over time, that are used to direct career moves (e.g., technical competence, creativity, need for security). Fisher speculates that an organization can have little impact on one's personal growth unless the potential for change in an area already exists in the employee. Also, socialization is a continuous process, but it occurs in varying degrees at different points in time (Bauer et al., 1998; Taormina, 1997); there is no evidence that personal change happens on the same time schedule as socialization. It may be that the personal changes occur before a job change, or well after socialization in a new job or organization. In addition, there are measurement problems; it might make more sense to measure personal change with the secondary outcomes of socialization (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, stress, etc.). Therefore, it seems logical to set aside personal change as a content area of socialization, and limit socialization content to "areas…judged to be under an organization's direct or legitimate influence" (Chao et al., 1994, p. 731).

Ostroff and Kozlowski (1992)

After Fisher's article in 1986, there was little attempt to elaborate on socialization content until Ostroff and Kozlowski (1992) published the first empirical study to use an instrument designed to measure socialization content. They wrote a 33-item survey based on four content domains: 1) job-related tasks, 2) work roles, 3) group processes, and 4) organizational attributes (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). The task domain includes the specifics of the job, such as learning the necessary skills and duties, performance

requirements, and expectations for routine problem solving. The role domain encompasses learning the behaviors and demeanors that are appropriate for the position, such as the boundaries of authority, when to seek help, and expectations beyond the job description. The group domain includes information about work group goals and values, the development of relationships with other group members, and learning the social dynamics of the group as a whole, including its politics. The organizational domain encompasses organization-level goals and values, politics, and culture.

Although this study measured knowledge about content areas, it was not an attempt to make a definitive measure of socialization content. The focus of the study was on the process of socialization; they were interested in the new employees' use of various sources of information (supervisor, co-worker, observation, training, or instruction manual), the amount of information learned over time from these sources, and the impact of the amount of learning on four attitudinal outcomes: satisfaction, commitment, adjustment, and stress. The study did not report any factor analysis of the content measure to see if the domains they defined held together, although they did report correlations between the four domains. Also, the survey items were not published for use by others, and they have not been used in any other published research that I could find except for one follow-up study using part of the same data collected for the 1992 study (Ostroff and Kozlowski, 1993).

Chao, O'Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein, & Gardner (1994)

In 1994, Chao et al. published the results of a study designed specifically to create and validate a measure of socialization content. In the article, the authors note the following:

Several researchers have suggested content areas or dimensions of organizational socialization (Feldman, 1981; Fisher, 1986: Schein, 1968). Although there is a great deal of conceptual overlap among these proposed content areas, there has been virtually no empirical research to verify the hypothetical content of the socialization domain or to relate content areas to socialization processes and outcomes. Thus, a serious limitation in much of the current research has been the lack of sound construct definition and development (Chao et al., 1994).

Recent reviews of the literature cite Chao et al.'s measure as worthy of further study (Bauer et al., 1998; Saks & Ashforth, 1997), and it has been used as a measure of socialization content in at least two later studies (Allen, McManus, & Russell, 1999; Klein & Weaver, 2000).

Chao et al. (1994) conceptualized six dimensions of organizational socialization content based on their review of the literature. These areas covered by these dimensions are not significantly different from the areas covered by the four dimensions of Ostroff and Koslowski (1992, 1993) and Holton (1996); rather, the content areas have been pulled apart and regrouped into narrower, more specific dimensions. The six content areas are:

Performance proficiency. This is specific task skills and knowledge needed to perform the job competently.

People. This domain encompasses the development of work relationships, group dynamics, and the learning of social parameters that are acceptable in the organization.

Politics. Politics is the knowledge of the work group and organization power structure – not just knowing what the organizational hierarchy is supposed to be, but also

knowing what it actually is. This content area is often described as the "how to get things done" knowledge.

Language. Chao et al.'s definition of language acquisition includes both organization specific "acronyms, slang, and jargon" (p. 732) as well as the technical language that is pertinent to one's profession, and is not organization-specific.

Organizational Goals and Values. This area covers both the formal principles of the organization and its unwritten rules. Chao et al. note that socialization in the *people* dimension describes an employee's adoption of work group norms; *organizational goals and values* addresses the employee's connection to the organization beyond one's work group.

O*rganizational history*. Organizational history perpetuates the organizational culture. It is the transmission of stories, rituals, legends, and defining characteristics of the organization and its people, including biographical information about the founders and leaders (Chao et al., 1994).

Chao et al. (1994) conducted a five-year, three-part longitudinal study. The subjects (N = 594) were alumni from a large state university and a small college who participated in all three phases of the study. Phase 1 consisted of writing, administering, and refining the socialization content survey (SOC survey). The final version of the questionnaire has 34 items which factor into the six subscales noted above. In the current study, subjects are all employees of the same organization, but we expect that even within a restricted population, the socialization survey will still factor into the six dimensions detailed in the Chao et al. (1994) study.

Of the two other studies that have used the Chao et al. survey, neither used the entire measure. Allen et al (1999) used the survey to measure the impact of short term peer-mentoring for first-year MBA students, and they eliminated the history and language subscales because they were not deemed pertinent to that situation. The other study focused on an organizational-level new employee orientation program. The researchers used all six subscales but eliminated six items that were job or work group specific, resulting in a 28-item survey instead of a 34-item survey (Klein & Weaver, 2000).

Holton (1996)

Holton (1996) created a model he named New Employee Development (NED), which merges the socialization literature and the training literature to define a clear process for socializing employees. He lists specific content for the effective socialization of new employees, and also describes how that content can be integrated through three "levels" of learning – 1) new employee orientation, 2) job skills training programs, and 3) workplace (on-the-job) learning. His model lists four domains, or spheres of influence, that the organization can use to develop its new members into effective employees. Each domain has three tasks associated with it. Holton's domains are organized as follows:

Individual. 1) adopting attitudes congruent with those of the organization, 2) developing realistic expectations about the job and the organization, and 3) "breaking-in," which is developing the adaptive skills necessary for successful entry into the organization.

People. 1) impression management, 2) understanding role relationships, networks, and team relationships, and 3) building the supervisor/subordinate relationship.

Organization. 1) understanding the organizational culture, 2) gaining organizational savvy (political awareness and skill), and 3) learning and becoming comfortable with one's organizational role.

Work Task. 1) acquiring work savvy (the general abilities needed to be an effective employee, such as communication and time management skills), 2) understanding the nature of one's tasks, and 3) identifying the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to do one's tasks successfully (Holton, 1996 & 1997).

Although Holton's taxonomy is very specific, he mostly replicates what we've seen in earlier models, and he only addresses *what* the tasks are, without suggesting *how* to measure them. However, he does add employee expectations -- specifically those concerning the organization itself -- to his model. Employee expectations are not in any of the other models, and it makes sense that they would have an impact on the socialization of an employee, although it is harder for an organization to influence employee expectations than it is most of the other content dimensions. Eisenberger et al.'s (1986) construct of perceived organizational support (POS) is a measure of an employee's expectations about the organization's behavior.

Survey Design for the Current Study

Based on the review of the four models listed above, I chose to combine the Chao et al. (1994) socialization content survey (SOC) with a short form of the Eisenberger et al. (1986) perceived organizational support (POS) survey. I also added questions about tenure, time spent working, time spent at work-related social events, and demographic questions (age, gender, race, nationality). My hypotheses are as follows:

H1: The 34–item Socialization Scale will factor into the six positively correlated a priori *subscales.*

Phase 2 of the Chao et al. study examined differences in socialization survey scores between those who had remained in the same job since Time 1, those who had changed jobs but remained in the same organization, and those who had changed jobs and organizations. Chao et al. hypothesized, based on Schein's theory (Schein, 1971), that job incumbents would show little change or increases in socialization subscale scores between Time 1 and Time 2, job changers within organizations would show decreases on the scales that were not organization-specific , and job and organization changers would show significant changes on all six SOC subscales. For the most part the hypotheses were supported, suggesting that when an employee crosses an organizational boundary, whether within the organization or to a new organization, the socialization process continues (Chao et al., 1994). In addition, some of the subscale scores moved in negative directions after a job change, while others had positive movement between Times 1 and 2. For example, the group of organization changers at Time 2 had lower scores on *Organizational Goals and Values* and *Organizational History* than did the other two groups, but their scores on those scales were higher after they changed jobs and organizations. This suggests that Chao et al.'s subscales are measuring separate dimensions, and can be used to help predict outcomes of socialization, such as turnover intention. In the current study, we predict that incumbents will have higher means than new employees on all six socialization subscales.

H2: All six socialization content subscale scores will increase as tenure increases from entry (new hire) to six months.

Phase 3 of the Chao et al. study measured the relationship between the socialization survey subscales and career effectiveness criteria over a four-year span for those subjects who had not changed jobs for the duration of the study. The criterion used was career effectiveness, quantified by 1) increase/decrease in personal income, 2) career involvement, 3) job satisfaction, 4) identity resolution, and 5) adaptability. After controlling for tenure, the socialization measures accounted for significant proportions of the variance in all five career effectiveness measures. In addition, changes in socialization scores were related to changes in career effectiveness scores. Finally, although the socialization survey subscales showed small to moderate correlations amongst themselves, there were differing relationships between the individual scales and the various career effectiveness measures, which suggests some discriminant validity of the subscales. For example, *Organizational Goals and Values* was a significant predictor of career involvement and job satisfaction, but only *Politics* was a significant predictor of personal income.

Two later, unrelated studies also offer some support for the existence of Chao et al's subscales as separate constructs. In the first study, Allen et al. (1999) used the Chao et al. survey to examine the relationship between mentoring and socialization for MBA students (N = 64). The results suggest that not only is mentoring related to socialization, but also that two types of mentoring (psychosocial and career-related) correlate with different subscales of the survey, which again indicates some discriminant validity for the subscales. However, beyond computing Cronbach's alphas for the socialization subscales (which ranged from .75 to .85; similar to Chao et al.'s results) the authors did not report

any other analysis of the socialization survey, except to correlate subscale means with mentoring and stress scales.

The second study using the Chao et al. survey was a field study measuring the usefulness of a voluntary new-employee orientation program at a large university. Klein and Weaver (2000) used Chao et al.'s instrument to compare the socialization levels of new employees (N = 116) who had and had not attended a formal new employee orientation training program. Six items were removed from the survey that measured job or unit level dimensions rather than the organization-level dimensions, which were the focus of the orientation program. One scale (language) dropped to two items, which is below the recommended bare minimum of three. The other five scales retained three or more items. Klein and Weaver (2000) did not report a factor analysis of the survey, but they did report Cronbach's alpha for all six scales, which ranged from .63 to .86. In a comparison of scores for employees who attended the training program vs. those who did not, the attendees were more socialized on three of the six socialization subscales, and socialization (as measured by the SOC survey) mediated the relationship between attendance and organizational commitment.

The results of these two studies do not offer complete support for the Chao et al. socialization content dimensions, but in both cases the sample was very small, so further testing of the survey is warranted. Although the dimensions of the Chao et al. measure of socialization content are drawn from the literature and have been used successfully, Bauer et al. (1998) note the following:

Chao et al.'s scale (1994) is a valuable addition to the socialization literature as it provides a measure of a broad array of changes that occur during socialization.

We encourage its use, but caution researchers from misusing the set of subscales

as a measure of a unitary construct....the measure was developed to capture many

aspects of socialization but was not intended to be exhaustive (p. 159).

Saks and Ashforth (1997) make a similar observation. Since research has shown that

socialization is related to outcomes including job satisfaction, organizational

commitment, turnover intention, adjustment, role stress, motivation, and performance,

this poses the question: *What other factors are related to Chao et al.'s socialization*

content areas? Based on Holton's (1996) addition of employee expectations of the

organization to the content model, covered above, we tested the relationship between

socialization content and perceived organizational support (Eisenberger et al.,1986).

Perceived Organizational Support

The socialization of a new employee is essentially the process of making him or

her an "insider" in the organization. Every model of socialization content includes the

need for establishing relationships, not only with fellow employees but also with the

organization itself. There are several streams of research that discuss the socialization of

employees via the relationship between the employee and the organization, including

person-organization fit (Chatman, 1991), psychological contracting (Rousseau, 1990),

and organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). According to social identity

theory, the importance of developing a successful relationship with the organization is

rooted in our tendency to create an identity based on the groups we associate with

(Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Hogg & Terry, 2000). In addition, identification with an

organization is distinctly different from identification with one's co-workers or work

group. Every model of socialization content listed in this paper (Fisher, 1986; Ostroff & Koslowski, 1992; Chao et al., 1994; Holton, 1996) distinguishes the employee-coworker relationship from the employee-organization relationship.

Prior research has shown that employees do distinguish between the organization as an entity separate from the work group and immediate supervisor (Reichers, 1985; Eisenberger et al. 1986; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996). Hogg and Terry (2000) argue that two core motivators for our associations with others are our need for self-esteem and our need for uncertainty reduction, and that employees are unlikely to develop a relationship with an organization unless membership in the organization addresses these needs. Co-workers, teams, and managers can only partially meet an employee's needs in these areas; the organization must contribute as well. In addition, the employee holds an anthropomorphic view of the organization (Levinson, 1965) and perceives the employee-organization relationship as a dyadic one, and as such is governed by the "rules" of social exchange theory, including the norm of reciprocity (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). In an exchange relationship with an organization an employee is willing to offer organizational commitment because it implies stability and the reduction of uncertainty. If the organization reciprocates with perceived commitment to the employee, this will strengthen the employee's affective attachment to the organization (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Hutchison & Garstka, 1996; Randall & O'Driscoll, 1997). However, if an employee feels that he is in an unequal relationship, the norm of reciprocity is violated and the employee should feel disenfranchised. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the organization to demonstrate its commitment to and support of its employees.

The survey of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) was designed to measure the employee's belief that the organization is participating fairly in the relationship by recognizing the employee as a valued member of the organization. It has been used in nearly three dozen studies since 1986, and the measure is a stable, unitary construct with consistently high reliability (generally $\alpha = .90$ or higher). POS has been linked to affective commitment (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhodes, 2001; Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996), organizational citizenship behavior (Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998), job satisfaction (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997), job performance (Eisenberger et al., 2001), perceptions of procedural justice (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000), and innovation (Eisenberger et al., 1990). The socialization content scale measures some aspects of an employee's connection with the organization, but does not specifically address the exchange relationship with the organization. It is possible that organizational support is a crucial dimension of employee socialization that supplements Chao et al's model as a distinct but related construct, and that the six content scales plus the POS scale taken together will produce a general measure of socialization effectiveness.

H3: The Perceived Organizational Support (POS) scale will be distinct from but positively correlated with the socialization content subscales.

H4: POS scores will increase as tenure increases from entry (new hire) to six months.

H5: The combined socialization subscales and the POS scale will create a higher order factor of socialization that will increase as tenure increases from entry (new hire) to one year.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were 304 white-collar employees of a large, multi-national, high-tech corporation. All subjects were drawn from a population of approximately 1800 employees at the corporate campus located in the southeastern U.S. Of the subjects in the sample who completed and returned the survey, 80% were male. The racial composition of the sample was 77% Caucasian, 16% Asian, 4% Black, 2% Hispanic, and 1% other. Tenure at the company ranged from less than 1 year to 9 years, with a mean of 2.25 years. Approximately 21% of the respondents had worked for the company for less than one year; 76% had been employed there for less than three years.

Instrument

The survey (see Appendix) is Chao et al.'s (1994) Socialization Content survey combined with a short version of Eisenberger et al.'s (1986) Perceived Organizational Support survey. The combined survey has 50 items grouped into 7 subscales – six from the socialization survey plus the POS scale. Although three of the subscales were re-named for clarity, the questions remained the same. Respondents used a 5-point Likert scale to rate each item from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). In addition, the employees answered questions about their tenure at the company and the amount of time they spend per week on various activities. Demographic data (race, gender, job title, and department) were also collected.

Data collection

The survey was administered at one of the main campuses of a large, multi-national high-tech firm. Approximately 600 randomly chosen employees were sent an e-mail on the company intranet requesting their participation in the study. The letter had an embedded URL link which the employee clicked to access the survey. After the participant completed the survey, he or she submitted the results via intranet. To insure confidentiality, the data were collected in a computer locker that was only accessible to the researcher in charge of the project. Three hundred and three surveys were returned, for a response rate of roughly 50%; exclusion of subjects with any missing data yielded 289 cases for analysis. Responses to questions 38 – 50 were lost due to a computer error during data collection, so the data available for analysis contains five of the six socialization survey subscales (the *Job Knowledge* scale is missing) and 9 questions out of 17 for the POS survey (see Table 1).

<div align="center">Results</div>

Socialization Content Scales

Reverse-scored items were recoded and subscale reliabilities (Cronbach's α) were computed. Of the five scales, only two had even marginally acceptable reliabilities: *History* (α = .72) and *Social Connection* (α = .72). *Language* (α = -1.04; a meaningless number computed by SPSS when the items are negatively correlated), *Influence* (α = .36) and *Goals and Values* (α = .13) were clearly unacceptable. Five items (5, 7, 19, 25, and 26) had factor loadings that were in the opposite direction to the rest of the subscale items they should have loaded positively with (see Table 1), so they were dropped from the

analysis to obtain acceptable alphas on all scales (since alphas cannot be calculated when

all item-total correlations are not positive; see Table 2). The remaining items were

analyzed by principal axis factoring with direct oblimin rotation. Principal axis factoring

was chosen because research has shown that a true factor analysis is almost always

preferable to a principal components analysis, particularly when the data contains low to

moderate factor loadings (Gorsuch, 1990; Floyd & Widaman, 1995; Fabrigar, Wegener,

MacCallum, & Strahan 1999). I selected direct oblimin rotation (an oblique rotation)

since it allows factors to correlate, which was expected both in theory and based on Chao

et al.'s earlier analysis of the socialization scales. If the factors do not correlate then an

oblique rotation replicates an orthogonal rotation, so nothing is lost in the interpretation

of the results (MacCallum & Tucker, 1991; Fabrigar et al., 1999).

The results of the initial analysis (presented in Table 3) did not conform to the

expected five-factor solution. In this analysis, several concerns arose. First, the fifth

factor was an uninterpretable two-item factor with modest loadings. Second, in the other

four factors, some item loadings were in an unexpected (negative) direction. Finally, the

anticipated factor pattern matrix was not realized, with items from different subscales

loading together.

Since the fifth factor was uninterpretable and the other four factors did not

replicate the expected *a priori* structure, the data were reanalyzed using a four-factor

extraction model. As presented in Table 4, this solution also failed to yield the expected

factor loading pattern. There were still unexpected negative factor loadings, and subscale

items failed to factor together. In response to this, four items (10, 13, 16 and 22) that

were loading with items from a different subscale were dropped in an attempt to replicate

a priori factor pattern from the Chao et al. model. This new analysis (see Table 5) produced a factor loading pattern that more closely matched the *a priori* pattern, except items from the *Influence* and *History* subscales merged to create a single factor, and one item from the *Language* subscale loaded with the *Influence* and *History* items. This confluence of items from three separate subscales, combined with mixed positive and negative loadings, render the factor uninterpretable as noted in Kim and Mueller (1978).

After multiple iterations, and the elimination of almost one-third of the items (9 items of 28), it was still not possible to replicate the expected factor structure for this instrument. After substantial item elimination several coherent subscales did emerge, albeit in reduced form. The factor analysis literature suggests that when communalities are moderate to low and loadings are moderate to low, as is the case for many of these items, then factors should contain several items apiece; most consider three items per scale the bare minimum and four items barely acceptable unless communalities and loadings are high (Velicer & Fava, 1998). Finally, in contrast to the Chao et al. data, these subscales, even in their significantly altered states, failed to correlate positively with each other.

Perceived Organizational Support Scale

The survey contained 17 POS items but responses to the last eight questions were lost, leaving nine items for analysis (see Table 1). Eisenberger and others successfully tested short versions of the POS survey with as few as 6 items (Eisenberger et al., 2001), and the items on the current scale were the highest loaders on Eisenberger's original scale (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Data were analyzed using principal axis factoring (see Table 6). The calculated reliability was negative (α = -.66) because not all item intercorrelations were positive. There was no reasonable explanation for the negative correlations between items, nor did the negatively correlated items group together logically, so four items (29, 32, 33, and 37) were dropped from the scale. The resulting five-item scale factored with moderately high loadings, with an eigenvalue of 2.81 and α = .80. This is consistent with other studies that have found Eisenberger's shortened POS scale to be stable across varying types of samples (Settoon et al., 1996; Hutchison & Gartska, 1996; Eisenberger et al., 1997; Wayne et al., 1997; Moorman et al., 1998; Masterson et al., 2000). However, given that almost half of the items had to be discarded to create this effect, the value of this significantly reduced scale in this case is questionable.

Inter-scale correlations

In order to test the hypothesis that one or more of the socialization subscales will correlate positively with the POS scale, it is necessary to calculate factor scores. Items clustering together from the final factor analysis are combined using factor loadings from that analysis as item weights. However, since the final factor analysis solution did not yield interpretable socialization subscales it is impossible to compute meaningful correlations between the subscales and the POS scale, so I could not test the hypothesis that a combined socialization scale would correlate positively with the POS scale to create a higher order factor of socialization (H5).

Discussion

Circumstances beyond our control seriously compromised the execution of this study as planned. This study was originally designed to take advantage of a large-scale hiring program being instituted by the organization. Plans were in place to hire approximately 1200 new employees at the local site within one year, with the first training class of 400 new hires already scheduled. Data were to be collected from the new hires as they entered the training class and again after six months on the job. Before the data collection began in the summer of 2001 a rapid contraction of the high-tech industry occurred, and the organization froze hiring and began laying off employees; I was unable to test hypothesis 2 (socialization content scores would increase from time of hire to six months' tenure) and hypothesis 4 (POS scores would increase from time of hire to six months' tenure).

In addition to the suspension of the hiring program, other problems may have affected the results. The relatively young company had been experiencing nearly exponential growth for the previous ten years, and the CEO had publicly proclaimed that he would never lay off employees. Thousands of employees were heavily invested in company stock, and the precipitous drop of the stock price caused a huge loss of wealth. It is possible that the extreme circumstances in the company and in the industry at large caused some of the unexpected negative correlations in the data. For example, *Goals and Values* was inversely correlated with POS, but these scales measure two aspects of an employee's perception of the organization, and logic suggests that they would be closely correlated. It is possible that the rapid crash, which was not foreseen by the leaders of the company and was followed by unprecedented layoffs, caused feelings of betrayal in

employees and they detached themselves emotionally from the company by stating on the survey that they do not share the company's goals and values, when three months earlier the reverse would have been true. However, this is pure speculation based on the circumstances.

It is also possible that the data behaved erratically due to a restriction of range problem, which suggests that either 1) this company does a good job of socializing its employees, so there is not enough variability in responses to get an accurate test of the scales, or 2) the scales are not sensitive enough to pick up statistically significant variation within the relatively homogeneous population.

A third possibility is fatal technical error. There was a significant amount of data lost. Forty percent of the responses to questions 38 – 42 were not recorded, and questions 43 – 50 disappeared altogether, which included an entire subscale from the socialization measure. In addition, the data for questions 51 – 54 were sketchy or uninterpretable; it is unknown if the data that were actually collected is an accurate recording of subjects' responses.

Due to the combined loss of data and the breaking apart of the socialization scale, hypothesis 2 (see above) and hypothesis 5 – that the socialization content scale and the POS scale would combine to form a higher order factor of socialization -- could not be tested. There was also not enough demographic variability in the subject pool to measure significant differences in socialization or POS that relate to race, gender, work department, time spent on site, or time spent in extracurricular activities. It is possible that a much larger number of subjects would reveal some differences, but it may be that if

an organization is very good at socializing their employees there would be few differences.

The data from this study is problematic, but it does lead to some interesting questions that can be pursued in further research. First, there does appear to be a link between perceived organizational support and Chao et al.'s socialization content scale. This study was done in a single organization; the next step would be to test the combined survey across multiple organizations to see if the relationship holds. Second, further testing needs to be done to examine the relationship between mean scores on the socialization and POS surveys and the results of outcome measures. Job satisfaction, turnover, performance measures, organizational citizenship, and other outcomes may all have stronger links to socialization and perceived organizational support than is currently known. Finally, there has been very little empirical work on the connection between socialization and training. By attempting to define the content of socialization, Chao et al. have provided a framework for organizations to actively incorporate socialization as part of employee training. If, as suspected, socialization is closely related to desirable outcomes, then organizations would be wise to pay close attention to socialization as part of their employee development.

In conclusion, this study design was compromised by uncontrollable factors, primarily changes in the global economic climate and technical problems with data collection. However, in spite of these problems, I believe that the study design is a good one and replication is warranted, and that further research would show that a combined measure of socialization and POS would be a better predictor of the desirable outcomes (commitment, low turnover, organizational citizenship, productivity, etc.) than either

scale by itself. If my hypotheses are accurate, then organizations would be advised to design a new employee orientation and training program that incorporated all aspects of the Chao et al. scales, in addition to making a directed effort to enhance an employee's perception of support by the organization.

References

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 847-858.

Allen, T. D., McManus, S. E., & Russell, J. E. A. (1999). Newcomer socialization and stress: Formal peer relationships as a source of support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*(3), 453-470.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(1), 20-39.

Bauer, T. N., Morrison, E. W., & Callister, R. R. (1998). Organizational Socialization: A Review and Directions for Future Research. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 16*, 149-214.

Chao, G. T., O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Wolf, S., Klein, H. J., & Gardner, P. D. (1994). Organizational Socialization - Its Content and Consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(5), 730-743.

Chatman, J. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 459-484.

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 42-51.

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(5), 812-820.

Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Diligence, Commitment, and Innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(1), 51-59.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 500-507.

Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 4*(3), 272-299.

Feldman, D. C. (1981). The multiple socialization of organization members. *Academy of Management Review, 6*, 309-319.

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

Floyd, F. J., & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment, 7*(3), 286-299.

Gorsuch, R. L. (1990). Common factor analysis vs. component analysis: Some well and little-known facts. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 25*(1), 33-39.

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 121-140.

Holton, E. F. (1996). New Employee Development. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 7*(3), 233-252.

Holton, E. F., III, & Russell, C. J. (1997). The relationship of anticipation to newcomer

socialization processes and outcomes: A pilot study. *Journal of Occupational and

Organizational Psychology, 70*(2), 163-172.

Hutchison, S., & Garstka, M. L. (1996). Sources of perceived organizational support:

Goal setting and feedback. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*(15), 1351-

1366.

Kim, J., & Mueller, C. W. (1978). *Factor Analysis: Statistical Methods and Practical

Issues*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

King, R. C., & Sethi, V. (1998). The Impact of Socialization on the Role Adjustment of

Information Systems Professionals. *Journal of Management Information Systems,

14*(4), 195-217.

Klein, H. J., & Weaver, N. A. (2000). The effectiveness of an organizational-level

orientation training program in the socialization of new hires. *Personnel

Psychology, 53*(1), 47-66.

Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization.

Administrative Science Quarterly, 9, 370-390.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering

unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 226-251.

MacCallum, R. C., & Tucker, L. R. (1991). Representing sources of error in the common-

factor model: Implications for theory and practice. *Psychological Bulletin, 109*(3),

502-511.

Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice

and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on

work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(4), 738-748.

Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational

support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational

citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(3), 351-357.

Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. (1992). Organizational socialization as a learning

process: The role of information acquisition. *Personnel Psychology, 45*(4), 849-

874.

Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information

gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization.

Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42(2), 170-183.

Randall, D. M., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (1997). Affective versus calculative commitment:

Human resource implications. *Journal of Social Psychology, 137*(5), 606-617.

Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment.

Academy of Management Review, 12, 460-471.

Rousseau, D. M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's

obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational

Behavior, 11*(5), 389-400.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997a). Organizational socialization: Making sense of

the past and present as a prologue for the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,

51*(2), 234-279.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997b). Socialization tactics and newcomer information

acquisition. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 5*(1), 48-61.

Schein, E. H. (1978). *Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs*.

Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schein, E. H. (1971). The individual, the organization, and the career: A conceptual

scheme. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 7*, 401-426.

Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations:

Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee

reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(3), 219-227.

Taormina, R. J. (1997). Organizational socialization: A multidomain, continuous process

model. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 5*(1), 29-47.

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization.

In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 209-264).

Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Velicer, W. F., & Fava, J. L. (1998). Effects of variable and subject sampling on factor

pattern recovery. *Psychological Methods, 3*(2), 231-251.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and

leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of

Management Journal, 40*(1), 82-111.

Table 1

Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Loadings

			Factor loadings	
Factor/item	Mean	SD	Chao et al. (1994) *N=594*	Current study *N= 289*
Factor 1: History				
1. I am familiar with the history of my organization.	4.30	.60	.73	*.10
2. I know very little about the history behind my work group/department. (R)	4.14[1]	.96	.74	.65
3. I would be a good resource in describing the background of my work group/dept.	3.72	.96	.70	.63
4. I am not familiar with the organization's customs rituals, ceremonies, and celebrations. (R)	4.01[1]	.94	.50	*.39
Subscale Eigenvalue			10.04	Did not factor
Factor 2: Language				
5. I understand the specific meanings of words and jargon in my profession.	3.75	.99	.74	*.00
6. I have not mastered the specialized terminology and vocabulary of my profession. (R)	1.66[1]	.67	.72	.80
7. I have not mastered the organization's slang and special jargon. (R)	4.08[1]	.99	.72	-.83
8. I understand what most of the acronyms and abbreviations of my profession mean.	2.17	.96	.77	.54
9. I do not always understand what my organization's abbreviations and acronyms mean. (R)	1.73[1]	.72	.71	.76
Subscale Eigenvalue			2.93	Did not factor

Table 1, continued

Factor 3: Social Connection (People)				
10. Within my work group, I would easily be identified as "one of the gang."	2.75	1.11	.73	*.20
11. I do not consider any of my coworkers as my friends. (R)	2.03[1]	.96	.68	.63
12. I believe most of my coworkers like me.	1.61	.75	.61	.56
13. I am usually excluded from social get togethers given by other people in the organization. (R)	1.90[1]	.67	.72	*.39
14. I am pretty popular in the organization.	2.00	.91	.64	.80
15. I am usually excluded in informal networks or gatherings of people within this organization. (R)	2.71[1]	.76	.72	.54
Subscale Eigenvalue			1.66	Did not factor
Factor 4: Influence (Politics)				
16. I have learned how things "really work" on the inside of this organization.	2.15	.89	.65	*-.21
17. I am not always sure what needs to be done to get the most desirable work assignments in my area. (R)	2.33[1]	.82	.50	-.58
18. I know who the most influential people are in my organization.	2.40	1.04	.66	*-.35
19. I can identify the people in this organization who are most important in getting the work done.	3.61	.86	.56	.76
20. I do not have a good understanding of the politics in my organization. (R)	2.15[1]	.75	.54	-.62
21. I have a good understanding of the motives behind the actions of other people in the organization.	2.64	.97	.70	-.57
Subscale Eigenvalue			2.51	Did not factor

Table 1, continued

Factor 5: Goals and Values				
22. I would be a good representative of my organization.	3.53	.80	*.41	*.15
23. The goals of my organization are also my goals.	3.99	.83	.78	.76
24. I believe that I fit in well with my organization.	4.32	.57	.52	.79
25. I do not always believe in the values set by my organization. (R)	1.71[1]	.74	.65	-.68
26. I understand the goals of my organization.	2.02	.87	*.40	-.49
27. I would be a good example of an employee who represents my organization's values.	4.32	.60	.74	.66
28. I support the goals that are set by my organization.	4.16	.75	.83	.76
Subscale Eigenvalue			1.48	Did not factor

Perceived Organizational Support scale			Eisenberger et al. (1986) $N=361$	Current study $N=289$
29. This organization values my contribution to its well being.	4.42	.60	.71	-.53
30. If this organization could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary it would do so. (R)	2.37[1]	.85	.69	.72
31. This organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me. (R)	1.98[1]	.81	.72	.75
32. This organization strongly considers my goals and values.	3.87	.84	.74	-.73
33. This organization would ignore any complaint from me. (R)	4.07[1]	.85	.71	-.63
34. This organization disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me. (R)	2.29[1]	.81	.73	.62
35. Help is available from this organization when I have a problem.	2.33	1.04	.74	.60
36. This organization really cares about my well-being.	1.89	.85	.83	.69

Table 1, continued

37. This organization is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.	3.81	.83	.80	-.61
38. Even if I did the best job possible, this organization would fail to notice. (R)	**	**	.80	**
39. This organization is willing to help me when I need a special favor.	**	**	.82	**
40. This organization cares about my satisfaction at work.	**	**	.82	**
41. If given the opportunity, this organization would take advantage of me. (R)	**	**	.73	**
42. This organization shows very little concern for me. (R)	**	**	.84	**
43. This organization cares about my opinions.	**	**	.82	**
44. This organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.	**	**	.76	**
45. This organization tries to make my job as interesting as possible.	**	**	.72	**

				Did not factor
Eigenvalue				correctly

Factor 6: Job Knowledge (Performance Proficiency)			Chao et al. (1994)	Current study
46. I understand all of the duties my job entails.	**	**	.60	**
47. I have mastered the required tasks of my job.	**	**	.76	**
48. I have not yet learned the "ropes" of my job. (R)	**	**	*.41	**
49. I have learned how to perform my job successfully in an efficient manner.	**	**	.74	**
50. I have not fully developed the appropriate skills and abilities to successfully perform my job. (R)	**	**	.73	**
Subscale Eigenvalue	**	**	1.13	No data

* item loaded higher on another factor
** lost data; items not included in analysis
[1] mean of reversed scores

Table 2
Subscale (Factor) Reliabilities

	Cronbach's α			
	With all items in subscale	With items deleted	No. of items removed	No. of items remaining in scale
Socialization Scale (SOC)				
1: History	.72	.72	0	4
2: Language	-1.04	.70	2	3
3: Social Connection	.72	.72	0	6
4: Influence	.36	.71	1	5
5: Goals and Values	.13	.81	2	5
Perceived Organizational Support Scale (POS)	-.67	.80	4	5

Table 3

Revised Socialization Scale: Pattern Matrix for Five-Factor Model

Item Number and *A Priori* Factor	Factor Loadings				
	1	2	3	4	5
Q21 Influence	**.68**	.11	-.12	.10	.13
Q17(R) Influence	**.59**	.00	.00	.00	.00
Q04(R) History	**-.58**	.00	.00	.00	.00
Q01 History	**-.51**	.00	-.29	.00	.14
Q22 Goals and Values	**-.49**	.00	.10	.00	.00
Q03 History	**-.40**	.17	.00	.31	-.30
Q18 Influence	**.40**	.24	.00	.00	.00
Q20(R) Influence	**.36**	.00	.16	.00	.00
Q02(R) History	**-.33**	.00	.00	.14	-.19
Q14 Social Connection	.00	**.80**	.00	.00	.00
Q16 Influence	.00	**.68**	.00	.00	.00
Q11(R) Social Connection	.00	**.52**	.00	.00	.13
Q12 Social Connection	.15	**.46**	.00	-.11	-.20
Q15(R) Social Connection	.00	**.43**	-.12	-.31	.14
Q06(R) Language	.00	.00	**-.72**	.00	.00
Q09(R) Language	.00	.00	**.71**	.00	.00
Q28 Goals and Values	.00	.00	.00	**.79**	.00
Q23 Goals and Values	.00	.00	.00	**.76**	-.20
Q24 Goals and Values	.00	.00	-.10	**.70**	.19
Q27 Goals and Values	-.21	.00	-.21	**.49**	.13
Q13(R) Social Connection	.00	.30	.11	**-.34**	.00
Q08 Language	.12	.10	.37	.00	**.47**
Q10 Social Connection	.16	.00	.32	.00	**.37**
Initial Eigenvalue	7.74	1.70	1.49	1.38	1.00

Table 4

Revised Socialization Scale: Pattern Matrix for Four-Factor Model

	Factor Loadings			
Item Number and *A Priori* Factor	1	2	3	4
Q21 Influence	**.71**	.13	.00	.12
Q17(R) Influence	**.57**	.00	.00	-.10
Q04(R) History	**-.56**	.00	.00	.12
Q03 History	**-.55**	.18	-.20	.22
Q22 Goals and Values	**-.43**	.00	.15	.15
Q02(R) History	**-.41**	.00	-.14	.00
Q18 Influence	**.37**	.27	.00	.00
Q01 History	**-.34**	.00	-.19	.18
Q20(R) Influence	**.28**	.12	.11	-.17
Q14 Social Connection	.00	**.82**	.00	.10
Q16 Influence	.00	**.71**	.00	.00
Q11(R) Social Connection	.00	**.51**	.16	.00
Q12 Social Connection	.00	**.50**	.00	-.19
Q15(R) Social Connection	.13	**.41**	.00	-.20
Q06(R) Language	.00	.00	**-.72**	.12
Q09(R) Language	-.15	.00	**.66**	-.15
Q08 Language	.30	.00	**.55**	.00
Q10 Social Connection	.30	.00	**.47**	.12
Q24 Goals and Values	.00	.00	.00	**.76**
Q28 Goals and Values	.00	.00	.00	**.71**
Q23 Goals and Values	-.25	.00	-.11	**.61**
Q27 Goals and Values	-.14	-.11	-.14	**.56**
Q13(R)Social Connection	.00	.31	.00	**-.34**
Initial Eigenvalue	7.74	1.70	1.49	1.38

Table 5
Second Revision of Socialization Scale: Pattern Matrix for Four-Factor Model

	Factor Loadings			
Item Number and *A Priori* Factor	1	2	3	4
Q21 Influence	**.70**	.15	.12	.00
Q04(R) History	**-.65**	.00	.00	.00
Q03 History	**-.58**	.10	.11	.19
Q17(R) Influence	**.57**	.00	.00	.00
Q02(R) History	**-.47**	.00	.00	.00
Q01 History	**-.44**	.21	.00	.12
Q08 Language	**.41**	-.37	.00	.00
Q18 Influence	**.34**	.00	.28	.00
Q20(R) Influence	**.30**	-.11	.00	-.15
Q06(R) Language	.00	**-.79**	.00	.00
Q09(R) Language	.00	**-.69**	.00	.00
Q14 Social Connection	.00	.00	**.79**	.00
Q11(R) Social Connection	.00	-.17	**.52**	.00
Q12 Social Connection	.00	.00	**.21**	-.16
Q15(R) Social Connection	.00	.00	**.41**	-.25
Q24 Goals and Values	.00	.00	.00	**.80**
Q28 Goals and Values	.00	.00	-.11	**.76**
Q23 Goals and Values	-.21	.00	.00	**.66**
Q27 Goals and Values	-.19	.12	.00	**.52**
Initial Eigenvalue	6.79	1.45	1.34	1.22

Table 6

Perceived Organizational Support Scale (POS): Factor Matrix

Original Scale		Revised Scale	
Item number	Loading	Item number	Loading
Q31(R)	**.76**	Q31(R)	**.72**
Q32	**-.73**	Q36	**.72**
Q30(R)	**.72**	Q30(R)	**.69**
Q36	**.69**	Q34(R)	**.62**
Q33(R)	**-.64**	Q35	**.61**
Q34(R)	**.63**		
Q37	**-.62**		
Q35	**.61**		
Q29	**-.53**		
Q38 - Q45	No data		
Cronbach's alpha	-.66		.80
Eigenvalue	4.47		2.81

Appendix

Note: this survey was posted on the company intranet in an html format that is not preserved here. Subjects used radio buttons to record their responses with the exception of questions 53 and 54.

Please think about how you have learned about the work and environment at [this organization]. Below, you will find phrases that could describe how people learn about working in an organization. Please read each statement and then respond depending on your own experience here at [this organization]. Reply using the 1 - 5 scale:

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

History

1. I am familiar with the history of [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

2. I know very little about the history behind my work group/department. 1 2 3 4 5

3. I would be a good resource in describing the background of my work group/department. 1 2 3 4 5

4. I am not familiar with [this organization]'s customs, rituals, ceremonies, and celebrations. 1 2 3 4 5

Language

5. I understand the specific meanings of words and jargon in my profession. 1 2 3 4 5

6. I have not mastered the specialized terminology and vocabulary of my profession. 1 2 3 4 5

7. I have not mastered [this organization]'s slang and special jargon. 1 2 3 4 5

8. I understand what most of the acronyms and abbreviations of my profession mean. 1 2 3 4 5

9. I do not always understand what [this organization]'s abbreviations and acronyms

mean. 1 2 3 4 5

Social Connection

10. Within my work group, I would be easily identified as "one of the gang." 1 2 3 4 5

11. I do not consider any of my coworkers as my friends. 1 2 3 4 5

12. I believe most of my coworkers like me. 1 2 3 4 5

13. I am usually excluded from social get togethers given by other people in [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

14. I am pretty popular in [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

15. I am usually excluded in informal networks or gatherings of people within [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

Influence

16. I have learned how things "really work" inside [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

17. I am not always sure what needs to be done in order to get the most desirable work assignments in my area. 1 2 3 4 5

18. I know who the most influential people are in [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

19. I can identify the people in [this organization] who are most important in getting work done. 1 2 3 4 5

20. I do not have a good understanding of the politics at [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

21. I have a good understanding of the motives behind the actions of other people in [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

Goals and Values

22. I would be a good representative of [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

23. The goals of [this organization] are also my goals. 1 2 3 4 5

24. I believe that I fit in well at [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

25. I do not always believe in the values set by [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

26. I understand the goals of [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

27. I would be a good example of an employee who represents [this organization]'s values. 1 2 3 4 5

28. I support the goals that are set by [this organization]. 1 2 3 4 5

Organizational Support

29. [This organization] values my contribution to its well being. 1 2 3 4 5

30. If [this organization] could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary it would do so. 1 2 3 4 5

31. [This organization] fails to appreciate any extra effort from me. 1 2 3 4 5

32. [This organization] strongly considers my goals and values.1 2 3 4 5

33. [This organization] would ignore any complaint from me.1 2 3 4 5

34. [This organization] disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me. 1 2 3 4 5

35. Help is available from [this organization] when I have a problem.1 2 3 4 5

36. [This organization] really cares about my well-being.1 2 3 4 5

37. [This organization] is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.1 2 3 4 5

38. Even if I did the best job possible, [this organization] would fail to notice.
   1 2 3 4 5

39. [This organization] is willing to help me when I need a special favor.1 2 3 4 5

40. [This organization] cares about my general satisfaction at work.1 2 3 4 5

41. If given the opportunity, [this organization] would take advantage of me.1 2 3 4 5

42. [This organization] shows very little concern for me.1 2 3 4 5

43. [This organization] cares about my opinions.1 2 3 4 5

44. [This organization] takes pride in my accomplishments at work.1 2 3 4 5

45. [This organization] tries to make my job as interesting as possible.1 2 3 4 5

If you have worked at [this organization] one year or less, please fill out the following:

<u>Job Knowledge</u>

46. I understand all of the duties my job entails.1 2 3 4 5

47. I have mastered the required tasks of my job.1 2 3 4 5

48. I have not yet learned the "ropes" of my job.1 2 3 4 5

49. I have learned how to perform my job successfully in an efficient manner.
    1 2 3 4 5

50. I have not fully developed the appropriate skills and abilities to successfully
    perform my job.1 2 3 4 5

Background Information: The information you provide in these questions will allow us to examine patterns of responses across different groups of people.

51. Have you changed positions within [this organization] during the past year?
    No
    Yes: less than 3 months ago
    Yes: between 3 and less than 6 months ago
    Yes: between 6 months and a year ago

52. How many hours per week do you spend working for [this organization]?
    Less than 20 hours
    20 to 30 hours
    30 to 40 hours
    40 to 50 hours
    50 to 60 hours
    60 to 70 hours
    70 hours or more

53. We are interested in the mix of time you spend working on and off [this
    organization's local] campus. During the week how much time to do you spend
    working
     on [this organization]'s campus _____
     off [this organization]'s campus _____

54. How many hours per month do you spend doing [this organization] activities that
    are not part of your job requirements (such as volleyball games, parties, contests,
    and events)? _____