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ABSTRACT

Organizational socialization is a dynamic process by which newcomers learn and adjust to attitudes and behaviors needed to assume their new organizational roles. Nowadays managing newcomers becomes a challenge for organizations as they demand more from their organization, and push organizations to invest time and resources for their adjustment. The present study introduces psychological needs satisfaction in the scope of organizational socialization research. 34 newcomers were interviewed about their new job, socialization experience and required motivational elements by using the critical incident technique. The results showed that newcomers’ psychological needs fulfillment was helping the success of the organizational socialization process. Based on these qualitative results and literature, a research framework was proposed to be empirically tested. Subsequently, a quantitative study was conducted to test the theoretical model. The study was done by introducing psychological needs satisfaction as a mediating mechanism and a proximal outcome of organizational socialization. Organizational social support was also considered as an organization resources fostering newcomers’ socialization process. To further strengthen the results, two moderating variables (psychological capital and newcomer’s proactivity) were introduced to study boundary effects. 225 questionnaires were analyzed in the study two. The data was collected through a self-administered survey. A longitudinal research design was applied with half of the variables assessed at time 1 and the other half assessed four months later at time 2. This study was conducted in three major economic sectors in Pakistan. Data was analyzed by using structural equation modeling. A positive relationship was found between organizational socialization tactics and psychological need satisfaction proving it as a proximal outcome of socialization. Distal outcomes i.e. job performance and affective commitment were also positively influenced by organizational socialization tactics and organizational social support from socialization agents. Further, it was found that newcomers’ psychological capital (moderating variable at T1) strengthened the relationship between socialization resources (i.e. organizational socialization tactics and organizational social support) and newcomer’s psychological needs satisfaction; and that newcomers’ proactivity (moderating variable at T2) strengthened the relationship between psychological needs satisfaction and job outcomes, i.e. performance and affective commitment.

Keywords: organizational socialization, newcomers, self-determination theory, proactivity, psychological capital, organizational social support
Préambule

La socialisation organisationnelle est un long processus à travers lequel les nouveaux venus apprennent tout ce qui concerne la nouvelle organisation dont ils deviendront membres. Aujourd’hui, les attentes des nouvelles générations à l’égard des entreprises sont très élevées. Cette étude introduit la théorie de l’auto-détermination (TAD) dans le contexte de la socialisation organisationnelle. En utilisant la méthode des incidents critiques, des entretiens semi-directifs ont été réalisés avec 34 nouvelles recrues. Les thèmes abordés concernaient : le nouveau travail, l’expérience de la socialisation et les éléments de motivation. Les résultats laissent transparaître que répondre aux besoins psychologiques des nouvelles recrues est un élément essentiel pour mener une socialisation organisationnelle réussie. En se basant sur ces résultats qualitatifs et sur la littérature, un modèle de recherche a été proposé afin d’être testé de façon empirique. Une étude quantitative a été conduite pour tester les hypothèses. Cette étude introduit la satisfaction du besoin psychologique comme résultat proximal de la socialisation organisationnelle, comme suggéré dans l’étude 1. Le soutien social organisationnel, c’est-à-dire le rôle des agents de socialisation, a été ajouté aux tactiques organisationnelles de socialisation comme variable indépendante. Afin de renforcer les résultats et pour prendre en compte les effets externes, deux variables modératrices (le capital psychologique et la proactivité du nouveau venu) ont été introduites. Les données ont été collectées à travers un questionnaire auto-administré et construite à partir d’échelles de mesure existantes. Un total de 255 questionnaires a été analysé pour l’étude 2. Le recueil des données a été longitudinal avec la moitié des variables mesurées à T1 et l’autre moitié mesurée quatre mois plus tard, à T2. Cette étude a été conduite dans trois secteurs économiques importants du Pakistan. Les données en ont été analysées avec les modèles d’équations structurelles. Une relation positive a été trouvée entre les tactiques organisationnelles de socialisation et la satisfaction des besoins psychologiques, ce qui fait de cette dernière un résultat proximal de la socialisation. La performance au travail et l’implication affective sont positivement influencées par les tactiques organisationnelles de socialisation et le soutien social des agents de socialisation. Cependant, aucune relation n’a été trouvée avec la variable dépendante intention de quitter l’emploi (turnover). De plus, il a été établi que capital psychologique des nouveaux venus (variable modératrice à T1) renforce les relations entre les tactiques organisationnelles de socialisation, le soutien social des agents de socialisation (variables indépendantes) et la satisfaction des besoins psychologiques ; également, la proactivité des nouveaux venus (variable modératrice à T2) renforce les relations entre la satisfaction des besoins psychologiques et les variables dépendantes à savoir la performance au travail et l’implication affective.

Mots-clés : socialisation organisationnelle, nouveaux venus, théorie de l’auto-détermination, proactivité, capital psychologique, soutien social organisationnel
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I. INTRODUCTION

In the past, employees accepted the fact that the employer was dominating in the employer-employee relationship, resulting in submissive behaviors; recently, the employer-employee relationships has shown significant evolution. This evolution is due to the fact, that talented employees are difficult to attract and keep motivated. Organizations rarely consider their employees as permanent members, the reason being that both parties (employee and employer) are aware of abrupt changes and possible interruptions that may occur in the relationship. In addition, many employees now prefer autonomy over submission to an administrative authority. One reason may lie in the growth of the private sector with respect to the public (more traditional) sector. New generations arriving on the job market seem to be more individually focused and career oriented than previous generations. Whereas, organizations look for intrinsically motivated employees who internalize organizational goals and concerns. Even though organizations are doing their best in terms of training and socialization programs to transfer knowledge and skills for newcomers; a considerable degree of success can only be achieved with some sharing of commonness between organization and employees. Socialization processes are useful for newcomers’ internalizing of organization goals.

Organizational socialization in recent years has progressed from imposition of organizational values to generating proactive employees (Schein, 1988). Organizational socialization has been through a long evolution that started from Schein’s definition of organizational socialization as an “indoctrination” process (Schein, 1968). In management literature, there has been a comprehensive amount of work in socialization research (Jones, 1986, Van Maanen and Schein, 1979, Lacaze and Bauer, 2014). Organizational socialization is concerned with learning content and processes by
which newcomers make their adjustment as new members of an organization. The research on organizational socialization is divided into two major categories. The first area of research is concerned with different organizational socialization domains, like, what is learnt during the process. Several researchers (Schein, 1968; Fisher, 1986; Feldman, 1981) have been prominent in this domain, discussing content areas and several dimensions of content nature. The major dimensions include, people, politics, language, organizational goals values, history and performance proficiency (Chao, O’Leary, Wold, Klein and Gardner, 1994; Klein and Heuser, 2008).

The second area of organizational socialization research is the process of socialization. It relates to the understanding of various stages through which a newcomer becomes a member of an organization (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Buono & Kamm, 1983; Dubinsky, Howell, Ingram & Bellenger, 1986; Chao, 1988, Feldman, 1981). Although there has been considerable research done in this area, more research is still needed, as the organizational challenges at workplace keep increasing. This is the reason of studying organizational socialization as a process in the present research. Further, as a “content” study socialization is more specific than general whereas process domain of socialization is more generalized and can be related to similar organizations.

The existing empirical studies have consistently demonstrated that organizational social support, is an essential form of social support, which is important in influencing newcomers’ job attitudes and behaviors (e.g. Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002; Allen, Shore & Griffeth 2003; Stinglhamber and Vandenberghe, 2003). As a result, another point of view arises from such studies, that employees and organizations can be involved in a social exchange relationship (Loi, Mao, & Ngo, 2009). In this stream of research, employee-organization exchange is widely operationalized by
using the explanatory mechanism of organizational social support (OSS). Organizational social support advocates the fact that organization is an entity working for the employees who in return work for the organization (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). While adopting organizational socialization as a process to facilitate organizational entry, organizational social support can be an additive advantage to facilitate the whole process of newcomer adjustment and learning.

**Research Statement 1:** Organizational socialization tactics and organizational social support entail positive work outcomes for the organizational socialization process.

### I.I Psychological Needs Satisfaction

Self-determination theory or psychological needs satisfaction is one of the major theories of human motivation and employee well-being. It was mainly developed by Edward L. Deci and Richard M. Ryan and later improved. The reason this theory gained much appreciation is because it involves natural human instinct for doing something for your sake, with your own interest. Deci and Ryan (2000) proposed that humans are naturally attractive and attractive to new challenges. However, this active motive needs to be fueled by fulfilling their needs. There for, by fulfilling the psychological needs of newcomers they can be satisfied and motivated to achieve better job outcomes and performance. Application of psychological needs satisfaction has been voluminous in the psychological studies related to sports, education, health related topics, and with limited appearance in areas relating to the work place (Deci, Connell, and Ryan, 1989; Kasser, Davey, and Ryan, 1992; Gagne, Koestner, and Zuckerman 2000; Otis, and Pelletier, 2005; Fernet, Gagne, and Austin, 2010; Mitchell, Gagne, Beaudry, and Dyer 2012; Fernet, Austin Trepanier, and Dussault,
It will be interesting to build a relationship between organizational socialization and psychological needs satisfaction. There are considerable instances in the work domain where there has been clear emphasis of using three psychological needs in understanding workplace adjustment (e.g. Porath, Spreitzer, Gibson, and Garnett 2012; Wang and Gagne, 2013). The purpose of introducing the mediating effect is to combine the effect of organization to employee and employee to organization (either way process). The sole purpose of doing so is to check whether or not organizational socialization process along with social support help fulfill newcomers’ need satisfaction which help gain positive outcomes.

**Research Statement No.2:** Newcomers’ psychological needs Satisfaction can play a role in motivating newcomers through the socialization process by acting as a proximal outcome of organizational socialization.

**I.II Psychological Capital and Newcomer Proactivity**

Psychological capital is an evolution of positive organizational behavior POB (Wright, 2003). POB is defined as a study of positively oriented human resources and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed and managed for better performance at workplace (Luthans, 2002a). According to Luthans et al. (2010) psychological capital is a “reservoir” serving as a motivational foundation that can drive people to act intentionally to achieve goals. Bandura (2008) suggests that the combination of psychological capital constructs produce a synergetic effect. Psychological capital has shown positive effects for many job outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, employee performance, organizational commitment (Luthans et al. 2002a). Psychological capital has proved as a resource to overcome stress and anxiety (Avey, Luthans, and
Youssed, 2010), it can be interesting to see how it can shield newcomers through their challenging first times at work.

While discussing about positive and stimulating factors to facilitate newcomers, newcomer proactivity is another element that can help facilitate the socialization process. Proactive behavior like information seeking, feedback seeking, networking and others can bring positive change to the socialization process. However, Bolino and Colleagues (Bolino, Valcea & Harvey, 2010) argued that proactivity can be negatively associated to well-being and performance outcomes when newcomers lack proactive behaviors. Chan’s (2006) found that proactive behavior can only result in positive performance outcomes when employees have enough resources to be proactive. Chan (2006) also mentioned the importance of judgement of time and place, i.e. when and where, to be proactive. Hahn & colleagues (Hahn, Frese, Binnewies, & Schmitt, 2012) suggested that proactive behavior needs initiative, that is developed over a certain period of time. Hence, newcomers in their beginning stage are mentally occupied and unaware of the environment they are operating. So, it is interesting to see how newcomer proactive behaviors can enhance the socialization process at a later stage.

Research Statement No.3: Psychological capital and newcomer proactivity can serve as potential external elements to facilitate the socialization process.

II. Problem Statement

Newcomers are employees that are new to the environment and mostly trying to find their way with or without any support. With increasing levels of unemployment is developing and under
developing countries, with respect to employee retention is a common problem. The new
generation (e.g. the millennials) generate problems for organizations and management with regards
to high levels of turnover and lower job performance. Retention programs are striving for success
and positive outcomes. This retention issue is not only related to the recruitment process and its
quality, but also with how newcomers are treated after hiring. Organizations still believe in
authoritarian manner for the newcomers (millennials), who in fact have evolved to be autonomous
and self-centered. They do have better focus than the newcomers before, but with a reduced interest
in organizational goals. These past experiences also trigger the identities they endorse and their
ability to endorse them (Beyer & Hannah, 2002). Organizations no doubt, strive to provide better
opportunities and develop programs for better adjustment. But they lack to understand the
requirement of mutual interest for achieving organization related outcomes.

As newcomers are processing lots of information during the entire socialization process, this is
also a time when newcomers must adapt to the new environment, to make a match that can help
them in adjustment. Research done by Schneider (2001) approved that whenever individuals are
placed in a situation, where they must adapt to the environment, they strongly desire a solution
that requires no effort. Organizations need to come develop a mechanism that helps achieve the
organizational goals by satisfying newcomers in a way they desire. Organizational socialization
process can be successful if there is a mutual understanding that satisfies both stake holders.

III. Research Gap and Questions

Organizational socialization tactics and processes are one of the most studied concepts in the
socialization literature, as noted by Saks et al. (1997). Many researchers have examined
organizational socialization in conjunction with key socialization outcomes (for example see Allen, 2006; Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Ashforth, Sluss & Saks, 2007; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Gruman, Saks & Zweig, 2006; Hart & Miller, 2005; Jones, 1986; Kim, Cable, Kim, 2005; Laker & Steffy, 1995; Saks & Ashforth, 1997a). Given this we know a lot about organizational socialization and outcomes. However, relatively less is known about the motivational elements (lacaze & Bauer, 2014) in organizational socialization. The present research attempts to fill this gap by introducing and testing psychological needs (Desi & Ryan, 2000) satisfaction as a distil outcome. Psychological needs fulfillment is a psychological energy that can activate the newcomer satisfaction protocol. The process to satisfy these needs is another sense of achievement that will enhance the social ability of the newcomers.

Further, the present study also considers the importance of socializing agents that can help facilitate the socialization process through their voluntary actions. This whole process of socialization in which the research tried to facilitate newcomers by proximal outcomes and later gain distal outcomes for the organization needs a high level of consideration from the newcomer himself. This consideration can be guaranteed by using their psychological capital i.e. positive work experience (Luthans, 2002a, 2002b) along with newcomer proactivity (Ashford & black; 1996).

- Do conditions provided during organizational socialization process designed by organizations through socialization tactics and organizational social support fulfill newcomers’ psychological needs satisfaction and consequently entail positive work outcomes?
- Do psychological capital and newcomer proactivity help facilitate the organization socialization process of proximal (motivational) to distal (job) outcomes?
IV. Conceptual Framework

The above diagram is mentioning organizational socialization and organizational social support as two independent variables and psychological needs satisfaction as its proximal outcome, whereas affective commitment, job performance and turnover intention as distal outcomes of the process. Psychological capital and proactivity are acting as potential moderators in their respective positions in Time 1 (psychological capital) and Time T2 (proactivity).
V. Theoretical Contribution

The purpose of this study is to understand the newcomer adjustment process and different challenges faced by newcomers during the socialization process. At first, a qualitative study led to comprehend the extent to which organizations apply socialization tactics and the supporting role of organizational insiders. The qualitative study is conducted to determine the presence of a new motivational proximal outcome for organizational socialization to increase newcomer adjustment process. This theoretical contribution resulted in determining the missing element of motivation in the socialization process, the need of motivational element was first identified by Lacaze and Bauer (2014). Hence, following the results from qualitative study (using Critical Incident Technique - CIT) psychological needs satisfaction was approved as a potential proximal outcome of the socialization process. Self-determination theory has never been studied as a proximal outcome in the socialization process before.

Second part of the study is a qualitative research conducted to develop a better understanding of the concept i.e. proximal and distal outcomes of organizational socialization process. In the quantitative study, newcomer psychological capital and newcomer proactivity are studied as potential moderators for the socialization process. Psychological Capital and proactive behavior of employees can help newcomers throughout the organizational socialization process. This study was longitudinal, T1 and T2 were separated by four months. Newcomers of six private and semi government organizations were contacted. Such type of study for newcomers has never been done in Pakistan before making it another contribution to literature and theory. As the study two (quantitative) covers the major sectors in Pakistan hence it has a considerable amount of generalizability to at least those sectors if not more.
VI. Dissertation Plan

PART 1:

First Part includes the theoretical background and literature review followed by a qualitative study. The purpose of this part is to present a base for the second half of the research which is of quantitative nature. To fulfill this purpose the first part presents a theoretical framework. Each chapter in part one explains and develops the concepts and provide a base for the final outcome i.e. the theoretical model. A brief outline of each chapter is given below.

CHAPTER NO. 1: Organizational Socialization

This chapter starts by defining organizational socialization as a process by which a newcomer becomes an insider from being an outsider. The major topics included in this chapter cover organizational socialization tactics and different theories and tactics used in previous literature for newcomer adjustment and facilitation. The major element in this chapter are organizational socialization tactics by Jones (1986).

CHAPTER NO. 2: Mediators and Moderators of the Relationship between organizational socialization and employee outcomes

This chapter introduces psychological needs satisfaction an element of motivation and a potential proximal outcome of organizational socialization process. Further, it also explains the role of
socializing agent in socialization process. The later part of this chapter explains the role of psychological capital and newcomer proactivity as moderators.

CHAPTER 3: Research Methodology

This chapter explains the research methodology used in this research. It explains both the qualitative and the quantitative research methodology after developing an epistemological position. It explains the whole research process and how it is carried out. The chapter also presents the research hypothesis and conceptual framework.

PART II:

Part II of the present research contains three chapters. It separates by the element of what was previously known (Part I) and what the results from the two studies conducted (qualitative and quantitative) in this research.

CHAPTER 4: Study One (Qualitative)

This is the first chapter of Part II. This chapter explains the results of qualitative study. All-important narratives and content analysis along with qualitative results are detailed in this chapter. This chapter further approved the proposed theoretical framework that is empirically tested in study two (quantitative).
CHAPTER 5: Analysis and Results Study Two (quantitative)

This chapter details the quantitative data analysis from start to end. Starting from data screening process, to explaining procedural remedies for normalizing data. The major analysis is the testing of research hypothesis which was carried out by structural equation modeling (SEM). This chapter explains the results based on which research hypotheses mentioned in chapter three are accepted and rejected.

CHAPTER 6: Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter concludes the whole research by discussing the results and contributions for theory and practice. This chapter has got subsection discussing in detail about every outcome in the present study starting from qualitative and ending on quantitative research. The later part of the chapter discusses the research limitations and some directions for readers for future research in socialization context.
CHAPTER NO.1

ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION

Organizational socialization is the process through which individuals become efficient members of an organization. This first chapter examines the process of organizational socialization through important key questions: what is it? why does it matter? what types of employees adapt better? and what organizations, superiors, and employees can do for a better adjustment of newcomers?

1.1 Defining Organizational Socialization

Organizational socialization literature consists of 50 years of history. OS can be defined in terms of process and content. Van Maanen & Schein (1979, p. 211) defined socialization as “a process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role”. This definition is probably the most cited definitions of organizational socialization. The first known definition of organizational socialization is an extraction from an earlier work of Schein (1968). This definition specifies that social knowledge is something that can be acquired. Schein (1968) defined socialization as, “the value system, the norms, and the required behavior patterns of an organization or group”. Organizational socialization occurs throughout a career, whenever an individual crosses a boundary for example, from insider to outsider (the boundary is crossed to become a member of company), for change in the group (boundary crossed when transferred from one group to another within the same organization), or
for change in position (boundary crossed by getting promoted from one position to another within
the organization) according to Van Maanen & Schein, (1979). Thus, organizational socialization
is ongoing for individuals, showing a greater intensity when they become insiders (from outsiders)
and is of a - lesser intensity when employees are being promoted or transferred. Organizational
socialization is particularly stressful when individuals initiate their work life. The better this
process is managed, the earlier an individual can adjust to his / her working environment.
Socialization is also considered an ongoing management concern for organizations, as new
employees are hired, and some are rotated between different functional areas or promoted. Despite
the given facts, organizational socialization literature has mostly considered one situation: when
individuals are transformed from outsiders to insiders, which has the greatest concern for
organizations (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). There is an abundant use of the word “newcomer”
in the socialization literature, which is also a sign of its use for new employees rather than for other
change situations mentioned by Van Maanen & Schein (1979). Except the work of Djabi (2014),
most of the organizational socialization literature has focused on the transition from outsider to
insider. A majority of organizational socialization literature, focused on the outcomes related to
the organization such as organizational commitment, job performance and other outcomes.

An important question is about the timing of organizational socialization. When does
organizational socialization show signs of beginning? According to Feldman (1970), the starting
point is at the time of first contact (e.g. the first interview session) during, an anticipatory stage,
whereas, some other authors, (Ashorft, Sluss, & Harrison, 2007) refer to a long-term socialization
of an individual entering the organization. These authors are mostly concerned with what happens
in the life of an individual from the beginning to the end including their social patterns in their
family (e.g. if they are raised in a family with lower or higher income level). Although Ashorft
and colleagues (2007) are only concerned with the specific organization or job an individual is trying to acquire (e.g. a doctor joining a specific medical facility).

While going through the organizational socialization literature and its boundaries it was found that the ending point for socialization is even trickier than the starting point. The estimates for duration of socialization range from weeks (Bauer & Green, 1994), to several months; 3 to 6 months for Feldman (1977), 12 – 18 months for Bauer, Morrison, & Callister (1998). In some cases, others reported the range as never ending because an individual is always in a learning process to contribute better to the organization (Harvey, Wheeler, Halbesleben, & Buckley, 2010). Though the above-mentioned estimates are an outcome of the studies, there is still more work to be done, on how to empirically measure the time of an organization socialization process. Some boundaries are worth declaring in organizational socialization. It is appropriate to link organizational socialization to the entry of an individual, in an organization. The socialization process can be extended to different types of transitions an individual goes through his / her tenure.

The success of organizational socialization is linked to the outcomes of organizational socialization. Although, Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) definition of socialization implies that knowledge and skill acquisition are the outcomes of interest, many other job outcomes are part of some influential models in socialization literature. Some of these models include satisfaction, commitment and intention to remain as outcomes of socialization (Bauer et al., 1998; Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000; Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007). This clearly suggests the organization’s interest in these outcomes but is beyond the scope of the typical definition of socialization (i.e. socialization for acquiring knowledge and skills). This argument also points out the evolutions in socialization literature through time.
1.2 Organizational Socialization Stages

Early work in organizational socialization literature was focused on organizations. Work from Feldman (e.g. 1976, 1981) exploring individual’s contributions during different stages of socialization (change acquisition, encounter and primarily anticipatory) paved the way of studying organizational socialization. It helped understand how organizations can utilize socialization to obtain the outcomes they wish to see in a newly hired employee.

Previous research on socialization showed a pattern of stages that newcomers go through to become members of an organization. Mainly, this work is focused around three stages of socialization by Ashforth et al., (2007) and Feldman (1981). The first stage corresponds to the “Anticipatory” stage where the newcomer is anticipating the coming future when he / she will be part of the organization. The anticipatory stage takes places before the organization is joined by the newcomer. It’s a stage where the newcomer learns about his or her job and develops expectations about the job. The next stage is the “Encounter” stage where the newcomer becomes part of the organization and it’s the first time the newcomer experiences the life of the organization. At this stage, the newcomer may experience changes in his or her behavior, attitude and starts to understand what his or her life will be in the new organization. During the encounter stage, the newcomer realizes what is required to be successful in the given conditions. It is this stage that he encounters a reality sock of what is going on around. This stage is important as it is the major core of all the stages. The present study about organizational socialization focuses on newcomers who are in the encounter stage of their socialization. The “Adjustment” stage is the next stage in which the newcomer has become an insider; it concerns growing and learning. In this stage, the employee adapts to the job role and the new organization. Last, the stage model is known as the “stabilization” stage where the newcomer is fully-blown as an insider. In the stabilizing stage, the
newcomer is fully integrated in the organization. The staged models explain how newcomers make the transition from one step to the next. These stage models present the challenge newcomers face in their transition from outside to insider. Ashforth et al., (2007) have been criticized for several reasons as they do not provide the exact way a newcomer moves from one stage to the other Bauer, Morrison & Callister (1998). Morrison (1993) concluded that in these staged models, newcomers are treated as passive participants and their proactive abilities are neglected. Still these staged models provide with the insights a newcomer goes through in his or her transition period along with the challenges faced by the newcomer in the new job. These stages however are helpful in determining which period of transition is important to study. The present research is mostly focusing on the encounter stage of newcomers where they are learning the ropes of their new job.

1.3 Organizational Socialization related Theories

Socialization literature can be divided in two perspectives. One perspective deal with the linkage of different theories around socialization, while the other perspective is about theories within socialization. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) established the foundations of socialization theory. Socialization has mostly been studied in its basic sense as a learning task (e.g. “learning the ropes”). For socialization studies, situations have always been new, complex, ambiguous and challenging which in fact invokes cognition without any surprise. For instance, a new job entry is full of challenges, complex situations, new environmental adaptations, uncertainty of culture and task (Chao, O’Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Kelin, & Gardner, 1994; Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). Ashford and Black (1996) looked at, what they called predictors of individuals (behavior adapted due to uncertain new environment) to help them get a sense of control (e.g. “seeking
feedback and information, building relationships”). Besides Ashford and Black, other research e.g. Morrison (1993) also used uncertainty in her estimation regarding the amount of information-seeking adopted, recommending uncertainty as containing an aversive nature. Further Morrison (1993) proposed that by reducing uncertainty for newcomers there is an increase in satisfaction, performance and reduction in their likelihood to leave the organization.

Another major import of theoretical transformation is the import of person-environment fit theory. Person-environment fit in its most basic sense is a comparison for fit or lack of fit concluding that it can result in many negative outcomes in presence of a misfit (Edwards, 1996; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). For the above reason both organizations and individuals are striving to bring about positive fit for newcomers and job seekers. The fit theory literature suggests that fit / misfit can happen due to variation in abilities of individuals and job demands, their expectations and actual rewards (e.g. pay, compensation, social, training), and even due to value difference (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Empirical testing by Cable & Parsons (2001) indicated a higher level of fit for individuals going through institutionalized socialization process. Positive school of thought suggests that being a misfit generates stress (Edwards, 1996) which might be helpful in motivating individuals to step forward to a better fit or might result in withdrawal from the situation. This leads to an increase in proactivity and / or change in role.

The last well-known theory exported from management literature for explaining socialization and its procedure is “social identity theory”. Social identity theory is where individuals are willing to develop their own “situated identity” (Ashforth, Sluss, Harrison, 2007, p.28) for their new job. Research by Ibarra and Barbulescu (2010) suggest a notion of identity work from the individual to build situational identity. This involves creating a whole narrative that makes sense to others. It is to make a link between the past and the future in such a way that it is harmonious and sense making
for changing environment (Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010). A transitionary period has many identity concerns which replaces identity work (Morgan, 2005). Morgan Robert sheds light on the downplay of individuals to gain attention and professional image by affiliating with specific groups (e.g. gender or racial groups) present in the organization. These recent claims of researchers such as Morgan (2005) deepen and enhance earlier work by Reicher (1987). This was the research which in the beginning triggered the attention of socialization researchers, reason being that during this transition stage the “old-timers” interact with the new coming. During this phase the older employees treat newcomers as “learners” whereas the latter treat the former as teachers and mentors. This role declaration also serves as their identity as either learners or mentors in the given environment.

Present day socialization has moved beyond the theoretical perspective of Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) propositions regarding socialization strategies. Afterwards, Nicholson (1984) developed a model for newcomer adjustment. He states this transition of newcomer’s results into two outcomes i.e. personal development and role development. Personal development is when the newcomer grooms himself to match and absorb new demands. Role development is where transitionary individuals try to make adjustment and redesign as per their preferences. The conclusions of Nicholson (1984) were later addressed by Ashforth, Sluss, & Harrison (2007) reminding that these outcomes are not an end but a new beginning. This theory opens up new insights in the literature and suggests high levels of developments that can be made in socialization literature. One major question regarded the notion adopted by individuals to change the organization setting rather than simply to fit in. This question was addressed both by Bell and Staw’s (1989) in their book “People and Sculptors vs Sculptors” and by Ashford and Taylor (1990) in their individual adaptation model after transitions. This work later laid out the foundation for a
new perfective in organizational fit literature to study individuals and their agendas. Newcomers and organizational entry became a division on the basis, of whether they try to fit in the present system or they prefer to mold the system to better suit them. This clearly derived the later work on job design and organizational entry in general (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001).

Theory itself and the situation in which an individual is behaving both are responsible for the happening of the transition of the newcomer. According to Ashford & Taylor (1990) the magnitude of change will also be one of the factors responsible for change to happen (e.g. Sudden vs gradual change, total number of factors involving the change process). Ibarra and Barbulescu (2010) added to Ashford and Taylor with their addition of the path adopted to bring in the transition i.e. a planned (institutionalized) transition versus a transition which is individual based.

Finally, Ashford et al. (2007) suggested two fundamental dimensions that can helpful in determining the transitional change happening. These two fundamental dimensions are intensity and its length for transition. Therefore, the insights provided by Ashford and Tailor (1990) along with Ibarra and Barbulescu (2010) is a head start to the new call by Harvey, Wheeler, Halbesleben, Buckley (2010) regarding a requirement for more theorizing in the field of socialization to determine the difference of transitions.

1.4 Organizational Socialization Tactics

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) described six tactics that can be helpful in socializing newcomers and moving long term employees taking new positions. These tactics were later analyzed by Jones (1986) and classified as individualized or institutionalized according to their effects on newcomers’ role orientation. Table 1.1 shows a description of all the tactics and their definitions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collective</strong></th>
<th><strong>Individual</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The degree to which individuals are socialized collectively, analogous to batch or mass production modes of production.”</td>
<td>“The degree to which individuals are socialized singly, analogous to unit modes of production.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Formal</strong></th>
<th><strong>Informal</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The degree to which the setting in which the socialization takes place is segregated from the ongoing work context and the degree to which an individual newcomer role is emphasized and made explicit.”</td>
<td>“The degree to which there is no sharp differentiation from other organizational members and much of the recruit’s learning takes place within the social and task related networks that surround his or her position.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sequential</strong></th>
<th><strong>Random</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The degree to which the transitional processes are marked by a series of discreet and identifiable stages through which an individual must pass in order to achieve a defined role and status within the organization.”</td>
<td>“The degree to which the socialization processes are accomplished in one transitional stage.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fixed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Variable</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The degree to which the recruit is provided with a precise knowledge of the time it will take him to complete a given step.”</td>
<td>“The degree to which the recruit is not provided with any advance notice of his transition timetable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serial</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disjunctive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The degree to which experienced members groom newcomers about to assume similar roles in the organization.”</td>
<td>“The degree to which a newcomer does not have predecessors available in whose footsteps he can follow.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Investiture</strong></th>
<th><strong>Divestiture</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The degree to which the socialization processes ratify and establish the viability and usefulness of the characteristics the person already possesses. The degree to which the socialization processes confirm the incoming identity of a newcomer.”</td>
<td>“The degree to which the socialization processes deny and strip away certain entering characteristics of a recruit. The degree to which the socialization processes dismantle the incoming identity of a newcomer.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. 1 Van Maanen and Schein’s theory of organizational socialization tactics (Source: Adapted from Baker III and Feldman 1991)**

This model was used by researchers extensively (Allen & Meyer, 1990b; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005; Ashforth, Sluss & Harrison 2007). Saks and Ashforth (1997b) considered this model as “one of the most theoretically developed models of socialization”. To shed further light to given knowledge of organizational socialization literature there are two meta-analysis, one by Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo & Tucker (2007) and the other by Saks, Uggerslev, & Fassina (2007). The findings of these studies showed very detailed outcomes which were different for all different variations of organizational socialization practice. Organizations will have different outcomes when socializing formally and collectively as compared to informally and individually; in a fixed way as opposed to random socialization practices with different
outcomes. Whereas Ashforth et al. (2007) and Saks et al. (2007) showed results where newcomers who were provided with no extra mentoring support to adapt to the new environment. On one hand, institutionalized tactics (formal, collective, serial, fixed, sequential and investiture) are concerned with helping newcomers to adjust and any other assistance required to better understand the new working environment. On the other hand, individualized tactics (informal, individual, variable, disjunctive, divestiture and random) leave the individual to its own. In the case of institutionalized socialization tactics, Ashforth et al. (2007) report its association with some positive outcomes such as job satisfaction and intention to stay. Whereas, individualized socialization tactics are associated to role innovation but also role stress and intention to quit (Allen & Meyer, 1990a; Baker, 1995).

The organization socialization tactics model tends to treat newcomers as responsive and even passive while they can be proactive and agentic (Jones, 1983; Ashforth & Saks, 1996). While the organization is processing through tactics to gain a specified integration goal, the individual can also plan and work with a positive approach, seeking information, creating a positive image, and developing a fit with the new job settings.

A complementary research trend in organizational socialization concerns the focus on what is the individual’s response during the socialization process. This set of research provoked individual’s interest in seeking information and feedback, building networks and relationships (Morrison, 1993; Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000).

Meanwhile the use of the organizational socialization tactics model in a myriad of situations (Ashforth et al., 2007; Kim et al., 2005; Saks et al., 2007). Some questions remain understudies.
Firstly, even though the vital role of organizational socialization tactics is clear (Gruman et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2005), a crucial question made by Jones (1986) regarding the effect that particular organizational strategies have on newcomers remains unanswered. In general, most researchers have explored the purpose of organizational socialization strategies in relation with socialization outcomes (e.g. Allen and Meyer, 1990; Gruman et al., 2006). In fact, research has indicated that various aspects of organizational socialization tactics are linked in many ways to the outcomes of socialization (Ashforth and Saks, 1996; Bauer et al., 2007; Cable and Parsons, 2001). Thus, in order to make clear the relationship between socialization outcomes and organization socialization tactics, this omission must be closely examined and addressed.

Secondly, Van Mannen and Schien’s study regarding organizational socialization tactics was based on a western context. Therefore, some view their studies as questionable when used in an eastern context. Even though the results of some studies such as those done by (e.g. Kim et al., 2005; Takeuchi, Wang, Marovina & Yao, 2009) may be applied in a non-western context, the numbers of studies are limited. As a result, in order to gain insight in to how organizational socialization strategies are administered in other cultural contexts, and to develop a stronger understanding for those who work in multinational corporations, it is necessary to study socialization tactics in relation to newcomer adjustment in a non-western setting.

Thirdly, present experiential studies such as those of (e.g. Allen et al., 2003; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002; Stinglhamber and Vandenberghhe, 2003) are clear in pointing out that organizational social support plays a significant role in impacting the employees’ outlook and conduct. Some researchers have suggested that organizations and employees can be a part of a social exchange relationship (Loi et al., 2009) which is broadly operated through the use of an explanatory mechanism known as OSS. OSS, abbreviated for organizational social support,
believes the fact that an organization along with its values and belief is working for the employee’s well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). OSS is a way by which employees can find satisfaction in boosting their confidence, emotional support, approval, and affiliation (Armeli, Eisenberger, Fasolo & Lynch, 1998). In the case of eager newcomers trying to adjust to their new working environment such satisfaction is crucial. Since OSS helps employees’ complete tasks with their provision of resources and instruction (Hochwarter, Witt, Treadway & Ferris, 2006), it can be assumed that OSS is crucial for the settlement of newcomers.

Fascinatingly, even though OSS plays a key role for the settlement of newcomers, the core of organizational socialization is primarily how the behavior and attitude of newcomers’ (for e.g “individual task mastery, role clarity, social integration and job satisfaction”) are affected by socialization tactics. Overall researchers have very little knowledge of the impact that their behavior and attitude have on the newcomers’ view of the organization as stated by Takeuchi et. al (2009), “…much less research had been conducted on demonstrating the importance of social exchange relationships in the process by which newcomers adjust to the organizations they join” (p. 9). Another researcher, Korte (2010), also suggested that in order to enhance the insight of organizational socialization, studies and research on psychological well-being need to be done. Thus, as a result of the significance of OSS regarding newcomer adjustment, it would be of value to use organizational socialization tactics and study its progress in newcomer’s OSS.

An important model developed on organizational socialization is by Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) typology of tactics on socialization (Ashforth & Saks, 1996). Van Maanen and Schein present socialization tactics as “the ways in which the experiences of individuals in transition from one role to another are structured for them by others in the organization” (p. 230). Further, Van Maanen and schein (1979) while talking about theory of organizational socialization identified a
total of six tactical dimensions and described their influence on newcomers depending on whether he/she chooses a supervisory content innovative approach, or a role-based innovation orientation. Jones (1986) in his research few years after came up with another approach saying that Van Maanen and Schein’s tactics of organizational socialization form a gestalt called institutionalized socialization i.e. collective, formal, fixed, sequential, investiture and serial tactics. While for Jones all the opposite ends of these tactics formed, another collection called individualized socialization containing informal, random, disjunctive, divestiture, individual and variable tactics of organizational socialization.

In brief, the small amount of studies concerning the influence of organizational socialization tactic done in non-western contexts, and the process through which organizational socialization tactics impact newcomers’ outcomes are two major limitations in the present-day literature addressing socialization tactics.

1.5 The Content of Organizational Socialization

As, in the previous discussions, the major question is not, if the newcomers or the organization are more active in adjustment to the changing environment but rather how both contribute to the socialization process. Many studies have tested how newcomers and the organization simultaneously contribute to betterment and facilitation. According to Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg (2003) a newcomer’s pre-entry and knowledge of the job along with his pro-active behavior when combined with the best matched socialization tactics required will result in task mastery and integrated working environment. Similarly, Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, Tucker (2007) concluded that newcomer information seeking and proactivity along with organizational
Socialization tactics contribute to better social acceptance and newcomer adjustment. Furthermore, Kim, Cable & Kim (2005) focuses on how institutionalized socialization tactics strengthen the fit between the organization and the newcomer. The above given studies and theories present a clear understanding of how newcomers and organizations are striving together to gain strength and adjustment. This also calls for future research to be with the similar focus of combined efforts from newcomers and organizations.

Socialization concerns the acquisition of the social knowledge and skills to undertake an organizational role, thus making it an important question i.e. “What do newcomers learn?” According to the vast span of literature, learning can be across the job or role span (Ashforth et al., 2007). According to Chao et al. (1994) newcomers in their job learn about if they know enough about the job, the different technical languages used at the job, the politics used at the organization and about the history and the people of the organization. However, it is not limited to the above-mentioned dimensions that the newcomer might be learning about in their given job Chao et al., (1994). Further research in organizational socialization also need to test whether the above-mentioned learning points are valid across different jobs or not. Furthermore, Chao (2012) is still in a process of studying the tacit knowledge meaning their personal learning points that they acquire during their early stages of organizational entry. For example, the author noted that learning and knowledge acquisition might happen regardless of any effort for it to happen. Tacit knowledge is known as an antecedent to creativity and innovation (Leonard & Sensiper, 1998; Osterloh & Frey, 2000), and this knowledge gained in the entry phase of a newcomers onboarding may be helpful in playing an important role in shaping their outcomes.

Chao et al. (1994) together developed a six-dimensioned measure for learning through socialization, it included (their performance, how proficient they are, people themselves, political
influences, role of language, organizational history along with values carried by the organization and organizational goals). Recently, Haueter, Macan & Winter (2003) came up with a scale which is claimed to reduce the short comings of the scale developed by Chao et al. (1994). The scale is known as Newcomer Socialization Questionnaire (NSQ) and it measures three dimensions of socialization for newcomers i.e. the organization itself, the group from which the newcomer belongs and the job of newcomer/ the assigned tasks). As described by Haueter et al. (2003), “each element consists of acquiring knowledge about the dimension and obtaining knowledge about appropriate role behaviors associated with the dimension” (p. 23). The major part of the research regarding proactivity and socialization treats learning to be one of the proximal outcomes of socialization. In previous research there has been a lot of relating different variables as part of socialization process including different socialization tactics, orientation training programs, mentorship and proactive behavior are all related to socialization learning in one way of the other. Some of them have also been used as mediators between socialization and adjustment processes (Allen, McManus, & Russell, 1999; Ashforth, Sluss, & Saks, 2007; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Klein & Weaver 2000). Ashforth, Sluss and Harrision (2007) proved this approach to socialization as more pervasive than any other research to socialization and outcomes.

1.6 Newcomers Learning During Organizational Socialization

As discussed in the previous section, among all the stage models the encounter stage is the major stage where most of the learning is to take place. It is during this stage that the newcomer is trying to overcome all the uncertain situations of his / her new job. The newcomer is seeking to resolve all issues and encounter all difficulties faced in his new role (Morrison, 1995). To have some
facilitation at this stage of organizational socialization the newcomer tries to take help from different sources including social / interpersonal and nonsocial (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). Interpersonal and social sources include coworkers, subordinates, mentors and supervisors while nonsocial sources include different official documents, files and sometimes even observations about what is going on (Morrison, 1993). One important way of learning about the new job and role is by engaging in proactive behaviors (Ashford, 1986; Morrison, 1993). Proactivity includes information seeking and testing the limits in the new job. Proactive behaviors even include trying to get feedback about performance from time to time (Ashford & Cummings, 1983). Newcomers might also engage in humorous forms of information seeking known as “disguising conversations” by Miller & Jablin (1991). For example, the newcomers might disguise their intended questions in a humorous manor or they try to ask indirect questions where they think it’s too embarrassing to ask about a specific thing or process. These acts are micro moves made by the newcomer during their transition phase as hypothesized by Ibarra and Barbulescu (2010). Such reasons of entering into indirect modes of enquiry and monitoring may be due to the social costs involved. According to Ashforth & Cummings (1983) such newcomers feel that their information and feedback seeking might be considered as bothersome by the management.

Furthermore, newcomers also learn by building networks with the organizational members (Morrison 2002). Newcomers may vary in the type of relationship depending on what type of information they are looking for. For instance, if they are looking for some task related information, they are move likely to depend on some peers but most of the time they try to make use of their network from their supervisors which are most helpful (Morrison, 2002). According to Fang, Duffy, and Shaw (2011) newcomers make a good use of their social networking within
the organization to get help and learning pattern to work. Indeed, the relationship newcomers have with their supervisors is of great importance in their learning but is still relatively understudied.

1.7 Respective roles of newcomers and organizations in the learning process

Organizational socialization has been regarded primarily as a process of learning in which the individual is involved to acquire information and gain knowledge. Early examination of organizational socialization presents it as a basic learning process in organizations (Fisher, 1986) and the recent literature describe organizational socialization as “the core of socialization” literature (Ashforth, Sluss, & Harrison, 2007). Thus, as a matter of fact, socialization has not much changed at all over last twenty-five years. As per stage models of socialization suggest, when newcomers enter an organization, they may perceive a discrepancy in their expectation with respect to reality and hence they experience a reality shock (Ashforth, Sluss, & Harrison, 2007). The deleterious effects of reality shock (stress, intention to leave) can be reduced by realistic job previews during the recruitment process.

For Louis (1980), unmet expectations are part of onboarding and organizational entry is a sense making process where newcomers make the sense of different sorts of surprises they experience (change). So, the sense-making model focuses on the mental processes generated by newcomers which can help them in dealing with surprises and unseen difficulties. Sense-making is a coping mechanism in which newcomers infer and impute meanings with the help of their interaction with mentors (insiders) and their own cognitive abilities which will only make sense if their way is eased through the socialization process. As mentioned by Louis, this process requires information for “making a chance in mental maps and internal mechanics of newcomer in order to reduce the
surprising effect of early job involvements” so that newcomers come up with most accurate mental
models to make coherence with the organizational setting (p. 244). Hence, the entire process of
sense making includes information given to and attained by newcomers (Ashforth, Sluss, &
Harrison, 2007). Based on such views, “socialization practices should be developed that help
provide newcomers with insiders’ situation-specific interpretations and setting-specific
interpretive schemes” (Louis, 1980, p. 248).

Socialization also follows another frame of reference where it is conceived as a method of
uncertainty reduction. Uncertainty theory states that, “newcomers desire to increase the
predictability of interactions between themselves and others within the new organization” (Bauer
et al., 2007, p. 708). Uncertainty reduction theory has been considered as the basis of newcomer
information seeking behaviors along with other organizational socialization tactics by Bauer et al.
adjustment and organizational socialization tactics using uncertainty reduction theory, saying “the
theoretical and conceptual underpinning of socialization tactics is that they provide newcomers
with information that can reduce their uncertainty surrounding the entry process” (p. 418). Further,
Miller & Jabline (1991) explored that uncertainty reduction theory can also be proved as a base
for investigating newcomer information seeking and proactivity.

Organizational socialization tactics can also help newcomers shape the information they receive
as guidance and guidelines (Jones, 1986). Institutionalized socialization, a formalized and
structured approach or socialization process, reduces the elements of uncertainty in early working
stages of newcomers. As a result, the early coping process for the newcomer is channelized and
provides with a proper sequence by which the newcomers can pave their way through the early
and difficult stages of their onboarding. Individualized socialization process suggests the opposite,
giving a sense of more unstructured formation of socialization at work, as newcomers are pushed to move their default socialization patterns. Individualized socialization requires individual socialization efforts from the newcomers in order to get to know their new environment. As theory and concept suggest, the basic motive behind institutionalized socialization tactics is that they are a tool used to facilitate newcomers with information that can help them reduce uncertainty and help them get through different hurdles in entry process (Jones, 1986). Indeed, previously researched arguments show that, “the prime reason firms make use of institutionalized socialization tactics is the reason to remove the so-called uncertain and ambiguous notion of a new environment by providing information and material that can guide employees’ behavior in the right direction” (Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005, p.235).

In the last twenty years, the most active side of socialization research has been on how to make the newcomers actively involved in their own socialization process through proactive behaviors to obtain information. Proactive newcomers are those newcomers who will indulge themselves actively in gaining information in the first place and later make use of that information to strengthen their situation. While going though proactivity literature it was seen that major part of this research is dedicated to how newcomers can make their way to gain information (Morrison, 1993a, 1993b) along with the information seeking patters of newcomers to reduce uncertainty (Miller & Jablin, 1991). Morrison (1993a, 1993b) was of the view that newcomers make more use of monitoring than inquiring, his research claims that newcomers use different methods of information seeking for diverse types of information and this information seeking results for many several types of proximal and distal socialization outcomes. As we go further into exploring the link between proactivity and socialization it was observed that newcomers have more proactivity were showing better socialization and information seeking behaviors than others.
As per the description of Ashforth, Sluss, and Harrison (2007), “research on newcomer proactivity explores how newcomers actively seek information about their working environment and their role and performance within it as a means of reducing uncertainty” (p. 22). Research on newcomer proactive behaviors has proved that two things affect proactivity for newcomers i.e. individual differences and other contextual variables, and Asforth, Sluss, & Harrison, (2007) also proved that proactivity results into proximal and distal socialization outcomes.

By description newcomers are categorized as a bunch of outsiders who are going to be part of a process generated by newcomers of the organization which will eventually turn them into insiders (Lave, Wenger & Wenger, 1991; Van Maanen and Schein, 1979). This process requires a lot of things to be taken under consideration as it is a complete set of gradual improvements which will result into making an outsider be become part of the organization. The process of organizational socialization which is normally generated for a complete group of people requires to be take into consideration every individual newcomer as a separate entity as every individual has its own proactive behavior or pattern of functioning and adopting to the environment. If we look at their psychological patterns every person has a separate pattern of functioning (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007).

During the socialization process newcomers are going through learning about different things that includes configuration about the social structure of the organization, including their role and position’s evolution with respect to other positions around (Ashforth et al., 2007; Chao et al., 1994; Van Maanen and Schein, 1979). Different people can provide different sets of information to newcomers with respect to their position in around the newcomer and its position. As such, the immigrate supervisor can be helpful and supportive to discuss matters needing special attention.
1.8 Organizational Social Support and socialization agents

Member of the organization, or a socialization agent is person who plays an extremely important role in socialization of the newcomers (Bauer, Morrison, & Callister, 1998). Socialization agents are individuals who facilitate the newcomer through his initial adjustment stage. Socialization agents provide information, feedback, support and help (Klein & Heuser, 2008). According to a research done in 1987 by Reichers, “co-workers, supervisors, subordinates, clients and/or customers act as agents of socialization through which newcomers learn their appropriate work roles, engage in sense making activities, and establish situational identity” (p.285).

As a matter of fact, there are organizational members who are formally designated on such positions where their role is to facilitate the socialization process for newcomers (e.g. mentor), but the role of socialization agent is an informal and voluntary one. As mentioned by Feldman during his research in 1989, “A great deal of what new recruits learn is learned through informal interactions with peers, supervisors, and mentors outside the context of formal training” and such casual exchanges “play an important role in filling the gaps left by formal socialization programs” (p.386). Reichers (1987) further mentioned that newcomer becomes insider due to frequent interaction with the insiders. It was described as the primary mechanism through which socialization will occur. Later, Korte (2010) found a positive relationship between developing relationship with managers and coworkers and successful learning and socialization.

Thus, while there are formal socialization mechanics it can be concluded from various previous researches that informal mechanism also operates in flexible and channelized manner. Evidence has also suggested that such social interactions and social support elements are known as more important than the formal practices. Nelson and Quick (1991) also found it conclusive that the
helpful behavior shown by peers and supervisors was more important for newcomers than formal training and orientational programs. Newcomers are good at seeking information from insiders.

Bauer et al., (1998) also proved that social support if provided is a great help to newcomers. The value of newcomer social support has long been a critical factor to organizational socialization (Fisher, 1985; Kartz, 1983). In a study by Jokisaari and Nurmi (2009) they found that supervisory social support is vital in the first two years of employment. In their study newcomers reported a decrease in supporting behavior from supervisor from six to twenty-one months following their entry in the organization. Their study results highlighted that continuous supervisor support beyond six months of organizational entry can bring much more positive results including performance and satisfaction.

Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg (2003) studied the influences shown by organization, supervisor and peers on socialization outcomes of both distal and proximal nature. Their results showed that social support and influence of supervisor has brought about less chances of turnover and better coping and sustained behavior from newcomers.

Hence, the present study incorporated organizational social support as the second independent variable in studying the process of newcomer adjustment along with organizational socialization tactics.

### 1.9 Factors helping Socialization and Social Adjustment

Organizations are on the verge of trying to use the best appropriate tactics and newcomers are busy behaving in a proactive way trying to find their way through. While both stake holders are in
pursuit to their best practices’ researchers have noted that most of the socialization occurs when the organization interacts with the newcomer (Reichers, 1987), for example, by asking questions, trying to seek information and feedback, availing interactive opportunities. These opportunities are what makes the newcomer more at ease and help them identify their role in the organization. Whenever a newcomer is trying to indulge in the given environment he is supposed to think in a local and organizational specific context (e.g. Will my boss be happy with my work? How will I interact with the group mates? Will they be happily involving me in their group? Is my place in the office any disturbance to my colleagues?).

Given the fact that most of socialization is due to the result of interpersonal and group interactions there is still a lot to learn in this field. Firstly, most of the literature is more about the organizational tactics neglecting other sources of social interactions such as social support coming from supervisors and colleagues. Socialization literature draws a very narrow line while talking mostly about the proactive behavior of the individual and neglecting the efforts of other variables such as their own psychological patterns. This is without any doubt that supervisors and leaders are the back bone of any organization and play a vital role in the social interaction taking place within the organization. This research attempts to include social support along with organizational socialization tactics to facilitate the wide range of prospective socialization agents (Moreland & Levine, 1982, Liu, Wang, Bamberger, Shi & Bacharach, 2015). As Ashforth et al. (2007) pointed out that the organizational values and norms are brought to life by the actions performed by the supervisors and coworkers. So, their support is what matters a lot along with the presence of socialization tactics. The organization may proclaim that it values its employees and their career development, but it will be always the supervisors and their social support that will be considered in this context. Research by Chen & Klimoski (2003) claims that the newcomers’ outcomes are
influenced by their supervisory support and the support provided by their teammate. When the organizational members are of the view that there is a higher level of expectation from the newcomer, they increase their positive social interaction accordingly resulting in a better outcome and better adjustment for the newcomer. Local context has always been important in shaping the outcomes expected from the socialization process. According to Chen (2005) the effect of social teams prior to the newcomer’s entry is also something that effects the outcomes as they try to attract newcomers with the similar attributes. The local context is helpful in adding to the existing socialization literature opening new insights for organizational socialization and relevant outcomes.

1.10 Organizational Socialization and Outcomes

Success in socialization is when the newcomer is fully socialized. A successful transformation of the newcomer is governed by both distal and proximal outcomes. Being successfully socialized means higher job performance and even higher and positive job attitude (e.g. Job performance, job satisfaction, affective commitment, intention to remain on job) and minimum turnover (Bauer et al., 2007). At one instance these outcomes do capture the adjustment of the newcomer but still they do not indicate the amount of success in socialization (Saks & Ashforth, 1997; Bauer et al., 2007). While considering socialization as a process of learning and reducing uncertainty, there are other outcomes that also show relevance (Bauer et al., 2007). These is considerable research showing proximal outcomes such as task mastery, role clarity and in-role performance as more direct indicators of newcomer adjustment, as they are helpful in reflecting, “the acquisition of requisite knowledge and skill for the organizational role as well as the development of social relationships
that will help to bind the newcomer to the organization and its goals” (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003, p.781). In the present times, scholars are concerned about such proximal outcomes that show direct relationship to the antecedents of socialization, such as proactivity and organizational tactics. These proximal outcomes sometimes result in a more distal outcome depending on the addition of several moderating or mediating variables. For instance, if a newcomer has finally achieved role clarity but the job is still awful enough to achieve job satisfaction; performance will still be suffering if the newcomer gets his/her way through the new group and finds out some unethical norms being practiced in the group. Such phenomena suggest the complexity of organizational socialization from newcomers’ point of view and indicate that elements of moderation and mediation might intervene in the relationships between organizational socialization tactics and organizational support, on the one side, and organizational proximal and distal outcomes on the other side.

In addition, at present, organizations are not just concerned about gaining the required skills and knowledge by the newcomer. Organizations are also concerned with employee commitment and desire to contribute to the organization for a long time. Lewicki (1981) proposed that organizational socialization was a process of seduction where organizations made attempts to ease organizational entry with significant employee benefits so that newcomers could perceive that their goals were aligned with the goals of the organization (Podolny, Khurana, & Hill-Popper, 2005). People are believed to be socialized when they are passionate about the organization and its norms and when they think their career is aligned with the goals of the organization. This notion of broadening the socialization perspective gives rise to the increasing trends of studying socialization with outcomes other than just acquiring the required set of skills. This will in turn bring about change in the whole definition of socialization making it a sense of belonging between
the newcomer and the organization. The perspective we are here to develop will add to the literature by moving to untraditional moderators and mediators. The traditional intervening variables mostly talk about how organizations can teach and how newcomers and individuals can acquire knowledge. The new perspective is about how organizations can bring into account elements of seduction and engagement with active involvement in organizational missions. We are trying to consider elements of intrinsic (motivation) more than extrinsic motivating, as organizational socialization is about winning hearts than just minds. And the process of socialization has a lot of variations depending on which outcome is to be considered and which intervening variable is to be taken into consideration (Ashforth et al., 2007). The time taken by a newcomer to realize that his/her colleagues are not trustworthy can vary from one newcomer to another. It can also vary for one newcomer to another, to learn the norms of the organization and even more to learn the values of the organization. The variation in time to socialize is due to the specific outcome taken into consideration. Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg’s (2003) set the first steps in sorting out the issues related to outcomes.

1.11 Methodological Concerns in the study of Organization Socialization

The definition of organizational socialization as per (Van Maanen and Schein 1979, p. 211) is “a process by which newcomers being individuals acquire social knowledge and necessary skills to undertake an organizational role.” The importance of organizational socialization is the fact that it is the first and most important process through which a newcomer should pass through as he or she enters an entirely new entity. Thus, having said what the process does, it is of prime importance
that its quality should also be considered. Its quality cannot be compromised since it might have a long-lasting effect on his or her future performance for a long time through their career succession.

Historically, research on organizational socialization can be classified into two different perspectives. The more dominant element of socialization lies within the domain of first perspective which is about the work-related contextual elements including organizational strategies and organizational norms. Generally, when analyzing these norms researchers noticed that the current organizational setting seems to overwhelm individuals (e.g. Van Maanen and Schein, 1979; Wanous 1980, 1992). Some researchers claim that when newcomers encounter a new working environment, they are proactive in adjusting and assimilating into their new workplace (Crant, 2000; Morrison, 1993a, 1993b).

During this time period, researchers have been focusing on better understanding organizational socialization with the assimilation of the newcomer’s proactive behaviors and an organizational-based layout (e.g. Cooper-Thomas and Anderson, 2002; Gruman, Saks & Zweig, 2006). While following the same approach, it is also advised that newcomers should interact with others in order to gain insight of events and avoid going to the extreme concerning the effects of situations or individuals. To further understand such factors and behaviors, Bauer et al. (2007) discusses two common precursors of literature that will influence the newcomer’s adjustment; organizational socialization strategies and newcomer information seeking). In other words, organizational socialization strategies are the tactics that are used to transition an outsider to an insider (Van Maanen and Schein, 1979). Newcomer information seeking is where newcomers acquire the appropriate resources and information to adjust in their new environment (Morrison, 1993a, 1993b), also take into consideration how organizational social support can be another different option to act upon.
Scholars such as Ashfort et al. (2007) demonstrate the significance of organization socialization strategies and social support through the suggestion that “the process of socialization has often been operationalized as either socialization tactics or newcomer proactive behavior” (p. 448). A group of scholars, Fu, Evan, Wang & Lee (2008), suggested that in order to completely comprehend the influencing factors on the outcomes of socialization the two precedents of socialization literature will have to be thoroughly studied. Therefore, it is sensible to conclude that newcomer proactive behaviors, and socialization strategies are significant factors in present time research of newcomer adjustment.

Similar to other topics in management and organizational behavior there are many empirical studies that can be found in socialization driven by convenience. It has been always an easy access for researchers to consider MBA students graduating and entering in the organizations for the first time. In many situations the sample is high as it is even more convenient to get hold of undergrad students for the sample purpose. Moreover, there is empirical research about a sample of newcomers who are holding the jobs for the first time as opposed to those who have prior experience. In both situations the sample shows very different results. These sampling techniques are relevant as graduate students are going for their first jobs while others have prior experience (Ashforth, et al., 2007). Socialization research has talked less about more transitioning phases than just the organizational entry stages. The focus needs to be on a more detailed approach of studying every situation a newcomer face.

Socialization has mostly been studied by a typical technique of survey method and in some situations, there are intervals with time laps (longitudinal studies). There are studies that have mostly used a three-month interval for gathering data on organizational entry. The most frequently used intervals in organizational socialization literature are at entry, three-months interval and six-
monthly following survey (Bauer et al., 2007). There is comprehensive literature about multiple
data collections over time which is a good technique to record the change in behavior of the
newcomer through the entry or encounter stage (Chen, 2005; Boswell, Shipp, Payne & Culbertson,
2009). Studies which use mixed method (qualitative and quantitative) of enquiry are rare in
socialization literature, but it will be helpful in strengthening the socialization literature.
This chapter introduces the mediators and moderators for the present study. Moderating and Mediating effects with socialization have been mentioned in several research (recent e.g. Parrot, Bauer, Abonneau, Campoy, Erdogan & Liden, 2014; Lapointe, Vandenbergh & Boudrias, 2014; Song, Chon, Ding & Gu, 2015; Awan & Fatima, 2018; Oh, 2018). This chapter introduces psychological needs satisfaction as a mediator variable, along with psychological capital and newcomer proactivity as potential moderators.

2.1 Self-Determination Theory (Psychological Needs Satisfaction)

Self-determination theory has become one of the major theories of human motivation in the last 40 years. It was mainly developed by Edward L. Deci and Richard M. Ryan and later improved by other researchers. The major reason of this theory to develop was because the motivating power of doing something for one’s own sake. It started with scholars of intrinsic motivation during their research on monkeys (Berlyne, 1950, 1955; Dashiell, 1925; Harlow, 1950; Montogomery, 1952; Nissen,1930; Premack, 1959; Welker, 1956). Hull (1943) came up with the drive theory which
was prominent at that time, so researchers often considered their intrinsic behavior as energized by an exploratory drive.

White (1959), quoted by Mulder (2014), came up with a compelling argument in his article going totally against the drive approach suggesting the concept of “competence satisfying behavior”. Other theories came up with other ideas about exploratory behaviors; for example, Hebb (1955), quoted by Gagne & Deci (2014), considered them as associated with central nervous system. But still, White’s approach was gradually taking hold and De Charms (1968) with some addition later resulted that intrinsically motivating behavior is about personal feeling of accomplishment. Deci (1971) came up with his first theory of intrinsic motivation with an introduction of the need of competence. This shows an association of what we are trying to accomplish in the present research by combining organizational socialization with intrinsic motivation.

2.1.2 SDT and Related Theories

Perhaps the best-known theory of need in all times is Maslow’s need hierarchy theory (1943, 1970), which has been deeply studied both in terms of need-strengthening and need-satisfaction. Maslow came up with five basic needs including the psychological and physiological needs along with deficit and growth needs. Later, the five categories were further organized in hierarchical formation. Maslow debated that the lowest order of needs (e.g. oxygen, food and sex) are most powerful, physiological motivators when they have not been fulfilled. When they have been satisfied, however, the individual moves to a next higher level, at which needs such as safety and security become essential. So, on and so far, the levels keep promoting making its way through the affiliative needs to the need for esteem and finally to the need for self-actualization, which is
the top limit of the hierarchy. A less well-known theory will less levels of hierarchy (i.e. three levels) was presented by Alderfer (1972).

Accordingly, research has differentiated the different levels of needs into higher and lower order needs. Research by McGregor (1960) stated that when the lower level of needs is well satisfied the highest motivators are the higher-level of needs. According to their research it was the case amongst residents of United States, Canada, and Western Europeans. They also proposed the concept of theory Y approach to management. This theory Y explained that as most of the people in their sample societies are well satisfied with their lower level of needs so it’s the higher level of needs that focus on in their workplace. McGregor suggested that, employees when become part of a working environment tend to focus on achievement, accomplishment and mastering of their environment, so organizations should be highly focusing on their intrinsic motivation being a higher-level need.

In line with the above thinking and research Hackman and colleagues (1970s) worked on the same concept of reducing the five levels of motivation into two categories – the lower-order and the higher-order needs – with higher order inclusive of esteem, actualization and accomplishment (e.g. Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Accordingly, they were of the view that there are individual differences with respect to higher and lower order of needs, there are people who consider higher-level needs as stronger, whereas others consider lower-order needs as their strength. Their research resulted in interesting outcomes for the working environment suggesting that people stronger in higher order needs perform better and feel satisfied in jobs which are more enriched, independent and creative. While others making lower order needs as their strength are less motivated by enriched jobs.
2.1.3 Psychological Needs Satisfaction as an important Motivational Theory

The conceptual basis of SDT differs from Maslow’s in three significant ways. First, given the fact that both theories suggest that there are universal psychological and physiological needs, still SDT does not believe in all hierarchical basic needs. Instead, SDT suggests that needs for security and safety are alternatives and actually resultant of unsatisfaction of basic needs (Deci & Ryan, 2000). For example, when individuals are in continuous accomplishment of their needs for competence, relatedness and autonomy, they think less and try to build their esteem (Brown & Ryan, 2003). In other words, the search of self-esteem becomes important element when people start experiencing non-satisfaction of the basic psychological needs (Deci & Ryan, 1995). Self-esteem is more a level that becomes accomplished as soon as some individual passes through the basic needs with satisfaction. While the same self-esteem becomes a need when there are insecurities mounting need satisfaction, making self-esteem as a strong motive and desire (Deci & Ryan, 1995).

Second, SDT shows no sign of hierarchical fashion of differentiation in terms of needs, however it still maintains that psychological needs are necessary and operative across the whole life span. As such, accordingly it is not necessary that lower-order needs be fulfilled before the higher-order needs. Indeed, people have the tendency to pursue a different protocol and go for higher-order needs, when they neglect the un-satisfied nature of lower-order needs. But there is evidence proving that higher order needs related to autonomy, competence and relatedness are growth-oriented and others relating to lower-order needs are more functional (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Functional needs are in action since the birth of an individual. For example, the need for relatedness starts with the basic attachment of a child with their caregivers, moving their body and making use of their body parts mastering their environment, yielding experiences of competence and autonomy. Later, same patterns are experienced in their schooling, sports, other activities and
finally at workplace. In short, the basic psychological needs are operational throughout the lifespan along with different domains of activities.

Third, important distinction is that SDT has its prime focus on psychological needs and their satisfaction, rather than their strength for predicting outcomes. Thus, in case of organizational socialization where the target population is newcomers in their encounter stage, we will not use the strength of high-order needs as our central focus. The focus will be on the degree to which these needs were satisfied on the job, to predict higher performance on job, affective commitment, and other important employee outcomes. This does not mean that we are by any means in argument about the difference of strength to psychological needs for different newcomers. Rather, the point is that need satisfaction versus un satisfaction is important in achievement of outcomes. Furthermore, focus on satisfaction of psychological needs gives information to the organization about how to structure organizational functions for better satisfaction and intern greater well-being and performance. Finally, it should be noted that the differences of need strength can be a resultant of prior experience which in the case of newcomers is very less likely to happen. For example, Baumeister and Leary (1995) and Leary, Kelly, Cottrell, & Schreindorfer, (2007) used the concept of belonging and found differences of need strengths for belonging (essentially the same as relatedness).

2.1.4 Psychological Needs Satisfaction as Intrinsic Motivation

Deci was curious to know what happened to people when they were rewarded (financially) to do something they were willing to in the first place (Deci & Ryan, 1995). Will there be an increase in the rewards of the newcomers once they are given extra motivation? do they have more joy in
doing such things like following their hobby, sport or favorite game? Deci led an experimental study by rewarding a group of students for doing a SOMA puzzles while another group did the same activity without any reward. The research concluded that the motivation dropped after being rewarded (Deci, 1971) in relation to those who were in no way rewarded. In other words, it was concluded that their focus was moved from the intrinsic motivation to the reward and financial benefit. Using de Charms’s (1968) locus of causality between the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, Deci concluded that reward brought a shift from having the feel of enjoyment to making it more like work (Lepper & Greene, 1975). Based on the above anomalies and conclusion, it was later suggested in many research that there are some underlined factors that can bring about change in the intrinsic motivation. The decrease in intrinsic motivation is due to the fact that rewards reduce the autonomous feeling an individual has when he or she is: monitored, imposed special conditions, given deadlines (Deci 1972; Leeper & Greene, 1975; Amabile, DeJong, & Leeper, 1976; Deci, Betley, Kahle, Abrams, & Porac, 1981; Enzle & Anderson, 1993). It contrasts with the motivation people feel when they are intrinsically driven through autonomy and choice. (Zuckerman, Porac, Lathin, & Deci, 1978). This brought about the formation of cognitive evaluation theory.

Furthermore, research kept on adding to the literature by increasing more and more values to the intrinsically motivating behavior of individuals. If we try to see the autonomous nature of an individual when he or she has just joined the company, we feel that he or she has his or her own motivation to make a fit within the organization (Edwards, 1996; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). When the appropriate organizational socialization tactic is supporting for being autonomous it provides with a motivation which needs no extra rewards.
Later, Vallerand & Reid (1984) along with White (1959) added to the intrinsic motivation literature by concluding their research about intrinsic motivation saying that when the individual is of the view that he is mastering his work, it yields an extra feeling of competence and achievement. They concluded that competence is a very important element of intrinsic motivation but is not enough to be motivated. In other words, competence is necessary for all kinds of motivation, whether it is intrinsic or extrinsic motivation; otherwise, one would be having the feeling of helplessness and amotivation. Recent research has proved that people (whether newcomers or fully socialized employees) need to feel both competent and autonomous in their work to experience intrinsic motivation (Dysvik, Kuvaas, & Gagne, 2013). Although, recent refinement in research has made it clearer that there will be a difference in results when the rewards are controlled and when there is a confirmation of competence (Ryan, Mims, & Koestner, 1983), and such research has been leading to complex debates amongst motivational researchers. Still, a very important meta analytical finding provide strong support for the theory of cognitive evaluation (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999).

Ryan, Koestner, and Deci (1991) reported that their instances when people behave intrinsically but infect it is their ego-driven behavior. Being egoistic is an internally motivated feeling where the individual wants to take hold of the situation all by himself. Such topics of interest came into discussion because intrinsic motivation was often derived from the lens of free-choice (Plant & Ryan, 1985). It resulted in the feeling of intrinsic motivation as a more pressurized and tensed feeling. When people are intrinsically motivated, they have a positive sensation towards the work they are performing, but when they convert the same activity into an eco-centered activity it changes everything resulting into something totally negative. Such feelings have lead researchers into taking steps other than free-choice, while studying intrinsic motivation (such as, personal
interest, enjoyment or positive effect). Moreover, Plant & Ryan (1985) proposed that these research results may suggest the existence of more than two types of motivation (i.e. intrinsic and extrinsic motivation). Accordingly, they suggested an eco-provoking type of motivation as well. Even though eco-centered motivational theory seems to be an internally motivated regardless of any reward or punishment still it is not the same as intrinsic motivation. This has led to perfecting cognitive evaluation theory along with a theory of organismic integration, and both are united under the umbrella of Self-determination theory (SDT). Organismic theory is there organizational socialization and newcomer plays an integrative role in (SDT). According to organismic theory its all about internalization i.e. taking the values, beliefs, behaviors and making them one’s own (Ryan, 1995).

2.1.5 Psychological Needs Satisfaction and Newcomers

Being social animals, humans involve themselves in activities which they perform unknowingly with a personal urge and enjoyment but infect are for their own good. Such behaviors performed by individuals are also for the collective good. In the field of developmental psychology, humans enter into a process that helps them learn the norms and behaviors necessary to exist in any given place, this is known as internalization. From the above definition of internalization psychological needs satisfaction having an organismic nature that changes the concept of socialization. According to this concept, socialization is not something that can be done to people and newcomers infect it is a notion taken into consideration by the natural tendency of humans if the environment is supportive and nourishing (Deci, 1995). Without the element of support that needs to provide nourishment to the concept of internalization it might be less effective. As Deci (1995, p.98) put
“if you put an avocado pit in a pot of earth it will probably grow into a tree, because it is in the nature of avocado to do that … (but for that to occur) they need sun; they need water, they need the right temperature. Those elements do not make trees grow, but they are the nutriments that the developing avocados need, that are necessary in order for the avocados to do what they do naturally.” In the same way the human beings have a natural ability to translate the values and behaviors they absorb from the environment into their own patterns of internal functioning but only if they have the supporting nutriments for doing so.

There are two ways in which a newcomer can fall into the effect of internalization. If the context in which the individuals are operating is pressuring and controlled, they will use it to create value then used to measure their own worth (Marylene Gagne and Edward L. Deci, 2014), something discussed before as ego-centered motivation. While, if the context of the nourishment is something that makes them feel autonomous and agentic they are likely to adapt such values for their personal self-regulatory system. To explain this, it can be noted that extrinsic motivation can be a solution when there is a missing link of intrinsic motivation and there is nothing interesting and enjoyable to work on. So, it can be concluded that there is a variation in the degree of autonomy with respect to the given situation. Ryan and Connell (1989) explained the same notion with a rather simple example of a childhood experience. In their example they discussed that schoolchildren at times are not motivated intrinsically to do their homework but still are asked to do it anyways. The same goes for the newcomer who might not be so much motivated in the beginning but has to do as the new job dictates. In addition to the basic findings of reasons associated to doing homework due to the pure intrinsic motivation or due to extrinsic motivation to get rewarded or even avoid punishments, they also found two other reasons. One reason was the presence of introjection motivation (i.e., a fractional internalization that involves some ego-centered reasons and some
reasons to avoid shame) and other was identification (i.e., a fully internalized reason where the homework was done out of personal goals or for respecting personal values). In order to empirically test the above two regulatory styles of taking an action Ryan and Connell constructed a scale that asked people to provide reasons of doing a certain activity, doing so the choice of their regulatory style was determined.

This measure led to the development of similar measures in many applied areas of psychology, including education (e.g. Vallerand, Pelletier, Blais, Briere, Senecal & Vallieres, 1992; Williams & Deci, 1996), sports and gymnastics (Mullan, Markland, & Ingledew, 1997; Gagne, Ryan, & Bargmann, 2003; Pelletier, Vallerand, & Sarrazin, 2007), prosocial behavior (Ryan, & Connell, 1989), religion (Ryan, Rigby, & King, 1993), relationships, personal goals (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998), and work (Gagne, Forest, Vansteenkiste, Crevier-Braud, Van den Broeck et al., 2014), with some refinement over time. This extensive empirical research has led to an increasing understanding on the antecedents and consequences of different forms of motivational regulations.

More recently, a meta-analysis studied 184 different data sets (Ng, Ntoumanis, Thorgersen-Ntoumani, Deci, Ryan, Duda & Williams, 2012). These recent studies proved a considerable difference in the regulatory style, declaring autonomous motivation (intrinsic motivation and identified regulation) as more positive and effective than controlled types of motivation (external and introjected regulation) Deci & Ryan 2000, 2008). In terms of their antecedents, the question that prompted was regarding the promotion of internalization and intrinsic motivation. As per cognitive theory people when having the feel of competence and autonomy feel more intrinsically motivated. So, researchers like Deci, Eghrari, Patrick, & Leone (1994) examined if the same factors would also prompt internalization, and indeed they proved it positive. However, according to them there was another feeling that was also found to be an important facilitator of
internalization, along with the two mentioned before (i.e. autonomy and competence). Baard, Deci, & Ryan (2004) described that feeling to be related was that feeling that brought about internalization. This inclusion of a third feeling made it vibrant that there are three basic psychological needs required for any individual to perform in an internalized manner with an autonomous nature of motivation (e.g. Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

2.1.6 Competence, Relatedness and Autonomy as Psychological Needs

Various theories have come to light discussing the importance of competence and relatedness for human behavior and wellness. But the question is whether or not they have referred them to as universal needs. However, amongst all of them SDT is the only theory emphasizing the importance of the autonomous nature for well-being of individuals, and indeed this concept of autonomy has been controversial in nature since the beginning. Deci and Ryan (1985, 2000) have also had a clear stance in terms of autonomy and its explanation. According to them autonomy is not the same as independence, individualism, defiance and even detachment behavior. Deci and Ryan (1985, 2000) always took autonomy as endorsement of one’s behavior. But still there was a lot of controversies in previous research regarding the autonomous nature of choices at times (Lyengar & DeVeo, 2003) or at times mismatching autonomy of choices and Volition with the independence (Markus & Kitayama, 2003). Their main reservation and arguments backed with the cultural association of autonomy. According to them autonomy is more of a concept of North American and Western European cultures where independence and individualism is valued. For them autonomy of choices and behaviors had no relevance to the East Asian collectivistic nature of culture, where collectivism and interdependence is valued as a culture and as a working environment (Markus &
Kitayama, 2003). After going through such research as mentioned above, there seems to be a lack of value presentation and lack of research on Asian cultures and working environment, given their variations and strength of population and different orientation.

Soon after, Chirkov, Ryan, Kaplan, and Kim (2003) responded to the cultural parameters described previously by saying that even though things operate in a different manner in their parts of the world but still there is a fair chance of people acting both on individualistic and collectivistic values in an autonomous way, or if not, they can endorse their given set of values in a controlled way. Thus, autonomy versus control is by concept independent to individualism, and the same goes for collectivism. These researchers in a later study pointed out that well-being and psychological health is reflected from the autonomous nature of cultural behaviors (i.e. either collectivistic culture or individualistic culture). According to Chirkov, Ryan, Kaplan, and Kim (2003) there is no sign of moderation shown by culture with respect to autonomy. In other words, regardless of the culture an individual is working or has become part of the more he or she behaves autonomous the more psychological health and well-being is displayed. Comprehensive amounts of studies have proved the independent nature of autonomy and its relation to well-being along with evidence proving all three (i.e. relatedness, autonomy and competence) as universally necessary for the psychological health of an individual. All such studies have also shown independent concerns about cultural (collective or individualistic) nature (Vansteenkiste, Zhou, Lens, & Soenens, 2005; Vansteenkiste, Lens, Soenens, & Luyckx, 2006; Bao & Lam, 2008; Zhou, Ma, & Deci, 2009).

While discussing the origin of the concept “relatedness” since the mid-1980s, when this third basic human psychological need was introduced, there was considerable discussion on its importance. The main reason behind relatedness being important was its relation to internalization, which in terms is the similar concept in organizational socialization. Organizational Socialization and
internalization carry similar notion of making an outsider see everything with an insider lens making a psychological harmony and comfort at work. Research on the topic of relatedness shows enough evidence of its important role in optimal development and wellbeing (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Later, Deci & Ryan (2000) made more compelling arguments in their research proving that relatedness and autonomy are not two opposite ends of the same concept, but in fact are two separate needs. Similarly, while adding the third need to the family of basic psychological needs there was another debate concerning the limit to these psychological needs (see Andersen, Chen, & Carter, 2000; Reis, Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe, & Ryan, 2000; Sheldon, Elliot, Kim, & Kasser, 2001). Even after so many claims there have been no comprehensive evidence claiming any other psychological need necessary to add to the theory of SDT. So, the basic needs for competence, relatedness and autonomy are currently considered necessary and sufficient for human growth, functioning and psychological health (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Sheldon & Filak, 2008). In other words, if individuals and newcomers are treated as avocados then competence, relatedness and autonomy act for the human psychological function like water, sun and soil.

Research has opened many avenues in exploring satisfaction verses dissatisfaction of three psychological needs. Research in many life domains proved that in an autonomous support system people use perspective building, making rationales, and give choice to gain internalization and above all intrinsic motivation (see Deci & Ryan, 2008). SDT research is not only limited to intrinsic motivation there has been work done on reward structures and task orientation and their match with proactive performance showing influence on certain motivational styles. With respect to the working environment, performance management and compensation system, job design and organizational support should influence the newcomer’s quality of work motivation.
2.1.7 Psychological Needs Satisfaction at work

Numerous characteristics of psychological needs satisfaction have established considerable attention in the management research through past years. During the mid-1970s, there was a considerable amount of research done on the effect of rewards on intrinsic motivation. There was a lot of debate going on to relate it to management research (e.g. Calder & Staw, 1975; Deci, 1976). Subsequently, Gagne and Deci (2005) proclaimed in their research known as the concept discussion of SDT with regards to management and organization. And it is due to this reason that their research became one of the most cited articles published in the *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. Since than there have been several management applications with respect to SDT, not limiting it to just need satisfaction but in fact looking deeper into workplace adjustment for new employee. It is also about individual differences in relation to concepts, such as causality (Deci & Ryan, 1985) along with outcomes related to individual performance and wellness in the workplace.

Application of SDT research has been most voluminous in the psychological studies related to sports, education, health related topics, and with limited appearance in areas relating to work domain (Deci, Connell, and Ryan, 1989; Kasser, Davey, and Ryan, 1992; Gagne, Koestner, and Zuckerman 2000; Otis, and Pelletier, 2005; Fernet, Gagne, and Austin, 2010; Mitchell, Gagne, Beaudry, and Dyer 2012; Fernet, Austin Trepanier, and Dussault, 2013). There are considerable instances in the work domains where there is clear emphasis of using psychological needs in understanding workplace adjustment (e.g. Porath, Spreitzer, Gibson, and Garnett 2012; Wang and Gagne, 2013).
The workplace is where hundreds of millions of adults spend their substantial portion of life across the world. It might be in an executive office of a fancy company, on a farm or boutique, in a filling station in some part of the world. Amongst all given examples most of the employees or even newcomers are accountable to authorities within their respective organizational domain. Organizations and researchers have been after such a workforce who are important to the organization as their motivation is an element that counts a lot when it comes to productivity. The present research is trying to put emphasis on how newcomers are an even more managed product for the organization when their psychological needs are satisfied. In this section we will look into elements in relation to an individual’s wellness in the work place (e.g. Gagne & Deci, 2005; Grant & Shin, 2012).

From the perspective of self-determination theory SDT (Deci & Ryan, 2000), although productivity of newcomers is a critical variable for such analyses, it is claimed that outcomes that include long term psychological health and employee wellbeing should be of great interest. Indeed, theoretical viewpoints discussed by (Deci & Ryan, 2000) also claim that the views even though empirically tested, still can prove to be critical depending on the situation (e.g. productivity, affective commitment, creativity, job performance and other elements associated with high performing employees).

While dealing with self-determination theory there are alternative methods in use mainly focusing not on strengthening the needs but rather to the degree to which needs is satisfied. Self-determination theory (SDT) is more of a theory which studies psychological needs as nutrients which are essential psychologically. According to (SDT) these nutrients are essential for the high-quality performance and for better psychological wellness and if not, it can result in negative outcomes. The theory specifies that people have three basic psychological needs that are more
evolving than learnt: including need for autonomy, relatedness and competence (e.g. Deci & Ryan, 2000). This conceptualization of basic needs for making predictions can be applicable to a specific level in the job (e.g. making a strategic plan), the domain level (e.g. in new work place), or the broader level (i.e. applying to a newcomer’s personality). Then, regardless of the level of analysis, one can use the degree of satisfaction or nonsatisfaction of the basic needs to predict outcomes at any given level.

One reason to study psychological needs as individual differences is the result it will bring about after gaining that need. At times the need for dominance becomes harmful, while individual is looking for a need of abasement instead. The self-determination theory is a great introduction to the organizational socialization literature as it provides a place for every individual who has joined the organization and has its own individuality. The newcomers in their encounter stage are trying everything they can to get hold of what is best used for a fit Ashforth et al., (2007) and Feldman (1981). Here comes SDT in pursuit when it tries to even deal with individuals who have their own goals and they somehow manage to achieve them but still it shows signs of demotivation and diminishes their adjustment pattern in return.

### 2.1.8 Psychological Needs Satisfaction and Outcomes

Various studies have indicated that when people feel satisfied with their basic psychological needs, they are more autonomously motivated, meaning they start behaving with a full sense of volition and willingness. This behavior is totally opposite to when being controlled, which produces outcomes related to pressurizing and obligated (e.g. Lynch, Plant, & Ryan, 2005). Another
behavior which might also exist is feeling amotivated, meaning a lack of interest, intend and motivation with respect to work (e.g. Pelletier, Dion, Tuson, & Green-Demers, 1999).

Numerous studies have come up with relationships of basic need satisfaction with psychological well-being or employees (e.g. Nix, Ryan, Manly, & Deci, 1999; Reis, Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe, & Ryan, 2000). While, Niemiec, Ryan and Deci (2009) found that increase in well-being and decrease in ill-being for newcomers at work (with in their first year of career) was explained by their psychological need satisfaction. Need satisfaction was explored by Baard, Deci and Ryan (2004) and they found an increase in effectivity and performance. Deci & Ryan (2008) are the biggest contributors when it comes to need satisfaction and well-being in high-quality performance domain. Other work by them was in relation to education (Ryan & Deci, 2009).

Research done by Ryan, Sheldon, Kasser, & Deci in 1996 examined that when individuals join in an organization, they have their own long-term goals. These long-term goals are what makes them satisfied at their workplace. Ryan et al. (1996) proved that if their psychological needs are satisfied then there is a higher tendency of achievement of their long-term goals and interns leading to better outcomes in the workplace. The goals and psychological patterns, an individual comes up with at his workplace, are those that determine the later course of action related to his/her need-congruence or need-incongruence. Including the words from Seligman et al. (2005, p. 5) summarizes the future aim of positive psychology as:

“Psychology is not just about illness or health; it is also about work, education, love, growth, and play. And in this quest for what is best, positive psychology does not rely on wishful thinking, self-deception, or hand waving; instead it tries to adapt what is best in the scientific method to the unique problems the human presents in all its complexity.”
Making its relation to organizational socialization and need satisfaction and making use of the pilot interviews done to finalize the research model the idea is to treat psychological capital as a moderator between organizational socialization tactics and SDT.

2.1.9 Psychological Needs Satisfaction and Performance

Baard, Deci & Ryan (2004) studied two large banking organizations in New York City examining people’s need satisfaction, wellbeing, and performance (Baard et al., 2004). In their primary study they included 500 first-line employees of an investment-banking by participating in a questionnaire survey. These jobs are quite stressful at times with the increase in demand in high performance along with maintaining sense of wellbeing. The two-major interest of their research considered outcomes relating to need satisfaction and the degree to which employees feel good about themselves, and second whether social-contextual and in build psychological, and personality factors would predict new satisfaction.

Their research analysis revealed that each of the satisfied needs (i.e. autonomy, relatedness and competence) lead to a better adjustment the workplace. Hence, proving that need satisfaction are strong predictors of workplace performance. For their variables of autonomy with respect to support and autonomy with respect to orientation, both predicted overall need satisfaction for the individuals, with need satisfaction predicting both performance and other related workplace outcomes. In Baard et al. (2004) research interesting findings were related to men and women with differences in their adjustment patterns at work. According to their results, men perceived the working environment in a better way with a stronger level of adjustment than women. There were suggestions related to the difference in treatment of women as all managers were men in their case.
This also derives a major demographic variable (gender) for the study besides other demographics. The emphasis of a demanding working environment in this research is a major element for including the banking industry in the later part of research for empirical testing along with two other major industries in the target country.

### 2.2 Positive Organizational Psychology

The field of positive psychology was christened in 1998 as one of the initiatives of Martin Seligman in his role as president of the American Psychological Association (Peterson and Seligman, 2003). After World War II, psychology became a science largely devoted to healing. Psychologists spent most of their time focusing on what was wrong with the patient or employee. They concentrated most of their time on repairing damage and therefore neglected the idea of a fulfilled individual and a thriving community.

Positive psychology proposes that the time has arrived to correct the imbalance between the negative and positive approach and to challenge the assumptions of the disease model, i.e. positive psychology calls for as more focus on strengths, as much interest in building the best things in life as in repairing the worst, and attention on fulfilling the lives of healthy people (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). This focus on positivity has brought around a lot of thriving elements which are in practice for enhanced positivity but still there is a need to keep up the balanced work as more research is still inclined towards how to fix the negative effects rather than how to maximize positivity. The present research with its basis and target towards newcomers is a contribution to positive notions from the day it all starts to operate (i.e. outsider to insider).
Phycological capital is an evolution of positive organizational behavior POB (Wright, 2003). POB is defined as a study of positively oriented human resources and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed and managed for better performance at workplace (Luthans, 2002a). According to Luthans et al. (2010) psychological capital is a “reservoir” serving as a motivational foundation that can drive people to act intentionally to achieve goals. Bandura (2008) suggests that the combination of psychological capital constructs produce a synergetic effect. Psychological capital has shown positive effects for many job outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, employee performance, organizational commitment (Luthans et al. 2002a). Psychological capital has proved as a resource to overcome stress and anxiety (Avey, Luthans, and Yousssed, 2010).

2.2.1 Psychological Capital as a moderator of the relationship between organizational socialization and individual outcomes

Today’s business environment requires flexibility, innovation and managing human capital as a key ingredient for continued organizational performance. Organizations have shifted their focus from traditional economic capital to human capital, then social capital and are now drawing on Psychological capital as a means of improving performance through higher productivity, superior support and employee retention (Luthans, Luthans & Luthans, 2004).

Psychological Capital is theoretically endorsed by developing from the concepts of conventional financial capital, as well as human and social capital (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Luthans and Youssef (2007) explain that Psychological Capital intends building on and adding value to what an individual possesses (e.g. intellectual knowledge), what an individual has knowledge of (the
organization itself), who an individual is acquainted with (social bounds / support), whilst challenging and encouraging the development of the individual in his or her current state (the actual self at the time of joining) into what that individual can become in the future (the potential outcomes as the socialization process continues).

Psychological Capital is an individual’s positive psychological state of development, characterized by high levels of hope, self-efficacy, resilience and optimism. Preliminary and empirical findings across diverse samples support that these four psychological capacities may contribute more when combined and interacting, to the higher order construct of Psychological Capital (Luthans, Youssef & Avolio 2007). Psychological Capital lends heavily from the psychological resource theory of Hobfoll (2002), which proposes that individual (newcomer) resources should be treated as the manifestation of an underlying core construct or an integrated resource set, rather than in isolation. Therefore, Psychological Capital is a higher order construct that assimilates the outcome behavior, not only additively, but also synergistically (Luthans et al., 2007).

Luthans et al. (2007) suggest that there is a unique thread moving throughout Psychological Capital that represents an individual (newcomer) positive evaluation in a given circumstance, along with the resources required to deal with the given circumstances. It also provides the strength to prosper through the process or situation on the basis of personal endeavor, determination and persistence.

Psychological capacities of hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism, have many positive outcomes for organizations and individuals, with research indicating their relationship to performance. Many studies have highlighted a significant positive relationship between Psychological Capital and performance measures (Luthans et al., 2007; Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa & Li, 2005; Luthans, Avey, Clapp-Smith & Li, 2008; Peterson, Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa & Zhang 2011; Avey, Reichard, Luthans & Mhatre, 2011). In a number of these studies, no significant differences were
indicated between subjective (e.g. self-rated, supervisor evaluations) and objective (e.g. sales figures, product rejects, financial performance) measures of performance (Peterson et al., 2011; Avey et al., 2011; Avey, Nimnicht & Pigeon, 2010). This implies that positive Psychological Capital is positively related to multiple measures of performance.

Individuals with high levels of Psychological Capital are likely to produce creative performances, thereby making use of and displaying their creative potential (Sweetman, Luthans, Avey & Luthans, 2011). Their level of motivation and moral is higher when they use their psychological capital and are ready to achieve their desired goals with endeavoring capability.

The present research uses psychological capital as a moderator as done previously by Cheung, Tang, Tang (2011) in their study of relationships both positive (emotional Labor and job satisfaction). A study of attitudes and behaviors at workplace also treated psychological capital as moderator along with emotions (Avey & Wernsing, 2008). Most recently Probst, Gailey, Jiang and Bhole (2017) used psychological capital as a buffering effect in their longitudinal study on job insecurity and performance. Also, Pu, Hou, Ma and Sang (2017) did their study on Chinese teachers making use of psychological capital as moderator between a totally negative relationship of conflict and burnout at work. These recent studies prove that psychological capital has been in use for considerable amount of times as other than independent variable with major contributions as a moderator (e.g. Probst, Gailey, Jiang and Bhole (2017) than mediator (e.g. Luthans, Norman and Avolio, 2008).
2.3 Newcomer Proactivity and Psychological resources

During the adjustment phase newcomers cannot be provided all the information about their job and environment to make them socially adjusted unless they participate in the process. Proactive newcomers are active and participate to find their way without violating any social norms. Their proactivity helps them to be productive during the socialization process (Miller & Jablin, 1991). Having said that, there is a chance that newcomers have different values from their organization which increases the cost of behaving proactively (Morrison & Vancouver, 2000). The less experience a newcomer has, the more a proactive approach is required from the newcomer to get adjusted and to learn the required role (Van der Vegt, Bunderson, & Oosterhoff, 2006).

Proactive behavior in most situations can bring about positive changes during the socialization process. However, Bolino and Colleagues (2010) argued that proactivity can be negatively associated to well-being and performance outcomes when newcomers, who lack resources engage in proactive behavior on organizational demand. This also matches Chan’s (2006) results that proactive behavior can only result in positive performance outcome when employees have enough resources to be proactive. Chan (2006) also mentioned the importance of judgement of time and place, i.e. when and where, to be proactive. Another research by Hahn & colleagues (Hahn, Frese, Binnewise, & Schmitt, 2012) suggested that proactive behavior needs initiative that is developed over a certain period of time. Hence, newcomers in their beginning stage are mentally occupied and unaware of the environment they are operating in. This condition faced by newcomers may stop them from being proactive at an early stage but may focus on proactivity during the later stage of organizational socialization process.
2.3.1 Newcomer Proactivity throughout the Socialization Process

Newcomers vary their use of Proactive behavior over time. Some newcomers use a specific behavior before and some after some time to have their desired outcome. For example, a newcomer may use a tactic early for gaining social contacts and later might use another behavior to target more specific relationships at work. Similar results were seen in research done by Ashford (1986). She found that newcomers were given less preference to their feedback with increase in tenure while still they gave same weightage to feedback seeking behavior. This behavior was seen and related to many other proactive behaviors and subsequently Ashford (1986) concluded that proactive behaviors have the tendency to vary over the entry period. For this reason, proactive behavior was chosen to be in time T2 instead of time T1 in the present research framework.

Looking to another tenure long study by Wanberg and Kammeyer-Mueller (2000) found a positive association between the days employed and use of proactive behavior. The reason for such a behavior was the fact that in the beginning there seemed to be a more aggressive socialization process which made them reluctant to use their own proactive behaviors. So, in the beginning things like introduction and helping to build networks, was done by insiders but later they were left alone to make use of their proactivity. While Chan and Schmitt (2000) found that newcomers’ proactive behavior (e.g. seeking technical information) had an increasing rate, for a specific time, making proactive behavior to be measured later in the socialization process. Another study by Sonnentag (2003) found that newcomers in the beginning feel more stressed and mentally occupied. They make less use of stressful proactive behaviors than later in their tenure. This also suggested to measure newcomer’s proactivity while it is accumulated in time T2.
CHAPTER No. 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present research uses a mixed method research approach. The first study comprises a qualitative research while the second study is quantitative study. Qualitative study discusses the critical incident technique (CIT), its justification. While, later portion of the chapter describes the quantitative methodology used for the study two.

3.1 Research Design

Research design is “a process of making all decisions related to the research project” (Blaikie, 2003, p.21). Research design is also described “as a structure that guides the execution of a research method and the analysis of the subsequent data” (Bryman, 2016, p.27). Moreover, research design consists of a unified and consistent procedure, to guide the framework, to bring concepts, and research methods all together, with the domain of research objective (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005). Research design also describes the methods to conduct the research process (Creswell, 1996). It involves a series of rational decision-making choices so that the requisite data can be collected and analyzed to reach at a solution (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). The research design decisions should have consistency and should be guided from the research objectives (Lewis et al., 2007). Moreover, an appropriate research design increases the chance of conducting an effective and efficient research (Malhotra, Kim & Patil, 2006). In a broad prospective, research has two types: quantitative and qualitative (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). The present research uses
both types to reduce the baseness associated to either choices. The present chapter of research details the quantitative part of research. The proposed model keeps on improving with respect to the relationships, built, until the final model is constructed on the basis of previous literature and qualitative study.

3.2 Types of Research Design

Research designs can be broadly classified as descriptive or explanatory (Saunders, Lewis, Thornhill & Wilson, 2009). Descriptive research is undertaken to comprehend the nature of a problem (Sekaran, 2003). Descriptive research is especially useful to find out "what is happening; to seek new insights; to ask questions and to assess phenomena in a new light” (Robson, 2002). This research type is particularly helpful if researcher is unsure of the precise nature of the problem (Saunders et al., 2009). Descriptive research is carried out by qualitative studies and data are collected through observation or interviews as opposed to quantitative studies where data is gathered through questionnaires (Sekaran, 2003). The major way of conducting descriptive research include search of the literature (Saunders et al, 2009), expert surveys, and qualitative interviews (Malhotra & Birks, 2006; Saunders et al., 2009). The present study make use of the literature along with qualitative interviews to come up to the final proposed model which was later on empirically tested by a considerable sample of newcomers.

A descriptive research is a structured approach, which is characterized by preformed specific research questions and hypotheses and clearly defined information (Malhotra & Birks, 2006). This type of study is undertaken to ascertain and describe the characteristics of the variables of interest in a situation (Sekaran, 2003). Descriptive research aims for collecting data and describe the
existing characteristics of a defined target population using scientific methods and procedures (Hair et al., 2003).

Explanatory research focusses on why questions. For example, it is one thing to determine the issue of turnover in an organization, to examine its trend in various organizations over a period. Whereas, it is different to develop an explanation about why the turnover is increasing and why it is higher in certain type of organizations.

Explanatory studies are the type of research used to assess cause (independent variables) and effect (dependent variables) relationships. These studies emphasize upon studying a problem or a situation to explain the relationships between variables (Saunders et al., 2009). These research designs are especially helpful in determining and explaining the causality among measured variables, however they tend to be complex, expensive and time-consuming. Explanatory study is a pre-planned and structured approached like descriptive research, however the descriptive research is not suitable for examining causal relationships where independent variables are manipulated under relatively controlled conditions (Malhotra & Birks, 2006). It is, however, pertinent to mention that there are no absolute differences between descriptive and explanatory research types (Malhotra & Birks, 2006). That is, based on the research objectives, the research strategy may involve the use of more than one type of research design.

The present study uses an explanatory research method for a reason that there has been considerable research describing organizational socialization process and tactics that answers “what it is”. There is and always will be a need to study different causal relationships through which organizational socialization process can be better explained.
3.3 Mixed Method Research

Qualitative research considers narrative or experimental data, while quantitative research contains the data collection and analysis of numerical data (Hayes et al., 2013). Deeper understandings are explained by positivistic (quantitative) and naturalistic (qualitative) paradigms of research. The term “mix method research” is broadly accepted as a research, that integrates both qualitative and quantitative data in a single study (Wisdom et al., 2012, Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011). A major element of the mix method phenomenon is the “mixing” of the qualitative and the quantitative methods to be presented in a study (Simons and Lathlean, 2010, Maudsley, 2011). This mixing is referred to an interlink producing a fuller account of research problem by combing qualitative and quantitative elements of research (Glogowska, 2011, Zhang and Creswell, 2013). This interlink, or mixing can occur at any stage of research process but is important to the rigor of the mixed method research (Glogowska, 2011).

Another method at times linked with mixed method research is the multi method research. There is considerable evidence explain the difference between mixed method and multi method research (Johnson et al., 2007). Where mixed methods research is a combination of qualitative and quantitative research in a single combined study, multi-method research involves data collected by using two methods from the same paradigm (e.g. focus groups and one to one interviews, self and supervisory rated performance) (Andrew and Halcomb, 2009).

The strength of mixed method research relies on the strengths gathered from both qualitative and quantitative research, whilst ameliorating their weaknesses to provide a combined understanding of the topic under discussion (Scammon et al., 2013, Wisdom et al., 2012, Andrew and Halcomb, 2009).
3.3.1 Research Design Employed

The present research implies an explanatory research design for the qualitative part. We want to confirm with preliminary interviews that the use of self-determination theory as a mediating mechanism in the relationship between organizational socialization and employee outcomes make sense. Hence, the final research model will be derived from the qualitative research as well as from the literature review. The major idea of proposing self-determination theory as a motive to support the socialization process came from the qualitative results and literature base. For the present study a fixed sequential mixed method was chosen. According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2010) there are a set of principles that need to be followed while conducting a mixed method research. Fixed method was chosen as the sequence of qualitative to quantitative research was pre-determined due to given research purpose. Sequential mixed method was chosen due to the fact that qualitative research and quantitative research were conducted in a sequence. In the present research design qualitative followed quantitative research. The purpose of choosing a fixed sequential mixed method research design was to make use to both qualitative and quantitative research approaches while studying the organizational socialization process for newcomers.

Another major element taken into consideration is the time duration for conducting the study. Researchers needs to articulate the time horizon as part of research planning (Saunders et al., 2009). Research study of a phenomenon (or phenomena) in terms of a snapshot at a point in time, or a series of snapshots over a given period, is categorized as cross-sectional or longitudinal (Saunders et al., 2009). Cross sectional research seeks to collect information from respondents only once (Malhotra & Birks, 2006). Longitudinal research seeks to collect information from one or more fixed samples of the population at specified intervals over an extended period (Malhotra & Birks, 2006). A major advantage of longitudinal research is the ability of the researcher to
observe people or events over time and exercise a measure of control over variables being studied, provided they are not affected by the research process itself (Adams and Schvaneveldt, 1991). Additionally, longitudinal designs help the researcher to collect larger amounts of data compared to cross-sectional designs. However, the major shortcoming of the longitudinal design, is that it may take a longer time with more chances of losing the major chunk of study sample in time two (Malhotra & Birks, 2006). Longitudinal research design, which is a difficult type of descriptive research (Malhotra & Birks, 2006), was adopted in study two research. In a longitudinal research design, a researcher examines the change in behavior over time, whereas cross sectional study is employed to examine causal with perception-based study to examine the impact of one variable on other (Menard, 2007). The present research focuses on the change in behavior from Time T1 to Time T2 of newcomers and their outcomes as they move from a proximal outcome to a distal outcome.

3.4 Epistemological Positioning

A research project depends on its nature; if the research; starts by exploring a theory or ends as a theory. The placement of theory in each stage of research determines its type and approach. Mainly, there are three research approaches to theory development i.e. deduction approach (conclusion is based on logical grounds when found true), inductive approach (there exists a gap in the logic and conclusions are made with the help of observations), and abductive approach (starts with a fact being observed as conclusion and later used to make changes to given logic to determine new results) as described by Ketokivi and Mantere (2010).
**Deduction** is a complex phenomenon of scientific research. It is one of the major approaches used in natural sciences. It starts with developing a theory that is later tested through a rather rigorous approach containing a series of proposed statements.

Blaikie (2010) proposed a sequential list of the deductive theorizing process:

1. “Put forward a tentative idea, a premise, a hypothesis (a testable proposition about the relationship between two or more concepts or variables) or set of hypotheses to form a theory.”

2. “By using existing literature, or by specifying the conditions under which the theory is expected to hold, deduce a testable proposition or number of propositions.”

3. “Examine the premises and the logic of the argument that produced them, comparing this argument with existing theories to see if it offers an advance in understanding. If it does, then continue.”

4. “Test the premises by collecting appropriate data to measure the concepts or variables and analyzing them.”

5. “If the results of the analysis are not consistent with the premises (the tests fail!), the theory is false, and must either be rejected or modified, and the process restarted.”

6. “If the results of the analysis are consistent with the premises then the theory is corroborated.”

Deduction contains many distinctive and significant characteristics. First, there is a need for research and explanation to the causal relationship between the concepts and variables. Subsequently, hypotheses are developed, in order to prove the hypothesis, data is to be collected.
(given the fact that it is not a compulsion that deductive approach is about quantitative data). It is very likely that, there are different conclusions for different conditions. So, the researcher has to undergo the process of identifying the conditions under which the results work. Such research needs a highly-structured research method to support the fact that it is replicated, and a significant issue to verify its reliability.

Alternative approach to deduction might start with, interviewing a sample of employees or their supervisors in each organization. The reason of doing so, can be a reason, of what is going on to better understand the given problem. The next step will be to refine the results of the interview data through some analysis to result into the formulation of a theory, mostly termed as the conceptual framework of research. During these steps, there might be other underlying factors that may be deriving the results. Given the fact, that all factors cannot be determined in a specific research work, at the same time. Whatever the conclusion might be, the reason of doing so was the use of an inductive approach where theory follows the data and not the other way around as in deductive research.

Following this approach, a researcher makes him / her criticize the fact that deduction theory provides a rather ridged method by not permitting alternative clarifications of what is happening in a given situation. Therefore, this approach of inductive theorizing is better managed by a small sample of subjects rather than big data sets used in the deductive approach.

After a discussing two approaches of theorizing instead of driving from theory towards data (deduction) or driving data from theory (induction), an abduction approach of theorizing is one using both approaches back and forth. In other words, abduction provides a combination of both deductive and inductive approaches (Suddaby 2006). Van Maanen et al. (2007) suggested that some credible theories are more linking than the others and this is how the relationship is built.
between a given plausible theory and a surprising fact. Van Massnen et al. (2007) also suggested that deduction and induction theorizing complement the idea of abduction for plausible theory testing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deduction</th>
<th>Induction</th>
<th>Abduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logic</strong></td>
<td>“In a deductive inference, when the premises are true, the conclusion must also, be true”</td>
<td>“In an abductive inference, known premises are used to generate testable conclusions”</td>
<td>“In an inductive inference, known premises are used to generate untested conclusions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generalizability</strong></td>
<td>“Generalizing from the general to the specific”</td>
<td>“Generalizing from the specific to the general”</td>
<td>“Generalizing from the interactions between the specific and the general”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of data</strong></td>
<td>“Data collection is used to evaluate propositions or hypotheses related to an existing theory”</td>
<td>“Data collection is used to explore a phenomenon, identify themes and patterns and create a conceptual framework”</td>
<td>“Data collection is used to explore a phenomenon, identify themes and patterns and create a conceptual framework and test this through subsequent data collection and so forth”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory</strong></td>
<td>“Theory falsification or verification”</td>
<td>“Theory generation and building”</td>
<td>“Theory generation or modification; incorporating existing theory where appropriate, to build new”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Qualitative Study

Qualitative research is primarily exploratory research. Qualitative research is a method used to enrich the understanding of the research problem and its relevant context (Roussel & Wacheux, 2005). It provides insights relating to research problem and provide assistance to develop ideas and hypothesis for a potential qualitative research. Qualitative research is, “a scientific method of observation to gather non-numerical data” Babbie (2013). Qualitative research is type of research that refers to the definitions, concepts, meanings, characteristics and not to their counts, occurrences or measures (Berg, Lune & Lune, 2004). A qualitative research method is an approach used across numerous academic disciplines, with focus on the human elements (social sciences) (Given, 2008).

As a field of research, qualitative research approaches include multiple research concepts and methods from different academic disciplines. A qualitative research method is considered best for understanding human behavior and the reasons governing such a behavior. A qualitative approach is considered best for answering questions related to human behavior (Given, 2008).

The present study used convenience sampling to gain access to different participating organizations from the French and Pakistani service sectors. The present study considered young newcomers specifically as a sample. The age group of the sample was between 23 and 30 years.
The rationale for choosing newcomers less than 30 years was, because they are the ones starting their first job after graduation.

To choose the sample for the Pakistani service sector we specifically considered those newcomers who had less than one-year of working experience in their present job and who had at least a masters’ degree related to business management, marketing, economics or finance. While going for the French sample there was a constraint of being in an internship. As in the French education system professional master students must work in a compulsory internship to complete their degree. So, after their 6 to 11 months of internship, graduates are promoted to a higher position in the same company or some others look for a better opportunity in the same sector. The concern was that once they had around a year of experience with an internship, they would not match the sample collected from Pakistani newcomers. This might result in insignificant data results to compare the two samples. Hence, the French interview sample comprised of internees from an international business program who had little prior work experience.

3.5.1 Qualitative Method

The first phase in this research study was accomplished by adopting an exploratory qualitative research approach, by making use of in-depth semi structured interviews. These interviews were mostly done by face-to-face interaction with the respondent being newcomers.

The main objective of this phase of research was to determine if the introduction of psychological needs fulfilment as a mediating mechanism in the research model was pertinent.

The other objectives of the qualitative study were:
- To determine what type of socialization tactics are used by companies and what are the onboarding practices.

- To explore the role of organizational socialization for newcomers. i.e. How can we determine if the organizational socialization tactics used by the organization are affective and lead to positive socialization outcome.

- Determine if organizational social support from supervisor is helpful to newcomers.

- Identify how psychological resources of the newcomer intervene in the socialization process.

- Determine what are other outcomes besides commitment and performance of organizational socialization process.

- Determine if the active role of the newcomer results in a positive outcome for the socialization process?

This was done by exploring the way newcomers built their perceptions about the socialization process, during the early stage of entrance in an organization. According to Yin (2015) it is the finding of a study that leads to the validation of that study. The method used to get the valid set of conclusions was the critical incident method (CIT). The sample contained newcomers having less than a year of experience. Content analysis was used to analyze the critical incident data obtained from the transcribed interviews. The next section provides information on the description of CIT and the procedure used to employ CIT. It includes preparation along with planning, data collection followed by data analysis.
3.5.2 Critical Incident Technique (CIT)

Flanagan (1954) developed CIT and in his ground-breaking research explaining CIT he defined it as a method which is, “a set of procedures for collecting direct observations of human behavior in such a way as to facilitate their potential usefulness in solving practical problems and developing broad psychological principles” (p.327). Along with this, in this specific situation CIT also fits with the definition of Creswell (1994) who gives his definition on qualitative research saying that: “In qualitative research, the researcher is in a process of exploring social and human phenomena in a natural environmental setting; sources of data comes out to be by interviews or practical observations; inductive analysis by using words are sourced to form a picture; and it is made sure that the perspective of the participant is kept as natural as it can be.” (Butterfield, Borgen, Amundson & Maglio, 2005).

The procedure of CIT follows a certain process that enables the researcher to produce responses from interviewees known as “incidents” that are later apprehended, analyzed and interpreted (Lambrecht, Redmann & Stitt-Gohdes, 2004; Atkinson, 2007; Greenwell, Lee & Naeger, 2007; Tuuli & Rowlinson, 2010). Furthermore, Schluter, Seaton and Chaboyer (2007) interpreted a critical incident factor as, activities, events, behaviors and experiences that are important to people taking part in a process and they have either positive or negative influence on the process.

A qualitative research method using CIT is considered as an appropriate and predominantly useful way to explore, examine, infer and understand work related incidents and the amount of complexity involved in work place behaviors. It allows to capture the intensity and complexity in the behaviors from a perspective shared by those involved in actual situation. It also accounts for
their real condition at work along with the social contextual circumstances of occurrence (Chell, 1998; Greenwell et al., 2007; Atkinson, 2007).

As the purpose of this research was to explore what newcomers have to say about the organization and its’ socialization process and how they were treated in the early stages of job. CIT was considered as a suitable technique for data collection. CIT sheds light on the processes under study and related behaviors relevant to the investigated phenomenon (Parzefall & Coyle-Shapiro, 2011). From an organization’s perspective, as a qualitative method of study, CIT has been in use by researchers studying organizations, to explore events between employee and employer (Chell & Allman, 2003; Perren & Ram, 2004; Coetzer, Redmond & Sharafizad, 2012). It requires in-depth analysis of employee behaviors in firms and organizations that facilitate understanding of complex realities at work (Marlow & Patton, 2002). CIT has its strength being practical and flexible that can be easily molded into a specific research situation (Edvardsson & Roos, 2001; Schluter et al., 2007), with Flanagan (1954) stating that the CIT “should be thought of as a flexible set of principles that must be modified and adapted to meet the specific situation at hand” (p.335). As in this scenario, the researcher adapted CIT and applied to different techniques and a range of disciplines to answer the research questions (Butterfield et al., 2005; Chell, 1998; Gremler, 2004).

In addition to all this, CIT offers the flexibility and focus required to explore complex phenomenon by using specific incidents from relevant respondents (Coetzer et al., 2012; Gremler, 2004). More precisely, CIT offers a suitable solution in understanding, inferring and apprehending: the factors that are cause of critical incident; the resulting experience and consequential outcome (Butterfield et al., 2004; Edvardsson & Roos, 2001; Mallak, Lyth, Oslon, Ulshafer & Sardone, 2003).

The style of CIT specific to the present study constituted of the following five steps given by Stitt-Gohdes, Lambrecht and Redmann (2000), who talked about steps adapted from Flanagan (1954).
These steps are (1) preparing a plan for applying the technique “pretest and sampling”; (2) using the interview method to collect information from respondent “Data Collection”; (3) identification of themes from the collected information “initial data analysis”; (4) categorizing data as per their theme “final data analysis”; (5) understanding and interpreting the final results.

The steps followed in CIT are more detailed in the following section as the first part of this chapter. The reason to follow certain steps and to document the procedure, as was in this case while employing CIT, is a way to contribute to the reliability of the study in a qualitative approach (Yin, 2014). Moreover, the procedure adopted in CIT helps in reducing any potential misjudgment and bias, the researcher might bring to the study (Stitt-Gohdes et al., 2000). Hence, the CIT process of focusing on specific critical incidents helps to add more validity to the research. This increase in validity is helpful in increasing the quality of the study (Creswell, 2009). CIT is also relevant to identify how newcomers’ need satisfaction are impacted by incidents i.e. problems and difficulties during the early stages of their employment. How can specific incidents play an important role in better outcomes? And are there external elements involved that can help facilitate the socialization process.

3.5.3 Sampling Process

The sampling technique used for this study was a purposeful sampling method (Miles, Huberman, Huberman & Huberman 1994; Patton & Marlow, 2002). Patton (2002) defined purposeful sampling as, “a technique used for the identification and selection of information-rich cases for the most effective use of limited resources.” This process involves selecting respondents or groups that have specific knowledge about or experienced with a phenomenon of interest (Cresswell &
Plano Clark, 2011). The reason of doing so is to make sure use of those newcomers who faced difficult incidents during their adjustment, to better exemplify the conditions newcomer faces during organization entry. This type of sampling is used in qualitative studies to maximize the quality of information obtained (Tuuli & Rowlinson, 2009). It is a technique that requires a deeper study of the participant exploring its purposefulness for the given research (Creswell, Shope, Plano Clark & Green, 2001).

In a qualitative research, a bunch of parameters are used to choose the sampling technique: the setting (the location of the study); actors (participants under consideration for interview or observation); processes (the way people make sense of their surroundings); events (related activities between the process and actor); and outcomes (results and findings of the process) (Miles et al. 1994).

### 3.5.4 Current Sample

The present sample is composed of newcomers in two countries i.e. Pakistan and France. Interviewees were newcomers who were coming back from their internships to give final reports to their school for the French sample, while for the Pakistani sample, they were students from different business schools who had completed their internship recently. Processes focused on how socialization factors affected newcomers’ learning and adjustment during the socialization process; events are incidents that occur during the OS process; and outcomes are the resultant proximal and distal outcomes of the process. It was kept in mind that there should be a discussion generated during the interview to facilitate the newcomers in expressing everything that has been happening to him / her since the past several months of internship.
The competitiveness of the environment, changing market situations, new technological advancements, and novel work circumstances are making human resource processes complex. Due to situations related to issues of employee retention human resource is becoming more focused towards learning and adjustment for successful recruitment. This intern helps employees to adapt to the changing work conditions (Lee, Bennett & Oakes, 2000; Chaston, Badger, Mangles, Sadler-Smith, 2001). HRM practices applied to newcomers that support learning, also helps to facilitate a long-term compatibility to the entire process which increases the performance of the organization (App, Merk & Buttgen, 2012).

The recruitment of newcomers was crucial for the collection of a sufficient number of critical incidents during the interviews that addressed the research questions for this phase of the study. A number of newcomers were contacted and informed about the focus of research. The requirement was to recall their internship experience and answer questions that will enable the researcher to elicit “incidents” relevant to this phase of the study. Later these responses will be captured, analyzed and interpreted. As previously noted, these critical incidents were to become the units of analysis for qualitative research i.e. study one.

Newcomers of the specific background who expressed an interest and willingness to voluntarily participate in this phase of the study were sent a covering letter formally inviting newcomers to participate in the study. The covering letter included information outlining the purpose of the study, the involvement of participants, participants’ rights, issues of confidentiality, anonymity, contact details of the researcher along with sample interview questions for newcomers. Those interested in participating were asked to contact the researcher directly. Once agreement to voluntarily participate in the study had been reconfirmed, arrangements were made to conduct the interviews with newcomers.
3.5.5 Qualitative Data Collection

Following newcomers’ agreement regarding their willingness to participate in the study, a consent form was signed by interview participants, Individual interviews with respondents were conducted at their place of convenience, during the period April 2014 to June 2014 for the Pakistan sample and from October 2014 to December 2014 for the French sample. The Interview Agenda provided a framework to conduct the interviews using the CIT. A similar set of prepared questions was used to collect the interview data from newcomer belonging to both countries. The format of the questions and the associated probes, an approach recommended by Rous and McCormick (2006), assisted in eliciting critical incidents from respondents by: (1) focusing on circumstances giving rise to an incident(s); (2) determining the role of key people involved in the incident(s); (3) reflecting on the resultant outcome(s); and (4) discussing what could have been done differently.

3.6 Quantitative Study

Quantitative research is a research method by which data is collected from different sources and later analyzed by using some statistical data analysis technique. This research method involves a process in which there is method used to collect data, it also involves the use of computational and statistical tools to derive results.
3.6.1 Data Collection

The data collection depends on the size and type of the samples (Hox, Boeije, 2005). The present research used a longitudinal design with a questionnaire-based self-administered survey in both time intervals. Data collected was of primary nature, as primary data is the best source of data collection (Bonds-Raacke & Raacke, 2012). Primary data is the type of data in which researcher collects data for the first time with raw hand and can be best resource when self-administered (Hox & Boeije, 2005).

As discussed in the above sections, the questionnaire was distributed to the respondents using the self-administration technique. The offices were self-visited to distribute the questionnaires, so that any ambiguity faced by the respondents, while filling the questionnaire could be resolved on the spot. The assurance of strict anonymity of individual response to address the social desirability bias, that might be a concern later, was well communicated to all the respondents.

The current study aimed at investigating the socialization of newcomers in Pakistani organizations. For this purpose, there were three major sectors taken under consideration i.e. the energy sector, the banking sector and the telecom sector. The data was collected from two companies in the energy sector (Attack Oil Refinery and Shell) whereas, two companies each from the banking sector (Bank Alfalah, Fasisal Bank) and two from the telecom sector (Warid Telecom, Telenor Pakistan). The data was collected from employees of the above-mentioned companies. The reason of choosing these sectors was that they are the sectors providing most of the jobs in Pakistani job market. Banks and telecom sectors are mostly multi-national companies, introducing new trends of employment to the local market. Following the banking industry and telecom sector, energy sector is the first sector to adopt to the new trends introduced by the multi-national companies.
Recently in 2017 UNDP launched a survey on Pakistan Human Development saying that currently Pakistan has the largest number of youth ever in its history, having a population of which two-third is below the age of 30. Employment rate and opportunities are still rare as it is characterized as a developing country by United Nations, but still due to a decrease in rate of dependency youth is active and grasping every opportunity to seek employment. Islamabad as the center and capital of the country was chosen to be a true representative of best organizational practices. The reason of choosing Islamabad was due to the fact that all head offices are situated in Islamabad.

Further, it was also explained that what the respondent can do if they have any concerns about the study (i.e. who they can contact). The participants in the consent sheet were invited to tick boxes showing their understanding of their rights as a research participant and convey their informed consent. The participants accordingly ticked the consent sheet boxes to show their understanding of their rights as a research participant and convey their informed consent. Data was collected (questionnaires were distributed and collected) by personally visiting the recruited respondents, working in their offices for both time T1 and time T2.

### 3.6.2 Population

A population is defined as a collection of observations through data collection to have analysis on variables and relationships (Washington, Karlaftis & Mannering, 2010). According to Sekaran and Bougie (2010) population are the group of people, event and things which the researcher wants to examine.

A field survey was conducted across various offices which deemed appropriate. Moreover, data was collected by personally visiting the organizations to further minimize the ambiguities faced
by respondents. Hence, data was personally administered containing structured questions to measure the major study variables. According to Ruane & Ugur (2005), results concluded on sample can be easily generalized to the population. This is important to select the right sample size in order to generalize results to the population. In terms of heterogeneity, a large sample size should be selected while in terms of homogeneity in population, a small sample size can be considered appropriate for representation of population (Gill & Johnson, 2010). According to Tabachnick and Fidell, (2007), a sample size can be computed through N= 50 + 8 * (variables). For example, if there are 11 variables in a study its sample should be computed as (50 + 8 (11) = 138) or above (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In this study, the author got the data from 225 employees twice which justifies the criteria suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) given the fact that the population of this research were only the newcomers that were recently hired in any management trainee program.

3.6.3 Sampling

Data was collected by using stratified random sampling which is a type of probability sampling. The consent sheet clearly explained the rights of the participants to refuse taking part in the study or withdraw at any stage. It also explained that the responses of the participants will be completely confidential and that no one will be identified in any written report or publication, and only aggregate data will be presented. The remaining questionnaire includes questions for measuring study variables and researcher took these from already validated instruments. Earlier researches in Pakistan revealed reliable results for such instruments (Malik, Nawab, Naeem, & Danish (2010).
3.6.4 Instrument

In this longitudinal study, a questionnaire was used as a tool for the data collection. It is the most widely used technique to collect data from a large group and it helps the researcher to save time as it allows respondents to fill it without much interference (Rubin & Babbie, 2007). For this research already developed questionnaires were used. The reason for doing so was to limit the validity and reliability issues while measuring of these variables (Proctor, 2004; Hayes & Krippendorff, 2007). Furthermore, the most commonly used 7-point Likert scale was used (Malhotra & Peterson, 2006). Even though the range can vary from 5 to 7 and in some references e.g. Loken et al. (1987) it can be also 10 – 11. The Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7 was described to be as, 1- strongly disagree, 2- disagree, 3-somewhat disagree, 4-neutral, 5-somewhat agree, 6-agree, 7-strongly agree.

3.6.5 Reliability

This study checked the inter-item and split-half reliability because it examines the consistency of respondent’s answer to all items. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used as it is the most widely used tool to measure the reliability of the scale in social sciences (Chao, O’Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein & Gardner, 1994). Previous studies which used the similar measures reported the Cronbach’s alpha value superior to 0.70 and stated these scales as reliable measures (Chao et al., 1994). However, the value is recorded as 0.60 which is also acceptable in social science studies (Gliem & Gliem, 2003).
3.7 General research model

The conceptual framework is representation of researcher’s synthesis coming out of literature on how to explain a research phenomenon. It maps out the variables and their relationships. It also points out the direction and actions required based on previous literature and logic. As known in researches that the typology of organizational socialization tactics is developed and mostly tested in the western society (Van Mannen and Schein, 1979), this construct has been part of various studies across different contexts and has been validated across many settings (Cooper Thomas and Anderson, 2002; Gruman et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2005; Takeuchi and Takeuchi, 2009). This
provides sufficient confidence in believing the fact that it will hold true in the Pakistani context.

The previous literature provides enough grounds for developing the relationship between organizational socialization tactics and other proximal and distal outcomes of organizational socialization for newcomers.

3.8 Hypothesis

Hypothesis are logical statements showing the relationship amongst variables. As defined by Kerlinger (1956) “A hypothesis is a conjectural statement of the relation between two or more variables”. Hypothesis in this study are derived on the basis of previous research and supported by the qualitative research. Creswell (1994) defined hypothesis as, “Hypothesis is a formal statement that presents the expected relationship between an independent and dependent variable” (Creswell, 1994). Hypothesis are divided into five categories described below:

3.8.1 Organizational Socialization and Newcomers’ Job Outcomes

Organizational socialization is the process of moving from an organizational outsider to insider. As called to be a process of “learning the ropes” by Schein (1968) and “people processing” by Van Maanen and Schein (1979). A founding theory conceptualization of organizational socialization is, organizational socialization tactics initially presented by Van Maanen and Schein (1979). This concept is further divided into two categories being institutionalized and individualized socialization (Jones, 1986; Allen and Meyer, 1990). Organizational socialization is also known as
a process helping newcomers adapt behaviors and develop their cognitive maps (Louis, 1980). Although Jones (1986) considered the three-dimensional structure of organizational socialization containing context, content and social aspects. Jones (1986) further suggested that a single dimension ranging from institutionalized socialization to individualized socialization tactics might be most appropriate. Later research has found some support via exploratory factor analysis for the three-factor model (e.g., Cable & Parsons, 2001).

**Hypothesis H1a:** Organizational socialization is positively related to newcomers’ affective commitment.

Maier and Brunstein (2001) studied newcomers, a sample of 14 German companies. They found that commitment plays an important role over the first few months of becoming stable at workplace. Their study was based on three data collection periods including pre and post entry periods.

**Hypothesis H1b:** Organizational socialization is positively related to newcomers’ job performance.

Research in socialization has utilized performance as an important outcome e.g. Chen and Klimoski (2003). While Molleman and Van der Vegt (2007) have found changes, in performance, during socialization process, over time. Bauer et al. (2007) found that job performance has a consistent relation with newcomer adjustment.
Hypothesis H1c: Organizational socialization is negatively related to newcomers’ turnover intention.

Bauer et al. (1998) found that inadequate socialization is a major reason for intentions related to negative job outcomes e.g. turnover. Losing a person not fit for the job may be a desirable outcome but losing employees because they feel confused and disaffected with how the organization is treating them, indicates insufficient socialization efforts.

3.8.2 Organizational Social Support and Newcomers’ Job Outcomes

Organizations are on the verge of trying to use the best appropriate tactics and newcomers are busy behaving in a proactive way trying to find their way through. While both stake holders are in pursuit to their best practices’ researchers have noted that most of the socialization occurs when the organization interacts with the newcomer (Reichers, 1987), for example, by asking questions, trying to seek information and feedback, availing interactive opportunities. These opportunities are what makes the newcomer more at ease and help them identify their role in the organization. Whenever a newcomer is trying to indulge in the given environment he is supposed to think in a local and organizational specific context (e.g. Will my boss be happy with my work? How will I interact with the group mates? Will they be happily involving me in their group? Is my place in the office any disturbance to my colleagues?).

Hypothesis H2a: Organizational social support is positively related to newcomers’ affective commitment.
Hypothesis H2b: Organizational social support is positively related to newcomers’ job performance.

Hypothesis H2c: Organizational social support is negatively related to newcomers’ turnover intention.

3.8.3 Psychological Needs Satisfaction as Mediator

There is comprehensive amount of research done on motivation but it’s less likely the case when we talk about newcomers’ motivation. Newcomers have unique situations and they undergo unique kind of “reality shock” (Feldman, 1967). In the beginning they are stressed as a lot is expected from them. They lack information to perform autonomously, and at the same time they are expected to be competent as well (Lacaze & Bauer, 2014). Hence, they have to rely on others to provide information and help through the initial processes that helps them relate themselves to the new environment. Fulfillment of such psychological needs can result in positive outcomes related to well-being, positive work-related behaviors, in-role and extra-role behaviors (Gagne and Deci, 2005; Van de Broeck, Vansteenkiste & De Witte, 2008). Psychological needs satisfaction appears well suited to analyze newcomer adjustment through socialization. As, newcomers in present generation, as discussed before, have high desires to be autonomous. It is an important element desire to be fulfilled by the employer, if they are to retain the newcomers. Thus, psychological needs satisfaction is an important nutrition that will help achieve the desired newcomer outcomes. This research introduces psychological need satisfaction as a proximal outcome of organization socialization process, hence resulting psychological needs satisfaction as a mediation effect between organizational socialization, organizational social support and distal job outcomes.
**Hypothesis H3a:** Organizational socialization is positively related to newcomers’ affective commitment such that psychological needs satisfaction mediates the relationship.

**Hypothesis H3b:** Organizational Socialization is positively related to newcomers’ job performance such that psychological needs satisfaction mediates the relationship.

**Hypothesis H3c:** Organizational Socialization is negatively related to newcomers’ turnover intention such that Psychological Needs Satisfaction mediates the relationship.

Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg (2003) studied the influences shown by organization, supervisor and peers on socialization outcomes of both distal and proximal nature. Their results showed that social support and influence of supervisor has brought about less chances of turnover and better coping and sustained behavior from newcomers. Bauer et al., (1998) proved that social support if provided is a great help to newcomers. The value of newcomer social support has long been a critical factor to organizational socialization (Fisher, 1985; Kartz, 1983). In a study by Jokisaari and Nurmi (2009) they found that supervisory social support is vital in the first two years of employment. In their study newcomers reported a decrease in supporting behavior from supervisor from six to twenty-one months following their entry in the organization. Their study results highlighted that continuous supervisor support beyond six months of organizational entry can bring much more positive results including performance and satisfaction.

**Hypothesis H4a:** Organizational social support is positively related to newcomers’ affective commitment such that psychological needs satisfaction mediates the relationship.
**Hypothesis H4b:** Organizational social support is positively related to newcomers’ job performance such that Psychological Needs Satisfaction mediates the relationship.

**Hypothesis H4c:** Organizational social support is negatively related to newcomers’ turnover intention such that Psychological Needs Satisfaction mediate the relationship.

### 3.8.4 Newcomer Psychological Capital as Moderator Time T1

Psychological capital is known as a positive human behavior that can be effective in producing synergy to positive outcomes, this behavior can be effectively managed and developed (Luthans, 2002a). Psychological capital has also been discussed as a “reservoir” that can help enhance motivation, driving people to act intentionally for achieving goals such as, job performance, satisfaction and commitment (Luthans et al. 2010). Bandura (2008) also pointed out the combined effect of four elements included in psychological capital to generate positive energy. This positivity is used as a moderating effect to enhance the level of psychological needs satisfaction.

**Hypothesis H5a:** Psychological capital moderates the relationship between organizational socialization and newcomers’ psychological needs satisfaction such that need satisfaction is higher when psychological capital is strong.

**Hypothesis H5b:** Psychological capital moderates the relationship between organizational social support and newcomers’ psychological needs satisfaction such that need satisfaction is higher when psychological capital is strong.
3.8.5 Newcomer Proactivity as Moderator Time T2

This research by Ashord & Black (1996) generally indicates that proactivity is associated with positive adjustment, presumably because newcomers are actively engaging in and tailoring their own socialization. However, few studies have examined the association between newcomer proactivity and knowledge acquisition. We argue that proactive behavior facilitates learning because the individual is likely to probe on (1) precisely those topics about which he or she is unsure and (2) in a manner and pace with which he or she is comfortable. In actively engaging the context, the newcomer not only generates information about his or her tasks, coworkers, and so on, but may substantively modify the context to better suit his or her needs and preferences, thereby enhancing learning.

**Hypothesis H6a:** Newcomer proactivity moderates the relationship between psychological needs satisfaction and newcomers’ affective commitment such that affective commitment is higher when newcomer proactivity is high.

**Hypothesis H6b:** Newcomer proactivity moderates the relationship between psychological needs satisfaction and newcomers’ job performance such that job performance is higher when newcomer proactivity is high.

**Hypothesis H6c:** Newcomer proactivity moderates the relationship between psychological needs satisfaction and newcomers’ turnover intention such that turnover is lower when newcomer proactivity is high.
3.9 Measures

All the study variables were measured using self-reported responses. Following questionnaires were used for the collection of data.

3.9.1 Organizational Socialization

Institutionalized socialization was measured using the scale of Jones (1986). The respondents were asked how extensively they were exposed to socialization tactics during their first time on the job. This was measured by answering 30 questions. Which were categorized as context, content and social and studied by Perrot, Bauer & Roussel (2012). For example, “Experienced organizational members see advising or training newcomers as one of their main job responsibilities in this organization” and also “Almost all of my colleagues have been supportive of me personally.” Another item, “In the last six months, I have been extensively involved with other new recruits in common, job related training activities,” specifically implicating the time frame. In order to make it more generalizable to the study the words “in last six months” were replaced by “since I started this job”. However, previous research in organizational socialization literature has routinely removed items due to poor loadings and used a shorter version (e.g., Black & Ashford, 1995; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Kim et al., 2005; King & Sethi, 1998; Riordan, Weatherly, Vandenberg, & Self, 2001) or modified (e.g., Ashforth & Saks, 1996) version of Jones’ (1986) scale. To ensure better results, Cable and Parsons (2001) was followed, by using the highest loaded items for the Jones (1986) scale. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted to check the factor loadings of the items, as it was the first time this scale was used in a Pakistani working environment. In the end only 7 items were left which loaded on a single factor, as previously reported by Kim, Cable & Kim,
(2005) in their one-dimensional model. The seven items that were later used a single dimension were found to be having loadings greater than 0.6 in the original scale of Jones (1986).

3.9.2 Organizational Social Support (Supervisor)

This measure was developed by Oldham and Cummings (1996). It uses 12 items to describe employee perceptions of the extent to which they receive supervisory support (eight items) and are subject to a non-controlling supervisory approach (four items). When supervisors are supportive, they show concern for employees' feelings and needs; encourage them to voice their own concerns; provide positive, chiefly informational feedback; and facilitate employee skill development (Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989). When supervisors are controlling, they closely monitor employee behavior; make decisions without employee involvement; provide feedback in a controlling manner; and generally, pressure employees to think, feel, or behave in prescribed ways (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). Coefficient alpha for supportive supervision was .86. Alpha for non-controlling supervision was .67 (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). Exploratory factor analysis of the 12 items found two factors. The first factor was composed of the eight items that reflected supportive supervision. The second factor was composed of the remaining four items and reflected non-controlling supervision (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). Non-controlling supervision correlated positively with job complexity, employee creativity, and employee performance ratings. Supportive supervision correlated positively with job complexity, non-controlling supervision, and employee performance ratings. Supportive supervision correlated negatively with turnover intention (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). For the purpose of this research only 8 items of supportive supervision were taken into account. Sample Items included; (1) “My supervisor helps me solve
work-related problems”. (2) “My supervisor encourages me to develop new skills”. (3) “My supervisor keeps informed about how employees think and feel about things”. The reason of using the supportive supervision items was because of its high reliability proven in previous research.

3.9.3 Psychological Capital

The measure of Psychological Capital was the psychological capital questionnaire or PCQ (Luthans, Youssef et al., 2007). This PCQ draws from widely recognized published standardized measures for each of the positive constructs that make up Psychological Capital as follows: (1) hope (Snyder et al., 1996); (2) resiliency (Wagnild & Young, 1993); (3) optimism (Scheier & Carver, 1985); and (4) self-efficacy (Parker, 1998). The PCQ has demonstrated reliability and construct validity (Luthans, Avolio et al., 2007).

To reflect the state-like quality of Psychological Capital, the questions were framed to ask the participants how they felt “right now.” Further, questions were adapted to make the target context specific to the workplace. For example, 21 out of the 24 items contained the terms work, company, or job. The entire instrument can be found in Luthans, Youssef et al. (2007, pp. 237–238). Sample items include: “At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my work goals” (hope); “I can get through difficult times at work because I’ve experienced difficulty before” (resiliency); “I feel confident contacting people outside the company (e.g., suppliers, customers) to discuss problems” (self-efficacy); and “When things are uncertain for me at work I usually expect the best” (optimism). The current research used a shorter version of research model which is also know as
PCQ-12 item version or composed psychological Capital scale (CPC-12) (e.g. Lorenz, Beer, Putz & Heinitz, 2016).

3.9.4 Psychological Needs Satisfaction (Self Determination Theory)

An adapted version of the Basic Need Satisfaction at Work Scale (BNS-W; Deci et al., 2001) was used to assess need satisfaction. We chose to use an adapted rather than the original version as some of the original BNS-W items reflect the perception of need-supportive contextual aspects (e.g., “People at work tell me I’m good at my job”) rather than the psychological experience of need satisfaction itself. The removal of these problematic items was deemed necessary as these items might artificially inflate the relationship between job resources and basic need satisfaction. In total, 15 items (5 items for each of the three needs) were used to assess autonomy satisfaction (e.g., “I feel like I can pretty much be myself at work”), belongingness satisfaction (e.g., “People at work care about me”), and competence satisfaction (e.g., “I don’t feel very competent at work, reversed coded”). In line with SDT’s assumptions and previous research, the scree plot showed a strong drop in eigenvalue from the first (eigenvalue 4.67) to the second (eigenvalue 2.10) and third (eigenvalue 1.31) factor, which empirically justifies the use of a general need satisfaction scale. Due to the reported issues in factor analysis the psychological needs satisfaction was taken as a single dimension which after conducting CFA showed high loadings for four items.
3.9.5 Newcomer Proactivity

The seven proactive behaviors were assessed via Ashford and Black’s (1996) scale. The correlations between the seven subscales range from .25 to .53 (mean = .36). Whereas the literature on socialization tactics tacitly portrays newcomers as relatively passive recipients of organizational efforts and information, research on proactivity emphasizes the active role that newcomers often play in learning about—and possibly altering—their work context (Crant, 2000). Our study utilized Ashford and Black’s (1996) typology of proactive behaviors: information seeking, feedback seeking, job-change negotiating (i.e., trying to modify one’s tasks and others’ expectations), positive framing (i.e., attempting to see things in an optimistic way), general socializing (i.e., participating in social events), building a relationship with one’s boss, and networking. Just as studies of socialization tactics have tended to focus on the distal outcome of adjustment, so too have studies of newcomer proactive behavior (e.g., Ashford & Black, 1996; Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000). CFA was conducted to find out the highest loaded items and only those items which were having loadings greater than 0.6 were included as a single factor of newcomer proactivity.

3.9.6 Affective Commitment

These measures, developed by Meyer and Allen (1997), describe three types of organizational commitment. Affective commitment measures an employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Normative commitment reflects pressures on an employee to remain with an organization resulting from organizational socialization.
Continuance commitment refers to commitment associated with the costs that employees perceive are related to leaving the organization. These measures have also been applied to describe commitment to an occupation or profession by substituting the profession name in place of organization in the items (Coleman, Irving, & Cooper, 1999; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). Coefficient alpha values ranged from .77 to .88 for affective commitment (ACS), from .65 to .86 for normative commitment (NCS), and from .69 to .84 for continuance commitment (CCS) (Allen & Meyer, 1990a; Cohen, 1996, 1999; Cohen & Kirchmeyer, 1995; Hackett et al., 1994; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Irving, & Allen, 1998; Somers, 1995; Somers & Birnbaum, 1998). From this scale of Meyer and Allen (1997) Affective Commitment eight items were considered in this research. Sample questions include; (1) “I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it”. (2) “I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one”.

3.9.7 Job Performance

The seven Items scale by Williams & Anderson (1991) was used to measure supervisor-rated job performance. Sample item includes “this person adequately completes assigned duties”. Previous studies have reported that reliability of this measure was (0.85), however, the current study found the alpha (0.92) which is well above the threshold value.
3.10 Control Variables

Individual differences in demographic variables such as gender, age, experience, and qualification have been found to be associated with commonly studied dependent variables in Socialization research (Taormina, 1999). Information about these variables were, therefore, collected through self-reports and included in the study as control variables. In addition, one-way analysis of variance and post-hoc test was conducted to reveal any difference in groups of respondents.

3.11 Data Analysis

A total of 375 questionnaires were distributed at Time T1 to newcomers in different companies associated to the energy, banking, and telecom sectors of Pakistan with the same proportion to every sector. It was made sure that all the respondents were having their first job experience and were in their first months in the job. Each respondent was provided with a self-reported version of the survey. An identification number was assigned to identify the respondent and to pair it together with the time T2 version of the survey which was conducted after four months. For Time T1, 302 filled questionnaires came back with a response rate of 81%. This percentage only included the complete and useable surveys. After four months at time T2, a questionnaire was distributed to all the respondents who were taken under consideration after the T1 survey. This time, the response rate was 60% with respect to the total questionnaires distributed. So, at the end of T2, there were 225 responses that were taken under consideration for analysis.
The table given below shows an overview at the number of questionnaires distributed and the response rate division as per each sector, along with the total number of responses in the extreme right column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector / Industry</th>
<th>Energy Sector</th>
<th>Banking Sector</th>
<th>Telecom Sector</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Survey Distributed</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time T1 Responses / Response Rate</td>
<td>107 – 85%</td>
<td>98 – 78%</td>
<td>97 – 77%</td>
<td>302 – 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time T2 Responses / Response Rate</td>
<td>85 – 68%</td>
<td>76 – 61%</td>
<td>64 – 51%</td>
<td>225 – 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Used Survey</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.2** Questionnaires Distributed with Response Rate for T1, T2

Of the 225 participants, 72 (32%) were females showing an encouraging improved trend of female participation in working organizations. In previous studies, data collected from various organizations of Pakistan showed that the organizations in Pakistan have high male dominance, less than 15 percent women’s participation (Haq *et al.*, 2011; Raja *et al.*, 2004). The mean age is found as 27 years. Level of qualification is much encouraging as 80% of the respondents are having masters level education. Education levels ranged from bachelors to masters, with 20 percent of the respondents having bachelor’s degree and remaining 80 percent having at least two university level degrees.
CHAPTER 4

STUDY ONE (QUALITATIVE)

4.1 Qualitative Data

As detailed before the first step of this study is an exploratory qualitative research approach including in-depth, semi-structured, face-to-face interviews, employing CIT as the method used for data collection. This chapter is a presentation of the content analysis of the transcribed interviews of 34 newcomers out of which 17 were working in France and other 17 were working in Pakistan from different companies and mostly multinationals. All the newcomers were about to finish or had finished their internship. All respondents participating in this study were voluntarily participating and sharing their practical experiences at work in the early stages and their first experiences in the professional carrier. A complete description of their age, gender, experience, job status, title and organization are given in the appendix.

4.2 Qualitative Findings

Qualitative study findings include the results obtained by critical incident technique including narratives and content analysis and their classification into appropriate concepts (Flanagan, 1954). “A critical incident is one that makes a significant contribution, either positively or negatively, to an activity or phenomenon. Once the information is collected, information concerning incidents is
carefully scrutinized to identify data categories that summarize and describe the incidents” Grove, Fisk (1997). Following are sets of narratives that emphasize on the presence of a variable. The part of narrative in bold letters is the content of narrative which emphasizes the category under which it falls. First three narratives are made part of the chapter for explanation of the results whereas the detail of important narratives is given in appendix II.

4.2.1 Newcomer Experience

Given below is are narratives that discuss the experience of newcomers as they start their first job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer Experience</td>
<td>1. It was great. Had a great start with <strong>meeting new people</strong>. Then there was an HR meeting. <strong>Introduction to the company</strong>, regarding benefits and regulations. It was a little messy. I got all the passwords and all new stuff to take care about. (R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. My first day <strong>was an orientation</strong>. There were not many activities. I had to sign a long contract. Then they played a long video about coke and all what coke is doing and where ever they have plants. There was just me in that room. I would have liked if there were others to tell with the video. Then there was a small marketing team with three divisions the HR introduced me with all the marketing team heads. The good thing about the whole day was my <strong>integration with my team</strong>. (R1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. I was very well integrated in the company. What helped me was that I was not the only one in the company to start that day. It was me and three other interns to start together that day. So, they had a plan which was followed as a startup for our day. (R3)

As seen in the above situations that the observed behavior of the newcomers seems more positive and exciting. There were no instances where they were expecting less than what they were found. This showed a great deal of what a newcomer is expecting when he starts his first day at work. Many pointed out the initiatives taken by the company for welcoming them. But it seemed that in most of the incidents they were expecting a lot more, the way they answered to these questions was not like they were pleased with what was offered. While interviewing them it was noted that there was no sign of excitement while they answered this question. This concluded that there is an existence of high levels of expectation from a newcomer when it comes to their starting day at a new job. Further, it was seen that there was an effort shown by the company and in all the cases the company used at least some of organizational socialization tactic to engage the newcomers from the day one.

4.2.2 Organizational Socialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Well, in advance already my manager for a lot of access for me to different websites, databases already. As, it takes a lot of time in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Organizational Socialization**

beginning. We were all the newcomers and the company made a tour as it is a big company. (R12)

2. The first week was about the entire procedure how is everything done. What is the procedure of booking and order placement? The reason was to have an overview of what are the issues is selling coke even though coke has a good name. Then there was a casual meeting going on with the supply chain and other departments, but all was done casually as it was a lateral hiring, so nothing was much planned. (R28)

3. The first day we did not work. The boss took us with and made a round of the company. As it is a small company, so she showed us all around. There are not a lot of departments and she took us to all the department heads so that they can tell us about what the departments do. (R33)

The above incidents showed that the organizations used some short of socialization techniques for adjustment and facilitation purposes. There are enough instances found that showed planned organizational socialization tactics. But still every newcomer in the above given sample was facilitated with some way of social interaction, from icebreakers to a month full training schedule. This showed a positive nature of what organization is ready to do for a newcomer. As, the organizations were mixed so it was observed that organizations where there was a formal human resources department were more concerned for organizational socialization.
4.2.3 Challenges Faced by Newcomers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>1. Well, I must say the capability of managing internationally. It’s a global company and not a western company. We have a huge HR in Latin America from where you feel it is well managed. It has <strong>high values and cultural adoptions</strong> etc. (R7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. In the beginning I faced a big <strong>cultural clash</strong> as before I was working for a bank and was wearing a suit to go to the office. And now I was in the site area to the shops and it was a big shock I never thought it would be like this. I was having an idea, but it was different to be actually on this position. As I was working with really old people who were double my age and they were thinking to treat me like a kid but eventually I was at the same level due to my graduation that they did not had and at times I was to <strong>tell seniors what to do so this was the biggest difficulty in the beginning.</strong> (R23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. It was a French company and I had never worked in a French company. The other thing was that I have worked for a big company, but I have never worked for a small company like this. This company was establishing itself and there was still no good furniture and not much furnished with office equipment as well. So, the <strong>level of facilities was lower</strong> this was all different in the beginning. (R31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above narratives and critical incidents are in fact some of the challenges that newcomers were having in one way or the other. Some of the newcomers felt that as they were in for their first job experience it something, they have never done making it a new challenge. Some had slight job experience and were facing differences in terms of their new working environment. The challenges had all sorts of ranges from acceptance of culture to pay and salary issues which made them uncomfortable right from the start. In some instances, newcomers were not at all sure of their exact job in the beginning as the responsible was out station, so they were treated by another internee. This newcomer was not even sure if to take those orders seriously or not.

### 4.2.4 Organizational Social Support at Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Support at work</td>
<td>1. Yes, especially as I am working with a special tool and a special database which is not that user friendly. So, they helped me get used to it. They showed me some things but later I had some training on it for around three to four days. (R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. There was a big push and resistance in the beginning. I was part of the marketing campaign in the beginning where I had to visit a lot of shops to visit. To integrate I had to really push myself to get along but towards the end we became friends, and all went well later, with the immediate supervisor. (R4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The company members were very friendly. As it was a small company there were no much procedures as to who is to talk with whom or any restrictions and it was a free environment, so I could ask anyone about the things I dint knew in the beginning. (R17)

The above narratives and instances show a great sign of help from the co-workers. In detailed interviews it was also found that the insiders realizing the fact that the newcomer is in a situation where he / she can use some help most of them helps. This was a voluntary help which was done without any fear of responsibility and was totally out of the bounds of job description of the individual. While in some instances, newcomers mentioned the help from only the human resources as they were the first point of contact for them. This showed that newcomers were treated in a friendly in most of the situations while in others there were difficult times that they reported in few cases.

### 4.2.5 Supervisory Social Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>She is a nice person. She is very friendly. She is great, and I like her very much. She is very down to earth she is funny as well and she is so direct. It’s very comfortable to work with her. If she likes something or do not like something, she will just let you know. (R15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisory Social Support

2. The behavior of my boss was quite different. In the beginning it looked to me as if we will be working like colleagues because we were graduates from the same school in the same year, but later on it became quite different as he had joined a year earlier which made him my boss, so he wanted to show the bossy attitude. Initially was really disturbed by all this situation but later things went along but he made sure that he showed everyone that he is the boos on me and then I decided to let things go his way as he was my boss. (R27)

3. I cannot say he is a control freak, but he is control of everything and he is the owner of the company as well. At times he did not explain too well due to which we had some misunderstandings but I was about to understand him as he is too direct in what he was to say or what he wants from his employees. (R13)

The narratives and instances detailed in this section not only show how the supervisors play their role but in fact they also showed how important it is to be a helping and participative socializing agent. Their input and help were more appreciated, than all the other support at work combined. The above responses mention the helping behavior from supervisors in the beginning during the process of socialization. Even though there were instances, where newcomer faced difficulties in getting along with the supervisor and some felt ignored just because their supervisor was not paying much attention. All such points raise the use of organizational social support (supervisory) to be the most important element that can help newcomers. The support from the supervisor was considered as much more appreciated than that coming from other insiders.
### 4.2.6 Newcomer Psychological Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer Psychological</td>
<td>1. And in order to socialize it was my <em>own willingness</em> to get to know people around that really helped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>I <em>ask people</em> to overcome any difficulties in the beginning. I try to ask other people as well. I <em>make a tour</em> around the office as well to get to know more and more people. Besides all the challenges I was <em>confident</em> to make my way through. (R17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The key is to get along slowly and gradually <em>try to hang out</em> with them other than work and <em>become a friend</em> with them this is how it helped me to manage things better. I started having lunch with them and I <em>applied basic networking rules</em> to <em>get along</em> with this difficult time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to <em>get to know</em> more and more about people around me. And this is how I get out of the difficulties in the beginning. (R23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. There were two things that helped me in the beginning. One of them was that I was not alone there was another intern to begin with me. So, it helped a lot and the other thing was that the company was not too big, and the environment was very friendly, and it was all like a family working with each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Later, I started finding my way around and eventually I was comfortable enough to apply basic networking skills to find my way through. (R20)

Psychological capital is an important element long been under discussion by many researchers in organization psychology. The above-mentioned narrations not even showed the presence of a higher level of psychological capital in the newcomer but also showed their usage to help through the challenging times of the beginning.

4.2.7 Newcomer Proactivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer Proactivity</td>
<td>1. Yes, I plan, and I do a <strong>performance check</strong> on me. People tell me that I am very German on this part. I more or less <strong>plan all the week</strong> and I love to erase things I have done, and I am more a person <strong>who is planned</strong>. (R19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. In the beginning when I was in probationary period, I use to keep a <strong>good check on my performance</strong> but later on when my probationary period was over than my new boss was keeping a big performance check by himself, so dint had to do much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to <strong>negotiate</strong> few times. Especially when I had to make the procedure short for the advertisement equipment to be issued from store, I did a lot of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
negotiation. Other than that, I negotiated when my probationary period was increased and fought my case and justified my performance. (R17)

3. My boss gave me a lot of liberty, so I control myself. So, I try to keep a check on myself. So, I set goals for myself else I know I won’t be able to do things. I am good in negotiation.

I understood this networking when I came to France. (R12)

Newcomer proactivity was in one way or the other involved in most of the narratives showing a high concern for newcomers. They felt as if they were obliged to follow proactive behaviors as they are in a new organization and it is their first time working for an organization. For some cases the newcomers were given enough authority that could have been misused but instead was proactively executed. Showing how the newcomers made a change in their behavior due to their proactive nature.

Proactive behavior (signs of feedback seeking and follow-up seeking) helped the newcomer in retaining his job although it should have been done as per the procedure. Signs of newcomer trying his own adjustment mechanics to secure his job.
### 4.2.8 Psychological Need Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Satisfaction</td>
<td>1. It’s more me that <strong>made me autonomous</strong> but then it’s the company. You can feel that there is not much hierarchy in the company and you don’t have to follow blindly to your boss and everything. I think so that I am <strong>competent enough</strong> for the job but in the beginning, it was different. It was the time when my manager ….and I <strong>pass by many people</strong> who will like to ask me, “hey how is it going” this really <strong>makes me feel as I am part of this group</strong> and that they are really taking me along with them. This makes me feel <strong>that I really belong to this job</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I would <strong>like to make some changes if I am on my own</strong> and I am not <strong>reporting</strong> to the boss. As there was a long procedure to release advertising equipment which was in a store, I was in charge off. Yes, I think <strong>I was really competent enough</strong> for the job as there was nothing strategic to be done it took me a week to get to know all the work and slowly ……I had a <strong>few close friends at my work</strong> place there was a girl of my age and same education we had good friendship, but we just use to discuss some things other than work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. No I will be doing the things in the same manner and I <strong>will not take the decisions on my own</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think it was my boss who felt this that I can be autonomous in my job. And other then this I also think it was my competency which made me autonomous at work ..........I realized that they are trying to integrate me with themselves and they started asking about my weekend and other things and started helping with my work as they know I am knowing in the company.

Psychological Needs Satisfaction was an important proximal outcome that was considered in the qualitative study. The narratives in all the cases proved a high concern for psychological needs satisfaction for better distal outcomes. It was observed that newcomers in some situations felt unsatisfied psychological needs in the beginning which were latter on improved. The way they expressed the improvement was really encouraging and helped authenticate the presence of psychological needs satisfaction as a proximal outcome of organizational socialization. The respondents while narrating their response were at ease as if they felt really good while they were given attention in terms of their psychological needs satisfaction.

4.3 Conclusion

The objective of this study was to justify the theoretical research model proposed in chapter 3. This study proves its concerns by providing evidence that newcomers go through challenges as they first join the organization. Organizational socialization tactics are at times another challenge besides other work-related issues that they have to tackle, if the organization is not using appropriate socialization tactics. The experience newcomers go through in the beginning
determines their outcomes, along with their expectation from the organization. The major objective of this study was to introduce three theoretical perspectives in order to bring new understanding to the newcomer’s socialization. We propose that psychological needs satisfaction can be a mechanism through which organizations can produce better outcomes. While, psychological capital and newcomer proactivity are the factors that can influence the whole socialization process. As psychological needs satisfaction act as an energizer that can makes people to act (Deci and Ryan, 2000). Psychological needs satisfaction can act a driving force by which organizations can achieve better outcomes from newcomers. This concludes the qualitative study, that by combing psychological needs satisfaction along with psychological capital and newcomer proactivity there is a possibility of developing a new theoretical perspective for newcomers’ socialization.
CHAPTER No. 5

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS STUDY II

This chapter discusses the data analysis and results of the quantitative study (study II). This chapter presents a link between the results from descriptive statistics, data screening, confirmatory factor analysis and structural (SEM). It also includes interaction term and multigroup moderation results. The main objective of this study is to study the organizational socialization process of newcomers with respect to proximal and distal outcomes. Statistical software, SPSS 21 and Smart-PLS (V.3.2.7) were used for data analysis.

5.1 Analysis Technique

There were several techniques used to analyze the present date of newcomers. Initially, a process of data screening and data cleaning was conducted to deal with the missing values, removal of any given outliers and making data normal for further treatment. Following the initial data analysis another test known as the non-response bias was conducted. This test was necessary to identify differences between the responses of the participants and the time they took to fill in the responses. Afterwards, normally of the data was checked by the normality test. For the purpose of normalizing the data skewness and kurtosis was checked. Following the skewness and kurtosis the issues related to multicollinearity were taken into account. During the multicollinearity check it was made sure that the inflated results are deleted before going for further analysis. Furthermore, data related
to demographics was also analyzed by using frequency distribution and running one-way ANOVA for check for demographic influences.

5.2 Data Screening

As a first step just before getting started with the main data analysis, some initial tests were conducted which included missing value check, normality test, descriptive statistics, abnormal value check, multivariate test for outliers and test to check common method bias effect (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010).

5.2.1 Missing Value Analysis

The most important step to ensure the quality of data is the process of identification of missing values. These missing values reduce the ability to perform certain data analysis. The presence of data sets with missing data can cause trouble and can mislead results (Hair, et al., 2010). Therefore, it takes into consideration that before going for a rigorous data analysis there should a missing value analysis performed. So, the first step to data analysis is the missing value test to make the results more accurate.

There are several methods used to deal with issues relating to missing values. One common method used by researchers is through missing value imputation meaning, “last observation carried forward” (Molnar, Hutton, & Fergusson, 2008). The other method is known as the mean substitution method which involves replacing missing values with the mean of all remaining observations related to the same variable. By this method the research analysis can benefit from same sample
Another method proposed by Hair et al., (2010) suggests removing the missing values for data quality and authenticity.

The following table 5.1 and 5.2 show the missing values per case. Out of total 225 cases, 9 were missing for T1 and 12 were missing for T2. i.e. for T1 there were 3 cases with only one missing value whereas there were 4 cases with 2 missing values whereas only 2 cases had 3 missing values. While looking at details of missing values for T2 there were 12 missing values in the finalized data sets including 4 cases with one missing value, 5 cases with 2 missing values and 3 cases with 3 missing values in total. After the identification of all missing values they were treated by replacement of values though SPSS by choosing the option of mean substitutional method. Mean substitutional method is the most commonly used method for missing values. This method is useful when we are dealing with comparatively smaller number of missing values (Hair, et al., 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. 1 Missing values per case analysis T1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Missing values per case analysis T2

5.2.2 Aberrant Values

Values that do not fall under the given response category is known as the Aberrant Values. It can be any value generated because of clerical errors and mistakes of data entry. To analyze for unusual responses i.e., values falling outside the range of 1 to 7 (given range), in our data set, a new variable was created named as “aberrant” it computed all values, which were less than 1 and greater than 7. As data entry was checked and rechecked twice there was no evidence found for the aberrant value.
5.2.3 Outliers

In statistical data analysis, an outlier is an observation point that shows detachment from other observations. There can be different types of outliers such as, unengaged responses, univariate outliers and multivariate outliers. If a respondent answers the questionnaire with similar responses i.e. 3,3,3,3,3 or 5,5,5,5,5, the respondent is considered as unengaged (Gaskin, 2012). This is to be pointed out at the time of data entry. The researcher must be vigilant to find and eliminate all such responses. Therefore, it was ensured by careful examination of data set to detect all such responses. After the treatment of missing values, aberrant values and detection of unengaged responses, box plot in SPSS was used to identify extreme responses. These outliers are categorized as univariate outliers. Such responses can be highly distortive for results (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). These responses can be caused by data entry and coding error as well (Hair et al. 1998). For large data sets, such issues can be resolved by deleting the responses, but it is not possible if the data set is small. Appendix IV shows the box plot of univariate outliers which are very few in number. Gaskin (2016) proved that this issue of outliers is not affected to Likert scale responses. In the end multivariate outliers were checked by Mahala Nobis distance (appendix V).

5.3 Common Method Bias (CMB)

Common method bias simply refers to an amount of variance caused by measurement method rather than by the variables of study (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). Researchers must analyze CMB effect in their data set because using a similar method of measurement for both independent and dependent variables (Podsakoff et al., 2003), could potentially “threaten the validity of the conclusions about the relationships between measurers”
(Podsakoff, et al., 2003; p. 879). Generally, there are two major issues caused by common method bias for researchers:

1. Biases the estimates of the reliability and validity of a latent construct (e.g., Bagozzi, 1984, Baumgartner & Steenkamp, 2001; Cote & Buckley, 1987; MacKenzie & Podsakoff, 2012; Podsakoff et al., 2012; Williams et al., 2010).

2. Biases the estimates of the empirical relationships between constructs. Researchers (Baumgartner & Steenkamp, 2001; Cote & Buckley, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2003; Siemsen et al., 2010) have demonstrated that when method factors are not controlled, they can inflate or deflate (or have no effect on) the estimates of the relationship between two constructs.

Thus, to mitigate CMB effect in the data set, this study incorporated the following remedies Podsakoff et al., (2003).

5.4 Procedural Remedies

Following the recommendations of Podsakoff et al., (2003), we used the following procedural remedies was to minimize the CMB effect in the present data set.

5.4.1 Confidentiality

Each questionnaire was accompanied by with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the research and ensuring participants about confidentiality of their responses. For instance, it was mentioned in the cover letter that there was not right or wrong question and participants’ answers neither would be associated with their personalities nor be disclosed to anyone. Confidentiality of
participants’ responses in research can also reduce the likelihood of presentence of CMB effects (Podsakoff, et al., 2003).

5.5 Statistical Remedies

Along with the above mentioned procedural remedies to CMB, Podsakoff et al., (2003) also proposed the following statistical techniques to ensure the absence/minimization of CMB in a data set.

5.6 Priori Statistical Remedies

Podsakoff et al., (2003) proposed some that besides the procedural remedies there are some remedies that can be statistically tested and can provide help in reducing biases in the data. In the present research the structural remedies included ANOVA test for control variables, Skewness and Kurtosis were calculated as a normality test and multicollinearity test.

5.6.1 Control Variables

The respondents’ demographic information is acquired by several self-reported items that cover gender, age, educational qualification, work experience (date of joining) and their job nature. The reason of including these demographic variables was to explain the characteristic of respondents who were being surveyed (Shaughnessy et al., 2003; McIntyre, 2005). Moreover, individual
differences in demographic variables have also reported to be related with the criterion variables in previous studies of organizational behavior (Xie & Johns, 1995). One-way analysis of variance was applied to reveal any difference in groups of respondents for these variables, however, no significant factor was found to be used as control amongst the given demographics.

5.6.2 Assessment of normality

Assessment of normality is imperative as it is one of the elementary prerequisites of multivariate analysis (Hair et al., 2010). It is a critical step to ensure that powerful and effective inferences can be drawn from the data. Usually, to access the normality of data, Skewness and Kurtosis values for all variables were examined. The acceptable threshold statistical values (Z) for Skewness and Kurtosis are <3 and <8 respectively (Hair et al., 2010). The Skewness and Kurtosis values for all the variables followed the acceptable range of <3 and <8 respectively. As can be seen in table below, Skewness values range from -0.569 to -1.045. (Hair et al., 2010) Similarly, Kurtosis values range from -1.550 to -0.282 revealing that the variables are not excessively peaked. Thus, the values presented in table below verifies that the data comes from normal distribution. Assessment of normality is further discussed in structural equation modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excess Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Socialization</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Social Support</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>-0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Needs Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.400</td>
<td>-0.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3 Descriptive Statistics 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>Psychological Capital</th>
<th>Newcomer Proactivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.434</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>-0.417</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>-0.804</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.3 Assessment of Multicollinearity

Before conducting further analysis of the collected data, it was essential to check the level of multicollinearity among the variables used in the study. If the issue of multicollinearity exists among the independent variables, then the results may be false. Therefore, this issue cannot be ignored. Multicollinearity refers to the high degree of inter-correlations with in the independent variables. When the issue of multicollinearity is ignored then the major problem occurring is that the impact of each variable over estimates the overall change in the dependent variable. In reality the value of r² may be very low if the issue of multicollinearity is removed. The best way to deal with multicollinearity is that one of the variables is removed (Lei & Lomax, 2005).

According to Kline and Santor (1999), if the independent variable is showing correlation higher than 0.80, than there is potential multicollinearity issue. However, variance inflation factor (VIF) is suggested as a suitable test for multicollinearity (O’brien, 2007). In study two data satisfied both the conditions of multicollinearity. Data in the present study showed VIF less than 3, even though
there is evidence that VIF less than 10 is also an acceptable threshold (J.F. Hair et al., 1998). The table 5.4 below shows the threshold level for variance inflation factor (VIF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Threshold Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>VIF less than 3</td>
<td>No collinearity issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>VIF greater than 3</td>
<td>Potential collinearity issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>VIF less than 5</td>
<td>Very likely collinearity issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>VIF greater than 10</td>
<td>Definitely a collinearity issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.4** Threshold for variance inflation factor (VIF)

### 5.7 Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis of major variables has also been calculated. This has been done in order to find the values of overall mean and standard deviation for each and every variable that has been used in the current study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Socialization</td>
<td>5.078</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Social Support</td>
<td>3.402</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Needs Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.318</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>5.261</td>
<td>0.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>5.651</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer Proactivity</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.5** Descriptive Statistics 2

### 5.8 Factor Analysis

A statistical method used for describing variability among observed, correlated variables in terms of unobserved variables known as factors, is called factor analysis. For instance, it is possible that the variations reflected by six observed variables are mainly a reflection in two unobserved variables.

### 5.8.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is a statistical method used for instrument validation in social sciences (Lovett et al., 2012). EFA is used for exploring new latent factors which best correspond to the variable under consideration (Henson et al., 2009). EFA is helpful to reduce the number of variables and also helps merge the highly correlated variables. EFA is most effective to develop and validate new measurements (Gaskin, 2012).
5.8.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is the next step to EFA. In case of already existing constructs CFA can also be the first step in factor analysis. CFA is a step to confirm the factors structure extraction done in EFA. CFA is a statistical technique which confirms the relationship between latent variables and indicators or observed measures. One major object of performing CFA is to account for the covariation among the indicators (Brown & Moore, 2012). With comparison to EFA, a CFA is performed to confirm a theory. CFA is also a tool to confirm that the hypothesized model is a fit to data (Bandalos, 1996). CFA is also recommended as a tool for estimation of scale reliability (Raykov, 2001). CFA can also calculate the measurement invariance (Brown & Moore, 2012).

Structural Equation modeling (SEM) also known as equation modeling is a multivariate statistical analysis technique that can combine complex path models with latent variables (factors). An important issue linked to SEM is that of, appropriate sample size, for performing the analysis. There are various references that range from 150 (Anderson & Gerbing) to 200 (Weston & Gore Jr, 2006). While some suggest that even 5000 might not be an adequate sample for performing SEM (Li-Tze Hu at al., 1992). CFA was conducted to confirm each measurement model. However, after the confirmation of measurement model, the validation of model is the next step to confirm the model data fit. For confirmation of model fit many indices are used in research. However, there is no consensus on the use of indices (Ping Jr, 2004). Some important model fit indices include, CMIN /DF, Goodness of fit index (GFI), Adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) and standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMS), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). The table 5.6 presents the threshold levels of all indices of model fit.
Table 5. 6 Model Fit Indices with threshold levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Model Fit Index</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmatory Factor Analysis</td>
<td>X² / df</td>
<td>&lt; .30 good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90 good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90 good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90 good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI / NFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90 good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>&lt; .08 good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although, model fit present enough statistical justification for the appropriateness of the model. Yet, there are also concerns relating to reliability and validity of the constructs. Cronbach’s alpha serves as an appropriate measurement tool for reliability. To validate the internal and external consistency of the construct, convergent and discriminant validities are also measured. Table 5.7 presents the threshold levels of the reliability and validity measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Greater than .70 (good)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cronbach (1951)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composite Reliability (CR)</td>
<td>Greater than .90 (great)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nunnally &amp; Bernstein, (1994)</td>
<td>Greater than .70 (fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent</td>
<td>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</td>
<td>AVE greater than .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>(Linn, 2000; Stewart-Brown et al., 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 Reliability and Validity threshold criteria

5.9 Coefficient of determination (R-square)

R-square is statistical measurement tool to determine the closeness of data to the regression line. It is also known as the coefficient of determination, or coefficient of multiple determination for multiple regression models. R-square gives some information relating to goodness of fit of a model. An R-square value of 1 shows a perfect fit of data. The most common criteria used is the R-square of endogenous latent variables (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013). The value of R-square equal to 0.27 and above shows substantial relationship between the variables, while values less than 0.27 indicate a moderate relationship (Faul, Erdelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007).

5.9 Direct relationships

The first hypotheses H1a, b, c and H2a, b, c of the study were tested as direct relationships between organizational socialization and distal outcomes, organizational social support and distal outcome. Systematic model analysis of structural equation modeling was conducted to check the hypotheses.
Structural equation modeling helps the researcher in getting a detailed picture of the results. The hypotheses that have been developed in the light of underpinning theories and the reviewed literature have been accepted or rejected with justification. While evaluating the outer model, initially an examination of direct relationships was checked between independent variables (organizational socialization, organizational social support) and the dependent variable (newcomer job outcomes). The size of path coefficients was examined through PLS-SEM Algorithm. The sign of the path determined the nature of relationship and the direction of the relationship. After getting the path coefficient, PLS-SEM bootstrapping was calculated with the help of Smart PLS-3 to identify the significance of the relationship. The original number of cases was used i.e. 225. To conduct bootstrapping, 1,000 was used as bootstrapping samples (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013; Henseler, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2015).

In the first model the focus was placed on the analysis of direct relationship between the dependent variable (job outcomes such as affective commitment, job performance and turnover intention) and the independent variables (organizational socialization, organizational social support). The results of PLS-SEM direct relationships Algorithm are mentioned in the first three models, which shows the path coefficients. Likewise, the results of significance measured through direct relationships bootstrapping have been mentioned in the second diagram of respectively. The details of all the paths and their significance have been mentioned along in the table. After confirming the direct hypotheses, the mediating and moderating variable was introduced to examine the effects.
5.10 Measurement Models

5.10.1 Distal Outcomes

The first model that was considered for direct effect in this chapter. The blue circles on the left represent the independent variables (Organizational Socialization and Organizational Social Support) whereas the rectangles attaching to them in yellow are their predictors or items forming the independent variables. Even though organizational socialization is a second order construct, there are several suggestions of using it as a single product-of-sum indicator to reduce complexity in structural equation analysis (Robert A. Ping, 2002).

Inside the circle is the value of alpha to determine. The variables on the right are the dependent variables (newcomer job outcomes). The values between the blue variable and the rectangular item is the factor loading. Please note that the diagram 5.1 is the most refined form of the data collected and does not show the items having lower (less than .6) loading for each of the variables. In the data shown in the figure 5.1 the relationship of well behaving outcomes is only presented.
As shown in the values above most of the direct relationships are having significant effect and hence proving the direct relationships between the given variables.

On the basis of PLS-SEM algorithms that are mentioned in figure 5.1 a significance bootstrapping procedure was followed, as mentioned in figure 5.2 i.e. PLS-SEM Bootstrapping. The path coefficient of the independent variables and the dependent variable can also be seen in table 5.8 i.e. PLS Path coefficient. The measurement model was validated showing a goodness of model fit with the data. The model fit indices for the measurement model were as following: \( \chi^2 / df = 2.74 \), \( TLI / NLI = 0.952 \), \( SRMR = 0.0374 \). These are the only measures that Smart PLS contains for the goodness of fit for the model. Further, the results of bootstrapping reveal that the exogenous variables have an effect over the endogenous variables. The results of bootstrapping show that the
relationships between independent variables (organizational socialization, organizational social support) and the dependent variable (job performance and affective commitment) are significant.

With respect to the given hypothesis, the result suggests that there is a positive impact of organizational socialization on job outcomes affective commitment ($\beta = 2.8; \ t = 2.895; \ p = 0.004$) and job performance ($\beta = 3.7; \ t = 8.6; \ p = 0.001$); therefore,

**Hypothesis H1a:** Organizational socialization is positively related to newcomers’ affective commitment. (Accepted)

**Hypothesis H1b:** Organizational socialization is positively related to newcomers’ job performance. (Accepted)

**Hypothesis H1c:** Organizational socialization is negatively related to newcomers’ turnover intention. (Not Accepted)
The structural model revealed that organizational social support has a strong and significant relation with job outcomes i.e. affective commitment ($\beta = 2.7; t = 2.8; p = 0.045$) and job performance ($\beta = 3.1; t = 2.3; p = 0.001$); therefore,

**Hypothesis H2a:** Organizational social support is positively related to newcomers’ affective commitment. (Accepted)

**Hypothesis H2b:** Organizational social support is positively related to newcomers’ job performance. (Accepted)

**Hypothesis H2c:** Organizational social support is negatively related to newcomers’ turnover intention. (Not accepted)
Table 5.8 Path Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path Coefficients</th>
<th>Sample Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational socialization and affective commitment</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational socialization and turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.542</td>
<td>-0.525</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Socialization and job performance</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>8.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational social support and Affective commitment</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>2.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational social support and turnover intention</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational social support and job performance</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>2.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the hypothesis H1c related to the negative outcome (turnover intention) of organizational social support and organizational socialization showed “some-what” significant concern in case of organizational socialization where as it showed an insignificant effect for organizational social support. Hence, the hypothesis was not accepted as a whole dropping turnover intention from mediating effects.
5.10.2 Common Method Bias CMB

The occurrence of a VIF greater than 3.3 is proposed as an indication of pathological collinearity, and also as an indication that a model may be contaminated by common method bias. Therefore, if all [factor-level] VIFs resulting from a full collinearity test are equal to or lower than 3.3, the model can be considered free of common method bias (Kock, 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collinearity Statistics (VIF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_EF_CMT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_EF_CMT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_EF_CMT6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.9 Collinearity Statistics (VIF)

The first step in PLS-SEM analysis is the assessment of the measurement model 1 (outer model). The outer model deals with the measurement of the component, which determines how well the indicator (items) load theoretically and are associated with respective constructs. This initial step identifies the strength of the items towards the variable. In other words, analysis of the outer model confirms that the survey items measure the constructs they were designed to measure, ensuring that there is no issue of reliability and validity of the instrument. The factor loadings of all the constructs used in the study are mentioned in table below.

5.10.3 Factor Loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affective Commit.</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>Organizational Socialization</th>
<th>Organizational Social Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2_I2Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_I2Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_I2Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_JP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_JP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_JP4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS24</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_EF_CMT1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_EF_CMT3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_EF_CMT6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_I2Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_I2Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_I2Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_JP1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_JP3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2_JP4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.10 Factor Loading**
Reliability and validity are the two main criteria used in PLS-SEM analysis to evaluate the outer model (Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2016). The conclusion about the nature of the relationship among constructs (inner model) depends on the reliability and validity of the measures used in the study. After validating the constructs, using factor loadings which have shown acceptable results, the next step is to access the reliability of variables used in the study.

### Construct reliability and validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Socialization</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Social Support</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11 Construct reliability and validity

After ensuring the reliability of the scale, next important thing before running structural equation modeling was to ensure the convergent validity. Convergent validity refers to the extent to which measures of the same constructs that are theoretically related to each other are actually related with each other (Henseler, Ringle, & Sinkovics, 2009). Therefore, it would be right to say that convergent validity shows the degree of correlation among the measures of different items in the same construct (Hair et al., 2016).
With regards to identifying an element of convergence in the measurements of the construct, Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is used. The threshold level of 0.50 and above is considered as appropriate to ensure convergent validity (Hair et al., 2010; Hair et al., 2016). AVE value of 0.50 indicates adequate convergent validity of the constructs. In other words, latent construct explains half of the variance of its indicators and indicates adequate convergent validity (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013). Therefore, in this study, convergent validity was assessed by examining AVE values. Results in table above show that the AVE value of all the constructs exceed the threshold value of 0.50 (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013). The result reveals AVE values range from 0.516 to 0.752; hence it can be concluded that there is no issue of convergent validity in the data collected for the study.

5.11 Evaluation of PLS-SEM Results

In evaluation of PLS-SEM, the presentation of the results of factor loading are presented. As previously mentioned in methodology chapter, all the items were adapted from previous studies but still reliability and validity have been checked. The outer model implies the uni-dimensionality of the variables.

After checking and screening of data as described in the previous discussion, the next step is to assess the outer model and inner model (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013). PLS-SEM was used in this study to evaluate the outer model (measurement model) and the inner model (structural model). In other words, PLS-SEM was used to analyze the direct and mediating effects of the mediating variable (Psychological Need Satisfaction).
Before conducting the PLS-SEM analysis, there is a need to configure the model in a way that it will be clearly understood. To do this, indicators should be clarified to establish which formative indicators are, and which reflective indicators are. It is essential to note that model configuration is vital because approach used in testing reflective measurement model is quite different from approach used in testing formative measurement model (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013; Lowry & Gaskin, 2014).

5.12 Measurement Model (Mediator)

The figure above shows the mediated model with psychological need satisfaction as a mediator. As shown in the figure all the variables have loadings above 0.5 with all the given items loading superior to the threshold level.
Figure 5. 3 PLS Algorithm Mediated Relationships
Figure 5. 4 PLS-SEM Bootstrapping Mediated Relationships

The figure above is showing the T statistics which have a lower threshold of 1.9. All the items of variables presenting this model are having values way more than the threshold along with few relations showing significance of results. The table showing loadings for this model are not given since all the variables and their loadings have been presented before. The model fit indices for the measurement model were as following: (\(\chi^2 / df = 2.43\)), (TLI / NLI = 0.851), (SRMR=0.0340).

The table below shows that there is not a slight chance of multicollinearity as VIF is below the minimum level of 3.33 making this model a better fit with all the given assumptions. The table shows values item by item used in the model above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collinearity Statistics (VIF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS13 1.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS2 1.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS22 2.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS23 2.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS24 1.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS3 1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_OS4 1.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 SDT_A2 1.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 SDT_A4 1.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 SDT_A5 1.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 SDT_A6 1.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS2 1.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS4 1.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS5 1.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS6 1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1_SS8 1.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 EF_CMT1 2.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 EF_CMT3 2.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 EF_CMT6 2.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 I2Q2 2.567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the new feature of Smart PLS3 it has become much easier to calculate the mediating effects and check their specific indirect effects instead of combined indirect effect.

| Psychological Need Satisfaction as mediator between | Path Coefficient | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Organizational Socialization and Affective Commitment | 0.539            | 0.541          | 0.125                     | 2.440                    | 0.002    |
| Organizational Social Support and Affective Commitment | 0.221            | 0.028          | 0.010                     | 4.520                    | 0.034    |
| Organizational Socialization and Job Performance    | 0.275            | 0.279          | 0.057                     | 1.980                    | 0.009    |
| Organizational Social Support and Job Performance    | 0.445            | 0.447          | 0.081                     | 4.598                    | 0.029    |

Table 5.13 Indirect Effects
The above table shows the P values based on which we will accept or reject our mediated hypothesis. There was a mediating effect of psychological need satisfaction between organizational socialization and job performance and affective commitment. While, significance P value in the specific indirect effect also showed full mediating role of psychological need satisfaction between organizational social support and job performance along with affective commitment.

Hence the Hypothesis of mediation are proved as following:

**Hypothesis H3a:** Organizational socialization is positively related to newcomers’ affective commitment such that psychological needs satisfaction mediates the relationship. (Accepted)

**Hypothesis H3b:** Organizational Socialization is positively related to newcomers’ job performance such that psychological needs satisfaction mediates the relationship. (Accepted)

**Hypothesis H4a:** Organizational social support is positively related to newcomers’ affective commitment such that psychological needs satisfaction mediates the relationship. (Accepted)

**Hypothesis H4b:** Organizational social support is positively related to newcomers’ job performance such that Psychological Needs Satisfaction mediates the relationship. (Accepted)
5.13 Moderation test

In order to run the moderation test, the direct effects are first taken into consideration (moderator to dependent), followed by the main effects of the independent variable. Later on, the moderator effects are analyzed (Cornell, 1987). Therefore, moderation occurs if the interaction terms introduced show significant results (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013).

By following that above mentioned procedure, the results of interaction effects of psychological capital and newcomer proactivity have been shown in the figure 5.5 and 5.8. Bootstrapping was steered to convey significant level of each interaction term. The moderation effects tested whether or not the organizational socialization process can make use of psychological capital to strengthen the psychological needs satisfaction on one hand, and while on the other hand does newcomer proactivity play an effective role in attaining better socialization outcomes.

5.14 Moderation Effects of Psychological Capital (T1) and Proactivity (T2)

5.14.1. Psychological Capital as Time T1 Moderator
The model fit indices for the measurement model were as following: \( \chi^2 / df = 2.54 \), \( \text{TLI} / \text{NLI} = 0.745 \), \( \text{SRMR} = 0.0275 \). Findings revealed that psychological capital moderates the direct effects of organizational socialization and psychological need satisfaction \((\beta = 0.045, p < .01)\). The figure below describes the pattern of moderation, whereby, slope of psychological need satisfaction shows a gradual increase when psychological capital is high. Whereas, slope of
organizational socialization again shows a considerable uplift when psychological capital is high (see Figure below).

Figure 5.6 Psychological Capital strengthens the positive relationship between Organizational Socialization and Psychological Need Satisfaction.

Results discovered that psychological capital moderates the direct effects of organizational social support and psychological need satisfaction ($\beta = 0.92$, $p < .01$). The same procedure is again applied to measure the pattern that whether the interactions are in expected directions or not. Figure below describes the pattern of moderation, whereby, slope of psychological need satisfaction
shows a gradual increase when psychological capital is high. Whereas, slope of organizational social support again shows a considerable uplift when psychological capital is high (see Figure below).

Figure 5. 7 Psychological Capital strengthens the positive relationship between Org. Social Support and Psychological Need Satisfaction.

**Hypothesis H5a:** Psychological capital moderates the relationship between organizational socialization and newcomers’ psychological needs satisfaction such that need satisfaction is higher when psychological capital is strong. (Accepted)
**Hypothesis H5b:** Psychological capital moderates the relationship between organizational social support and newcomers’ psychological needs satisfaction such that need satisfaction is higher when psychological capital is strong. (Accepted)

### 5.14.2 Newcomer Proactivity as Time T2 Moderator

![Figure 5.8 PLS-SEM Bootstrapping Moderated (newcomer proactivity) Relationship](image-url)

*Figure 5.8 PLS-SEM Bootstrapping Moderated (newcomer proactivity) Relationship*
The model fit indices for the measurement model were as following: \( \frac{X^2}{df} = 2.45 \), \( \text{TLI} / \text{NLI} = 0.762 \), \( \text{SRMR} = 0.0351 \). Results discovered that Newcomer Proactivity moderates the direct effects of Psychological Need Satisfaction and affective commitment (\( \beta = 1.367, p < .01 \)). The same technique is again applied to measure the pattern that whether the interactions are in expected directions or not. Figure below describes the pattern of moderation. Whereas, slope of affective commitment again shows a considerable uplift when Newcomer Proactivity is high (see Figure below).

![Figure 5.9](image)

Figure 5.9 Proactive Behavior strengthens the positive relationship between Psychological Need Satisfaction and Affective Commitment.
Results discovered that Newcomer Proactivity moderates the direct effects of Psychological Need Satisfaction and Job Performance ($\beta = 0.349$, $p < .01$). The same technique is again applied to measure the pattern that whether the interactions are in expected directions or not. Figure below describes the pattern of moderation, whereby, slope of Job Performance shows a uplift when Newcomer Proactivity is high (see Figure below).

![Figure 5. Proactive Behavior strengthens the positive relationship between Psychological Need Satisfaction and Job Performance.](image)

Hence the Moderating hypotheses are accepted in all positive instances as reported below:

**Hypothesis H6a:** Newcomer proactivity moderates the relationship between psychological needs satisfaction and newcomers’ affective commitment such that affective commitment is higher when newcomer proactivity is high. (Accepted)
Hypothesis H6b: Newcomer proactivity moderates the relationship between psychological needs satisfaction and newcomers’ job performance such that job performance is higher when newcomer proactivity is high. (Accepted)

CHAPTER NO. 6

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

6.1 Theoretical Perspective

The purpose of this study was to understand the newcomer adjustment process and different challenges faced by newcomers during the socialization process. At first, a qualitative study conducted to comprehend the extent to which organizations apply socialization tactics and the supporting role of organizational insiders. Further, the qualitative study was to determine the presence of a new proximal outcome (motivational) for socialization process in order to increase newcomer adjustment process. This theoretical contribution resulted in determining the missing elements of motivation in the socialization process. Hence, following the results from the qualitative study using Critical Incident Technique (CIT), psychological need satisfaction, was added to the research model. Self-determination theory (SDT) has never been used as a proximal outcome in the socialization process before.

The second part of the research comprises of a quantitative research. In the qualitative study, newcomer psychological capital and pro-activity of newcomers is studied as potential moderators for the socialization process. Psychological Capital and proactive behavior of employees can help
newcomers throughout the organizational socialization process. This study was longitudinal, T1 and T2 were separated by four months. Newcomers of six private and semi-governmental organizations were contacted. Such type of studies for newcomers has never been done in Pakistan before, making it another contribution to literature and theory. As, the study two (quantitative) covers the major sectors in Pakistan hence it has a considerable amount of generalizability to at least those sectors if not more.

6.1.1 Newcomer Organizational Socialization Process

Newcomers are employees new to the environment and mostly trying to find their way with or without any support. The biggest challenge that newcomers are facing these days is the fact that they are treated as if they are alike. When in fact they have differences with respect to their background, experiences and even identities. Certainly, mostly the way newcomers behave to overcome their uncertainties is dependent on their past and previous learning (Jones, 1983). These past experiences also trigger the identities they indorse and their ability to indorse them. This results in shaping their level and quality of adjustment within an organization (Beyer & Hannah, 2002). So, besides the current market and changing technology trends it is important to keep in mind the background of the newcomer for successful adjustment. Newcomers and young professionals with some prior experience are more challenging to deal with as they seem to know their way better than ever before (Beyer & Hannah, 2002).

Organizational socialization is a critical and important process for the organizations as they have done a great deal of investment in terms of time and resources for hiring new employees. The time
and resources invested in the hiring process of an organization will be wasted if the socialization process fails to understand newcomers and cannot get them adjusted to their new jobs.

Organizational socialization tactics have been under research and study for many years and still happen to be an effective method of categorizing differences in the way organizations engage their newcomers (Bauer et al., 2007 and Saks et al. 2007). Socialization tactics are the most studied concepts in the socialization literature as mentioned by Saks et al. (1997). The present study has found a positive relationship between organizational socialization tactics and outcomes (affective commitment and job performance).

The present research tactics scale of Jones (1986) was preferred due to the reason of being the most authentic and oldest version of socialization tactics and when socialization research was found to have not been done before in a Pakistani context, we decided to use the basic version of Jones’ scale. Furthermore, it was found that the importance of both proximal and distal outcomes (Bauer et al.; 1998) is present if we talk about a two-way organizational socialization process i.e. organization to newcomer / newcomer to organization. The new generation and youth have been under a great influence of changing technology and information. And Pakistan being a nation where UNDP (2017) survey report shows young talent as a critical force in shaping the human development. The report further explains that education and information have made new talent aware of their strength.

### 6.1.2 Organizational Social Support

A member of the organization, or a socialization agent is a person who plays an extremely important role in the socialization of newcomers (Bauer, Morrison, & Callister, 1998).
Socialization agents are individuals who facilitate the newcomer through his / her initial adjustment stage. Socialization agents provide information, feedback, support and help (Klein & Heuser, 2008). Organizational Social Support is an important element of the socialization process as mentioned by Louis et al. (1983). According to Louis organizational insiders place a very valuable role during the socialization process. Targeted efforts by socializing agents and insiders can bring positive effects on socialization outcomes. The actions and support provided by a socializing agent was a voluntary action and was not part of any job description. Organizational social support was found to be helpful in satisfying psychological needs of the newcomers during the present study, where newcomers were facing many challenges during their initial management trainee assignment. Although the role of socializing agent as a support and insider has often been declared critical for newcomer adjustment and socialization (Saks & Gruman, 2012). This is one of the few studies that talk about the contribution of socialization agents.

Social support may vary in terms of their contribution, the information they provide, and the effect they have on proximal and distal socialization outcomes (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). Specifically, taking about the most challenging sector in the given research was the energy sector having a huge amount of responsibility and high demands from newcomers. While, other reason organizational social support acted as a socializing agent was due to the fact that the facilities and the working environment was totally different than the other sectors i.e. the banking and telecom sectors. This shows a great deal of organizational social support where organization insiders (supervisors) have gone out of their way to help new hires. As mentioned earlier supervisors are an important support and direct provider of required information during the organizational socialization process which makes them prime drivers of socialization process (Korte, 2009).
While talking about study two, it was found that organizational social support does have a strong impact on the positive job outcomes but showed no relevance to nullifying the effect of intention to quit the job. This might be due to the fact that the job market is facing such a point of saturation where it is already impossible to make your way to the management trainee position. So, the chances to think about any such negative intention were not in the mind of any newcomer. Further organizational social support proved to be a socializing agent as mentioned in previous research, for the fact that there was a mediating effect of both proximal (psychological need satisfaction) between organizational social support and distal (job performance and affective commitment).

6.1.3 Organizational Socialization and Distal outcomes

Organization socialization and its distal outcomes are not new to socialization research (Bauer, 2010). Distal outcomes are vital in studying the definitive outcomes of organizational socialization process. Distal outcomes are indicators of the degree to which newcomer’s organizational socialization matters to organization related outcomes, including job attitudes and newcomer behavior. The most common distal outcomes to date are attitudinal. The present research considered one attitudinal outcome (affective commitment) one newcomer behavior outcome (job performance) and a negative distal outcome (turnover intention).

Distal outcomes that relating to job attitudes either positive or negative showed similar outcome as earlier. These elements have been consistently studied in organizational socialization literature. This does make sense, as attitudes are inconstant yet understandable, relating it to how socialization effects, can help determine newcomes’ commitment and likelihood to leave their new organization (Chang and Jacobs, 2009; Maier and Brunstein, 2001; O’Reilly and Caldwell,
Research in socialization has often considered newcomers’ job performance as an important distal outcome in different organizations e.g. large high-tech organizations (Chen and Klimoski, 2003), study of nurses over 18 months (Molleman and Van der Vegt, 2007) and Bauer et al. (2007). Successful socialization must facilitate appropriate job related knowledge which intern results in higher job performance making newcomers successful in their new job.

6.1.4 Psychological Need Satisfaction as Proximal Outcome of Socialization Process

Being social animals, humans involve themselves in activities which they perform unknowingly with a personal urge and enjoyment, but which are in fact for their own good. Such behaviors performed by individuals are also for the good of the collective. In the field of developmental psychology, humans enter into a process that helps them learn the norms and behaviors necessary for existence in any given place and is known as internalization. From the above definition of internalization self-determination theory (SDT) having organismic nature changes the concept of socialization. According to this concept, socialization is not something that can be done to people and newcomers in fact it is a notion taken into consideration by the natural tendency of humans if the environment is supportive and nourishing (Deci, 1995; Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2008).

While talking about the socialization process proximal outcomes are the outcomes that are generated in a short span of time or right at the beginning of the socialization process. Mainly, proximal outcomes determine that how well a newcomer is adjusting to his / her new place within the organization. Proximal outcomes of the socialization process tend to be measured within the start of the adjustment process. Such as, organizational entry or within 3 – 4 months of hiring or until less than a year with the organization (Bauer et al. 1998). Proximal indicators also known to
be as adjustment or accommodation indicators are supposed to be captured by understanding the acceptable of newcomer (Bauer et al., 2007).

During study one (qualitative) there was reasonable evidence found by the critical incidents pointed, to determine psychological need satisfaction as a proximal outcome of the socialization process. When newcomers engage themselves in mastering their new environment, they have a feeling of achievement within themselves, resulting in satisfied psychological needs (Vallerand & Reid; 1984). Further, our outcomes (study one) showed that not only competence is required for triggering the motivational element, but they also wanted to have the feeling of being autonomous (Dysvik, Kuvaas & Gagne; 2013).

### 6.1.5 Psychological Capital as time one effect

Time span is extremely integral aspect of socialization process. The concept of fully socialized has been related to tenure by Ashforth et al. (2007). While socialization is a long-term process there can be improvements made to different psychological capacities that a newcomer holds. Luthans (2002a) mentioned such capacities as effectively manageable and evolving. Psychological capital is one major aspect in organizational socialization process that can help both employee and employer. Employees can use their psychological capital as a strength to overcome difficult new job situations and employers can trigger newcomers’ psychological capacities can help strengthen the socialization process. Making use of psychological capital in the beginning or socialization process can help newcomers achieve their psychological needs satisfaction.
6.1.6 Newcomer Proactivity as time two effect

Proactive Newcomers may vary their use of behavior over time. Some newcomers use a specific behavior before, and some after some time to have their desired outcome. For example, a newcomer may use a tactic early to gain social contacts and later might use another behavior to target more specific relationships at work. Similar results were seen in research done by Ashford (1986). She found that newcomers were giving less preference to their feedback with increase in tenure while still they gave same weightage to feedback seeking behavior. This behavior was seen and related to many other proactive behaviors and subsequently Ashford (1986) concluded that proactive behaviors have the tendency to vary over the entry period. For this reason, proactive behavior was chosen to be in time T2 instead of time T1 in the present research framework.

As in the present age of fast information and technology organizations are moving from production economies to knowledge economies and their information is their strength. In this situation proactive behaviors have become more important than ever before for employees generally (Grant & Ashford; 2008) and goes true for even the newcomers (Ashford & Black; 1996). Proactivity showed positive results as moderator between psychological need satisfaction and newcomer job outcomes showing similar results as Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg (2003) in terms of job performance and satisfaction. Finally, we conclude that proactive behavior of the newcomer keeps on growing and is maladaptive both for newcomers and organizations.
6.2 Managerial Implications

Recruitment is a process where companies are investing massively. There is still an ongoing debate about putting human resources as an expense in the general ledger. These issues are always in the mind of a human resource manager. Give, the present challenges and rapid change in the working environment, where the new generation is tough to satisfy in terms of the facilities and working surroundings. The present study found psychological need satisfaction an important element of socialization process. Managers should design the initial hiring process in such a way that they can determine the desired outcomes of newcomers. This can in turn help the managers design a better socialization process.

It is wise to say that when managers and organization are looking for outcomes (distal) in the beginning of the socialization process, there is a possibility of undesired outcomes. The present research proves that newcomers are ready to make use of their psychological capital in order to be more psychosocially satisfied of their needs.

Managers and supervisors also need to know how important their role as socialization agents can be during the whole socialization process. The present study proves that on job social support or organizational social support is a big contributor to the success of entire socialization process.

Newcomer proactivity is what managers expect from their newcomers the day they enter into the organization. Managers feel that if they are provided with a suitable working environment, employee should be proactive enough to make full use of it. While the present research and previous studies show that, proactivity is a time-consuming process that develops over time to develop enough, to obtain positive outcomes.
Newcomer Psychological capital is a strength that can be used by managers to combat challenging situations during the socialization process. Psychological capacities can be managed and used for generating synergy during the adjustment process.

In a conclusion, managers need to give importance on making a socialization process which is more specific than general and expects to psychologically satisfy the customers of the socialization process in initial stages. With the presence of a socializing agent newcomer socialization process can be affective in generating positive job outcomes.

### 6.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, research on organizational socialization has enough potential to give important information about newcomers for their better adjustment and settlement. It can help them become active and effective members of the organization. A successful and well executed organizational socialization program is important and vital component of an effective talent management strategy. Without a successful and well-executed program, newcomers will remain strangers in their organization and will keep on wondering aimless and not knowing about their surroundings. This will make their current job challenges much greater and their environment will be more uncertain and unfamiliar. Such a situation will result in poorly adjusted employees who may choose to leave the organization soon. We believe that if psychological need satisfaction provides a framework for a complete and integrated theory of organizational socialization that will also provide information to the organizations for future development of OS programs. This also tried to address the longstanding criticism on socialization literature that it is fragmented and lacks a coherent theory that integrates various socialization processes (Saks & Ashforth, 1997a). While inclusion of
psychological need satisfaction (SDT) is an attempt to show that when organization processes help provides the fulfilment of psychological needs a greater good can be expected for the organization in the long term.

Organizational socialization is a process that is in place for facilitating newcomer through their adjustment stages. The present study proves its importance. As we have seen that psychological capital proves to be a moderator in time one showing how well newcomers can make use of their psychological capitals once their psychological needs are in picture. The organizations should realize the fact that when they are expecting from newcomers to join in their roles as experts, they need to give newcomers the initial strength of psychological need satisfaction. This will boost the socialization process newcomer will also make use of the proactive behaviors they have learnt in a short time of around six months or so to achieve positive outcomes.

As a nut shell, the new era has made information at everyone’s reach. Newcomers have high demands and huge expectations from their new working place. Managers are expecting a rapid adjustment as they need more competing strength for the market challenges. To all these issues, the solution can be to design a socialization process is such a way that it can work its way through psychological satisfaction of newcomer basic need towards better job outcomes.

### 6.4 Limitations

Every research ever done has its time bounds and weaknesses. The reason to present these limitations is to help the reader understand what lies outside the research, this can help as a research guide for future researchers. The present research comprises of two studies and their limitations as separately discussed below.
6.4.1 Limitations of the Qualitative Study

The present study adds to the existing literature a new proximal outcome for the socialization process. However, there are some limitations alongside. As in the present research study one was conducted, with an adequate number of newcomer of interviews from customers. However, we could not conduct sufficient number of interviews from newcomers. Due to lack of resources the supervisors of the newcomers could not be contacted for their performance and evaluation.

Although the qualitative research was conducted through careful transcription and content analysis, there is still limitation based on the methodology used and the treatment of data. Currently, many researches use sophisticated software to analyze and treat qualitative data. Having said that, the approach used was interview based which itself is a limitation with respect to the variety of other qualitative approaches present.

6.4.2 Limitations of the Quantitative Study

The present research part II has a quantitative study which was conducted on newcomers from three different sectors. Two companies were selected from each sector which produced around 255 (refined) participants in Time 1 and Time 2 making a total response of 510. The choice of three sectors and two companies each is also one of the limitations of this research.

The data collected was although through self-administered questionnaires but was self-reported as well which could have been supervisory rated making it another limitation of the present research.
Although, the present research made careful and logical choice of variables which was to add some new insights to the existing socialization literature. Still, there can be no bounds in determining which socialization outcome to choose and which external and internal effect should be checked. This makes the present choice of variable another limitation of the present research as the choice of outcomes was limited to job performance, affective commitment and intention to quit.

Self-determination theory (psychological need satisfaction) was a major contribution in the research model as there was no evidence found of its link with socialization literature. Yet there exists a possibility of a variety of choices and theories that can be create a strong logical and theoretical link with organizational socialization. This makes the choice of existing theory as another limitation of the present research.

Due to the complexity and lengthiness of the present research framework data was collected was analyzed on the overall variable. Even though it was proved through previous literature that same variables were treated as combined before. Yet, it proves to be another limitation of the present research which if given more time produce multiple sub models and research frameworks to understand the socialization process through psychological need satisfaction in a better and more detailed manner.

6.5 Future Research Directions

Future research direction is a topic that is supposed to provide a brief direction and understanding for the readers, who want to continue doing research in this field of study. While doing a research project the researcher comes across a lot of literature and directions which worth importance but
may be not in the context of his / her present research. Such directions are always noted and kept for future research. One thing goes without saying that all the limitations discussed in the previous section of the chapter can also be treated as future research directions. Other than the limitations there are some other directions that should be taken into consideration when doing research in the field of socialization in general and organization socialization for newcomers in specific.

6.5.1 Socialization Resource Theory (SRT)

Resources are very important for people to cope with stressful situations. It can help them reduce or break their stress pattern and stop them from entering a burnout situation. Newcomers are entering a new world full of new situations, new surroundings and new challenges (Hobfoll, 2002). If there is no resource funding in time there might be a situation causing health issues (Elizur & Hirsh, 1999; Pakenham, & Rinaldis, 2001), family separation (Wang & Amato, 2000), early retirement or withdrawl behavior (Wang, Henkens, & Van Solinge, 2011).

Resources can help newcomers from unwanted circumstances and provide a coping ability (Bakker, van Veldhoven, & Xanthopoilou, 2010). Socialization Resource Theory is all about the different resources that can help strengthen the socialization process. Future research direction can be making a mix of socialization resources and finding out their effectivity for a successive socialization process.
6.5.2 Social Capital Theory (Social Networks)

Social capital theory is about the social networks a person has at the workplace and related resources. It includes different advices, knowledge, social credentials and influences. They all play an important role in learning the how to perform the job and to progress your career in the organization (Burt, 2005; Lin, 2001).

For future research, modeling changes in newcomers’ networks along with network resources and their development overtime is very important to study the whole process of newcomer socialization.

Another missing link in socialization literature is the transition process. Social networking can be overcome the initial issues of information need and feedback required. There is no study that discusses about the transition of a newcomer from an information and help seeker to a help provider. This can help study the complete socialization process where a newcomer has actually moved from being an outsider to an insider.

6.5.3 Newcomer Socialization as a Change Process

The present research showed concern for two major outcomes being affective commitment and job performance along with a well know negative outcome being turn over intention. Future research can focus on a variety of other concerns such as use of organizational socialization process to bring about an organization change. The entry of newcomers to a new working place also work as a stimulus of change in operations, structure and even the process, of how a group or organization operates. Organizational socialization can be a helpful tool in bringing a cultural
change in an organization. To date, there are very few studies who consider newcomers and their role as change initiators (Kane, Argote and Levine (2005); Hansen and Levine, 2009).
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Appendix I: Newcomer Socialization Questionnaire

Dear Respondent,

We would like to associate you to an international research on newcomer socialization, contrasting Europe and Asia. By answering this questionnaire, you can participate to knowledge development in the scientific discipline of Organizational Behavior.

The process respects the deontology of CERGAM, the research center of Aix-Marseille Graduate School of Management (IAE), France. All information obtained in connection with this study will remain highly confidential. In any written report or publication, no one will be identified and only aggregate data will be presented.

There are no “tricky” questions, so please answer each item as frankly and honestly as possible. It is important that all questions be answered.

We greatly appreciate your help and thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Delphine LACAZE

Professor of HRM, Aix-Marseille School of Management (IAE)

Member of CERGAM research center

Saqib ILYAS

PhD Student working under the direction of Delphine LACAZE, Aix-Marseille School of Management (IAE)

Email: delphine.lacaze@iae-aix.com; saqib.ilyas@iae-aix.com
The Following statements concern your first times in the organization in which you work. Indicate your level of agreement or disagreement as in the following example.

If you think you “somewhat agree” with the statement circle as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I have been through a set of training experiences which are specifically designed to give newcomers a thorough knowledge of job-related skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
2. During my training for this job I was normally physically apart from regular organizational members. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
3. I did not perform any of my normal job responsibilities until I was thoroughly familiar with departmental procedures and work methods. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
4. Much of my job knowledge has been acquired informally on a trial and error basis. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
5. I have been very aware that I am seen as "learning the ropes" in this organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
6. I have been made to feel that my skills and abilities are very important in this organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
7. Almost all of my colleagues have been supportive of me personally. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
8. I had to change my attitudes and values to be accepted in this organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
9. My colleagues have gone out of their way to help me adjust to this organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
10. I feel that experienced organizational members have held me at a distance until I conform to their expectations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
11. Experienced organizational members see advising or training newcomers as one of their main job responsibilities in this organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
12. I gained a clear understanding of my role in this organization from observing my senior colleagues. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
13. I received little guidance from experienced organizational members as to how I should perform my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
14. I had little or no access to people who have previously performed my role in this organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
15. I have been generally left alone to discover what my role should be in this organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
16. I have been extensively involved with other new recruits in common, job related training activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
17. This organization puts all newcomers through the same set of learning experiences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
18. There is a clear pattern in the way one role leads to another or one job assignment leads to another in this organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
19. The steps in the career ladder are clearly specified in this organization. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
20. I can predict my future career path in this organization by observing other people’s experiences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
21. The way in which my progress through this organization will follow a fixed timetable of events has been clearly communicated to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
Indicate to which extent you agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My supervisor helps me solve work-related problems.
2. My supervisor encourages me to develop new skills.
3. My supervisor keeps informed about how employees think and feel about things.
4. My supervisor encourages employees to participate in important decisions.
5. My supervisor praises good work.
6. My supervisor encourages employees to speak up when they disagree with a decision.
7. My supervisor refuses to explain his or her actions.
8. My supervisor rewards me for good performance.

This part of the questionnaire asks you to describe your job, as objectively as you can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very inaccurate</th>
<th>Mostly inaccurate</th>
<th>Slightly inaccurate</th>
<th>uncertain</th>
<th>Slightly accurate</th>
<th>Mostly accurate</th>
<th>Very accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My job permits me to decide on my own how to go about doing the job.
2. The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.
3. The job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.

Using the following scales, indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel like I can be myself at my job.
2. At work, I often feel like I have to follow other people’s commands.
3. If I could choose, I would do things at work differently.
4. The tasks I have to do at work are in line with what I really want to do.
5. I feel free to do my job the way I think it could best be done.
6. In my job, I feel forced to do things I do not want to do.
The following statements concern the way you feel in your current job. Circle your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution
2. I feel confident in representing my work area in meetings with management.
3. I feel confident contributing to discussions about the organization’s strategy
4. I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area
5. I feel confident contacting people outside the organization (e.g., suppliers, customers) to discuss problems.
6. I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues.
7. If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it.
8. At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my work goals.
9. There are lots of ways around any problem.
10. Right now I see myself as being pretty successful at work.
11. I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals.
12. At this time, I am meeting the work goals that I have set for myself.
13. When I have a setback at work, I have trouble recovering from it, moving on.
I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work.

I can be “on my own,” so to speak, at work if I have to.

I usually take stressful things at work in stride.

I can get through difficult times at work because I’ve experienced difficulty before.

I feel I can handle many things at a time at this job.

When things are uncertain for me at work, I usually expect the best.

If something can go wrong for me work-wise, it will.

I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job.

I’m optimistic about what will happen to me in the future as it pertains to work.

In this job, things never work out the way I want them to.

I approach this job as if “every cloud has a silver lining.”

I sought feedback on my performance after assignments.

I solicit critiques from my boss.

I sought out feedback on my performance during assignments.

I ask for my boss’s opinion on my work.

I negotiate with others (including my Supervisor and / or coworkers) about desirable job changes.

I negotiate with others (including my Supervisor and / or coworkers) about my task assignments.

I negotiate with other (including my Supervisor and / or coworkers) about the demands placed on me.

I negotiate with other (including my Supervisor and / or coworkers) about the expectations of me.

I try to see my situation as an opportunity rather than a threat.

I Try to look on the bright side of things.

I try to see my situation as a challenge rather than a problem.

I participate in social office events to meet people (i.e. parties, softball team, outings, clubs, and lunches).

I attend company social gatherings.

I attend office parties.
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

Use the following statements to indicate your level of agreement and disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I often think about quitting this job.  
2. Next year, I will probably look for a new job outside this organization.  
3. Lately, I have taken interest in job offers in the newspaper.

Use the following statements to indicate your level of agreement and disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I would be happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.  
2. I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it.  
3. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.  
4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.  
5. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization.  
6. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization.  
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me.
The following questions concern your evaluation of your own performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My quality of work is much higher than average. 
2. The quality of my work in much higher than average. 
3. My efficiency is much higher than average. 
4. My standards of work quality are much higher than the formal standards of this job. 
5. I strive for higher quality work than required. 
6. I uphold highest professional standards. 
7. My ability to perform core job tasks is much higher than average. 
8. My judgment when performing core job tasks is much higher than average. 
9. My accuracy when performing core job tasks is much higher than average. 
10. My job knowledge with reference to core job tasks is much higher than average. 
11. My creativity when performing core job tasks is much higher than average.

Email Address: ___________________@______________________

Name of Organization: ____________________________________

Job Title: ______________________________________________

Date of entry in the organization: _________________________

Gender: 

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female

Level of Education: 

- [ ] PhD
- [ ] Masters
- [ ] Bachelor
- [ ] Matric
Appendix II: Qualitative Narrations

This section includes the detail of how the data was transcribed and how the important critical incidents were pointed out. According to Flanagan, (1954) critical incident technique is “a set of procedures for collecting direct observations of human behavior in such a way that their potential usefulness in solving practical problems and developing broad psychological principles” (p. 347). During the study there were 34 interviews done from the Pakistani and the French newcomers.

The procedure involved was a collection of narratives through an interview guide, content analysis was carried out and later the behavior was determined on the basis of the observations made (Flanagan, 1954). According to Grove & Fisk, 1997, “A critical incident is one that makes a significant contribution, either positively or negatively, to an action or phenomenon. Once collected, information concerning incidents is carefully scrutinized to identify their categories and incidents” (p. 67). So, in the given study the data was collected through interviews. The data was divided into useable critical incidents while going to transcription. This data was than used to further gain in sites regarding the factors effects the phenomenon (S. Walker & Truly, 1992).

Following is a detail of narrative and incident tables where every category has at least ten selective incidents that were reported by the newcomer. The number R was used for the number assigned to the respondent. The narratives include both the French and the Pakistani sample. Some selective narrations were later made part of the study and detailed in further detail. The categories were made in line with the literature review and already proposed research model. The main purpose of this study was to further strengthen the research frame work.
# Newcomer Experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>It was great. Had a great start with <strong>meeting new people</strong>. Then there was an HR meeting. <strong>Introduction to the company</strong>, regarding benefits and regulations. It was a little messy. I got all the passwords and all new stuff to take care about. (R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My first day <strong>was an orientation</strong>. There were not many activities. I had to sign a long contract. Then they played a long video about coke and all what coke is doing and where ever they have plants. There was just me in that room I would have liked if there were others to tell with the video. Then there was a small marketing team with three divisions the HR introduced me with all the marketing team heads. The good thing about the whole day was my <strong>integration with my team</strong>. (R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I was very <strong>well acquired</strong> in the company. What helped me was that I was not the only one in the company to stat that day. It was me and three other interns to start together that day. So, <strong>they had a plan</strong> which was followed as a startup for our day. (R3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>OK, So my first day in the internship. I just arrived in the open space because it was an open space company like one in the same area. So, I arrived with my team we were like 10 people. They asked me to put down one assistant. May be, 30 min after the one of the managers, not the top manager but she had the responsibility to <strong>walk me through the company</strong>. So, we went to the open space to show me all the different departments. Like audition, data, accounting. She brought me all over and it took 20 min to present me all around. Actually, my top manager was on vacations so other people who were not my managers’, so they were taking care of me and <strong>tried to explain me the things</strong>. (R7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My first day at work was not that much hectic. I was told about lots of things. They made me <strong>meet the staff</strong> and <strong>shown around</strong> it was not that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
planned nothing much as it is a small college and human resource procedures are not that much planned and organized. (R9)

6. Yes, it was a good day. I joined on 13th August and there were Independence Day celebrations going on in the office, filled with decorations and flags. We met all the departmental heads and had an icebreaking session. (R12)

7. May first day at work was really very good. All the staff of my company was really welcoming. Yes! I do remember the warm welcome of my director and head of Human Resource Dept. (R13)

8. First day at school was really good. Everyone over there was really cooperative and enthusiastic. Everything at school was so good which attracts you to come and teach there. Beautiful classes, little kids, creative art everything motivate me. The environment was really welcoming. (R25)

9. It was a different kind of a day. I was so stressed because it was my first day at job ever. In regard to performance level my day was quite good. It was more related to orientation of the company and its policies were also shared. (R17)

10. I was quite excited at my first day and at the same time I was confused too as it was my first day of job ever. Overall day went well. I met with my colleagues and other department fellows. I came to know about my job description and rules and regulations of the organization. (R27)

As seen in the above ten situations that the observed behavior of the newcomers seems more positive and exciting. There were no instances where they were expecting less than what they were found. This showed a great deal of what a newcomer is expecting when he starts his first day at work. Many pointed out the initiatives taken by the company for welcoming them. But it seemed that in most of the incidents they were expecting a lot more, the way they answered to these questions was not like they were pleased with what was offered. While interviewing them it was
noted that there was no sign of excitement while they answered this question. This concluded that there is an existence of high levels of expectation from a newcomer when it comes to their starting day at a new job.

**Organizational Socialization:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Well, In advance <strong>already my manager for a lot of access</strong> for me to different websites, databases already. As, it takes a lot of time in the beginning. We were all the newcomers and the <strong>company made a tour</strong> as it is a big company. (R12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The first week was about the entire procedure how is everything done. What is the procedure of booking and order placement? The reason was to have an overview of what are the issues is selling coke even though coke has a good name. Then there was a <strong>casual meeting</strong> going on with the supply chain and other departments, but all was done casually as it was a lateral hiring, so <strong>nothing was much planned.</strong> (R28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The first day we did not work. The <strong>boss took us with and made a round of the company.</strong> As it is a small company, so she showed us all around. There are not a lot of departments and she took us to all the department heads so that they can tell us about what the departments do. (R33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. May be, I forgot to talk about the HR. I also got one internship with the HR she was also an internee for the internships. She gave me the security batch and <strong>discussed the procedures.</strong> I had an informal interview with her. She <strong>presented a lot of general points.</strong> They also gave me a book a buyer asks to do. It was reading manual to read before I start my job. In the beginning they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
explained everything but then there was a book. They gave me a fake contractor and **wanted me to learn in a training environment**, but I think I learned more when I did some mistake for the real job. (R12)

5. Company called me and the other people who joined as MTOs on 13th August so that we can be a part of the Independence Day celebrations. All the **GMs met us in the board room** and we had **an ice breaking session** in order **to know a bit about the company and its team members.** (R7)

6. They have introduced me to each and every department in the very first hour during **a brief orientation**. At the end of the first day I knew about every single employee working in the company along with the details of their dept. and designation. (R21)

7. They gave us **an orientation** about what will going to have over there. A **mentor assists us** who tells us about our duties and what are the things and tasks they do in the school. They explain us our duties and responsibilities and that’s why we are getting training for. (R19)

8. They facilitate me with **one-month training program**. In training sessions, they taught me about software learning moreover their policies and KPI’s as well. (R11)

9. I was **assigned a mentor** who let me take to the multiple departments and tell me about their working, how they work, in order to know about the organization mentor, **tell me about their brands** and how they are managing it. (R9)

10. As it was a small organization there was not much done by the organization but still there was an **introduction with the existing faculty.** I started discussing things and they started discussions felt more like an **integration session**, it was not organized but it just happened as few people I felt were really like minded. (R8)

The above incidents showed that the organizations used some short of socialization techniques for adjustment and facilitation purpose. There are less instances found that showed planned
organizational socialization tactics. But still every newcomer is the above given incidents came up with some way of social interaction, from icebreakers to a month full training schedule. This showed a positive nature of what organization is ready to do for a newcomer. As, the organizations were mixed so it was observed that organizations where there was a formal and complete human resources department there were more formal practices than others.

Challenges Faced by Newcomers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>1. Well, I must say the capability of managing internationally. It’s a global company and not a western company. We have a huge HR in Latin America from where you feel it is well managed. It has high values and cultural adoptions etc. (R7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. In the beginning I faced a big cultural clash as before I was working for a bank and was wearing a suit to go to the office. And now I was in the site area to the shops and it was a big shock I never thought it would be like this. I was having an idea, but it was different to be actually on this position. As I was working with really old people who were double my age and they were thinking to treat me like a kid but eventually I was at the same level due to my graduation that they dint had and at times I was to tell seniors what to do so this was the biggest difficulty in the beginning. (R23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. It was a French company and I had never worked in a French company. The other thing was that I have worked for a big company, but I have never worked for a small company like this. This company was establishing itself and there was still no good furniture and not much furnished with office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>equipment as well. So, the <strong>level of facilities was lower</strong> this was all different in the beginning. (R31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>All the people were like joking. It was an open space and was a tourism company. In the beginning I was of the view that everyone was happy to work but later when you talk with people and talk about the company to get to know for instance that some are not happy because of the salary for instance and you learn a lot of stories about the company. Even with the commission it was <strong>not good pay</strong>. (R19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>It was <strong>friendly and welcoming atmosphere</strong> plus very less work burden for the starting. It was comfortable as if there was a period we were allowed to ease our self before we can actually start our full workload. (R7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>It was my first job, so it was a totally new experience for me to practically perform and handle work. I got use to it but in the beginning every day was another challenge and <strong>to learn everything about the job</strong>, as the <strong>information flow was more</strong> I could have handled. (R5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Basically, the <strong>environment</strong> for the early years is <strong>completely different</strong> as compare to other schools. This was the <strong>big difference</strong> which I notice. (R12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>For me I must say it was my first ever job, so I think on the initial level it was <strong>really difficult</strong> for me as I don’t <strong>know about the policies</strong> and don’t know that how to handle some particular situations. That’s why my initial time in company was little bit tough. (R22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>When I joined the organization, I wasn’t expecting that <strong>people were so supportive</strong>. As I told you earlier I don’t have my departmental colleagues and I am the only person in regional office Lahore. But people from IT and other departments explain me each and everything. They helped me out in different situations and guide me to whom should I consult for some specific issues. The major challenge was to <strong>meet the expectations</strong>. (R24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The company was a small one so there were not too many difficulties I faced in the first times but still the pattern of work was new for me. The process and <strong>record maintaining</strong> in a given specific format was another challenge which was <strong>not properly guided</strong>. (R14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above narratives and critical incidents are in fact some of the challenges that newcomers were having in one way or the other. Some of the newcomers felt that as they were in for their first job experience it something they have never done making it a new challenge. Some had slight job experience and were facing differences in terms of their new working environment. The challenges had all sorts of ranges from acceptance of culture to pay and salary issues which made them uncomfortable right from the start. In some instances, newcomers were not at all sure of their exact job in the beginning as the responsible was out station, so they were treated by another internee. This newcomer was not even sure if to take those orders seriously or not.

Social Support at Work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Yes, especially as I am working with a special tool and a special database which is not that user friendly. So, they helped me get used to it. They showed me some things but later I had some training on it for around three to four days. (R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. There was a big push and resistance in the beginning. I was part of the marketing campaign in the beginning where I had to visit a lot of shops to visit. To integrate I had to really push myself to get along but towards the end we became friends, and all went well later, with the immediate supervisor. (R4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support at work</td>
<td>3. The company members were very friendly. As it was a small company there were no much procedures as to who is to talk with whom or any restrictions and it was a free environment, so I could ask anyone about the things I dint knew in the beginning. (R17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Yes, all the <strong>employees and co-workers were helping</strong> as my manager was not there so everyone was happy to help me. Even than I had some issues. (R21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Yes, an <strong>HR coordinator helped</strong> us and introduced us with all the relevant departments. (R8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Yes, my <strong>co-workers helped me</strong> a lot during the training week to develop the best understanding for each and every responsibility of mine. (R32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Staff members were very cooperative.</strong> They told us all the things and answers all our queries. They make us feel comfortable in the environment. (R29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Yes, my all <strong>senior members provide me the training</strong> and valuable suggestions, and whenever I need some sort of help they were always there for me. (R34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Somehow no, as my boss was in Karachi and I joined in Lahore office. I didn’t get any <strong>direct help from my colleagues</strong> as I am working in customer development department and I don’t have colleagues from my department because I was the only person in this department. I have to come with my own solutions whenever I was facing some sort of job-related issue. For any kind of situations, I used to call my boss and discuss the issues. (R21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Yes, there was a feel of <strong>some helpful co-workers</strong>. They told me that I can always ask them for any new planning I will be making for the students. They also proposed to share their notes and told me how the procedure and administration works. (R30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above narratives and instances show a great sign of help from the co-workers. In detailed interviews it was also found that the insiders realizing the fact that the newcomer is in a situation where he / she can use some help most of them helps. This was a voluntary help which was done without any fear of responsibility and was totally out of the bounds of job description of the
individual. While in some instances, newcomers mentioned the help from only the human resources as they were the first point of contact for them. This showed that newcomers were treated in a friendly in most of the situations while in others there were difficult times that they reported in few cases.

**Supervisory Social Support:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. She is a nice person. She is very friendly. She is great, and I like her very much. She is very down to earth she is funny as well and she is so direct. It’s <strong>very comfortable to work with her.</strong> If she likes something or do not like something she will just let you know. (R15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Social Support</td>
<td>2. The behavior of my boss was quite different. In the beginning it looked to me as if we will be <strong>working like colleagues</strong> because we were graduates from the same school in the same year, but later on it became quite different as he had joined a year earlier which made him my boss, so he wanted to <strong>show the bossy attitude.</strong> Initially was really disturbed by all this situation but later things went along but he made sure that he showed everyone that he is the boos on me and then I decided to let things go his way as he was my boss. (R27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I cannot say he is a <strong>control freak</strong>, but he is control of everything and he is the owner of the company as well. At times he did not explain too well due to which we had some misunderstandings but I was about to understand him as he is <strong>too direct</strong> in what he was to say or what he wants from his employees. (R13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Three weeks when he came back he proposed me to become a buyer for Germany and Austria. So, I was really happy that he gave me the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
responsibility. I was really happy that he knows what I am doing. It was a kind of appreciation for me. Three months later I realized that the responsibility he gave me of the two regions they were really having small market share and they were not at all important for my boss. Then I was all the time wondering that does he really look at what I am doing and the work I am submitting to him. He really does not care about this region as he was the manager of Europe region. Then every Monday we have meeting … (R3)

5. Yes, it was **helping and encouraging**. But at the same time there was a lot to more than just help. For me the **supervisor is a person who matter** a lot as he is my immediate boss. So, if there is even a slight harsh comment it used to distract me for days. (R19)

6. Yes, she is very **encouraging and helping lady**. And at the same time, she was busy with lot of activities but still I use to have my feedback. It was not that easy to get help from her. (R24)

7. No doubt my **mentor has all these qualities**. She is really **talented and cooperative** in every manner. She is always trying to help me out in difficult situations. (R8)

8. The environment is really very supportive as they **promote you to take decisions** on your own. They really appreciate your own judgment. (R32)

9. My **boss is quite supportive** throughout my working. But in some situations, I feel she is giving me a push back like many times we get hard times from her and she is asking us to interpret the things overnight. Like at 10pm she’s calling me and asking me to make a presentation and I have to deliver it in short time. Overall my experience with my supervisor is really healthy and she is quite friendly with us. (R28)

10. My boss / head of department was a **nice person he was helpful at times** but showed less interest in what we had to listen, than what he had to say. SO, **at times it was troublesome** to explain things to him. Even though there were people around to help but the strength he used to give being the head was really what was required at crucial times. (R22)
The narratives and instances detailed in this section not only show how the supervisors play their role but in fact they also showed how important it is to be a helping and participative socializing agent. Their input and help were more appreciated, than all the other support at work combined. The above responses mention the helping behavior from supervisors in the beginning during the process of socialization. Even though there were instances, where newcomer faced difficulties in getting along with the supervisor and some felt ignored just because their supervisor was not paying much attention. All such points raise the use of organizational social support (supervisory) to be the most important element that can help newcomers. The support from the supervisor was considered as much more appreciated than that coming from other insiders.

**Newcomer Psychological Capital:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. And in order to socialize it was my *own willingness* to get to know people around that really helped.  
I *ask people* to overcome any difficulties in the beginning. I try to ask other people as well. I *make a tour* around the office as well to get to know more and more people. Besides all the challenges I was *confident* to make my way through. (R17) |
| 2. The key is to get along slowly and gradually *try to hang out* with them other than work and *become a friend* with them this is how it helped me to manage things better. I started having lunch with them and I *applied basic networking rules* to *get along* with this difficult time.  
I tried to *get to know* more and more about people around me. And this is how I get out of the difficulties in the beginning. (R23) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newcomer Psychological Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. There were two things that helped me in the beginning. One of them was that I was not alone there was another intern to begin with me. So, it helped a lot and the other thing was that the company was not too big, and the environment was very friendly, and it was all like a family working with each other. Later, I started finding my way around and eventually I was comfortable enough to <strong>apply basic networking skills to find my way through</strong>. (R20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. At the beginning I was all the time <strong>looking before doing</strong>. It was simple things for me later on but in the beginning I was all the time <strong>I was asking others</strong>. If I was given some task I just go to some assistant and ask and my boss use to say that go to all different people and device your own way to manage, for instance, if you have to manage your mail. Just all you need to do it go to her and him and see how they are managing their mail box and later find your own way or copy anyone as you feel like it’s better for you. So, <strong>I applied help given by them</strong>. (R32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All the existing team members and my immediate boss were helpful in the beginning but at the same time their expectation was that I do it on my own after they have told me once. I talked to the existing team members and my senior boss that I need some work and a <strong>detailed intro about the assignments</strong> which I am going to do in the coming year. (R26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The cooperation of seniors was the biggest support for me to get started my job <strong>with full confidence</strong>. My first <strong>challenge</strong> and difficulty were to <strong>resolve</strong> the issue of costly hiring in the software development department. But complete support of my HOD helped me a lot. He guided me in the right direction and after the struggle of one month I have <strong>successfully</strong> hired three senior software developers without spending any extra amount on any paid portal. <strong>It took my time</strong>, but I worked my way along well. (R6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. As I tell before that environment was very comfortable there. So that comfort zone and environment makes me feel at ease. Initially I have to face some difficulties, but our mentor supports very well so I can able to **overcome** my difficulties. In the beginning I felt difficulty in understanding their guideline book. They used to call it guideline book which contains different parts like running records, observing students, lesson planning. I feel difficulty in maintaining record of the students in running records or observing them. I refer to my mentor who helps me to maintain that records. And later, I came to know that it was a **challenge** well **accomplished**. (R11)

8. According to Unilever, its culture is really supportive, my boss and colleagues were really very helpful throughout my journey. For me whenever I was stuck in something or some problem, I go more for gaining information and moreover for that I used to **refer** my colleagues for **better guidance and right direction**. There were times when I had to **re-do** things in a different way. (R5)

9. When I joined in Lahore office my supervisor (boss) shared a lot of presentations and documents and previous assignments with me for my information. But after 15 days or so I feel I didn’t get the proper knowledge and I was not properly executing the things which they are expecting from me and I **thought** that I should get some **proper training** from basic to current level. I share the same with my supervisor, she discussed it with my line manager. Then they called me for three-day training session in our Karachi headquarter and let me go through each and everything in detail so that I can comfortably work in regional department. It was a slight **redirection** but had really good effects on my work. (R3)

10. In the beginning there were few **challenging** situations where I had to cope up with the teaching practices as guided by my fellows at work. I was **hopeful** from the start because my found the environment supportive I **realized** that I can have a good start with this organization. (R15)
Psychological capital is an important element long been under discussion by many researchers in organization psychology. The above-mentioned narrations not even showed the presence of a higher level of psychological capital in the newcomer but also showed their usage to help through the challenging times of the beginning.

**Newcomer Proactivity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newcomer Proactivity</strong></td>
<td>1. Yes, I plan, and I do a performance check on me. People tell me that I am very German on this part. I more or less plan all the week and I love to erase things I have done, and I am more a person who is planned. Yes, I don’t really negotiate deadlines and if I have given deadlines myself I try to keep an early deadline and keep the margin to negotiate at the end maybe if it is required or if something is left over. Yes, it is, and I do it also. I regularly do lunch with people to make networks and my first job was an outcome of a network that I had where she wanted to take me, but it was more due to my schedule that I couldn’t join. But I am regularly in touch with all newcomers and in a lunch like situation you are in a relaxing position. I think I know well. I know at least seventy percent. The other thing is that they try to get you know about what’s going on in the company so that you are aware of the facts about the company. They also tell us about different cultural contracts that they make, and I think the company is really planned in this sharing of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. In the beginning when I was in probationary period I use to keep a good check on my performance but later on when my probationary period was over than my new boss was keeping a big performance check by himself, so dint had to do much. I try to negotiate few times. Especially when I had to make the procedure short for the advertisement equipment to be issued from store, I did a lot of negotiation. Other than that, I negotiated when my probationary period was increased and fought my case and justified my performance. Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I know enough about the company to do my job. I had known about all the SOPs about marketing and my task but as coke was a big company, so I dint knew much about the company.

3. My boss gave me a lot of liberty so I control myself. So I try to keep a check on myself. So I set goals for myself else I know I won’t be able to do things.
I think my style is more authoritarian and I try to negotiate with people but I cannot say I am good in negotiation.
I understood this networking when I came to France. I think it is very important in France and I am not good in it. I try to keep contact with people from my previous work.
I know almost all about the company as it is an SME enterprise and the boss wants all the employees to know what is going on in the company. May be I don’t know much about the financials and stuff but still I know most about the company.

4. Yes, I make a list on daily basis and check it at the end of the day.
Yes, with proper discussion and supporting my points with facts and figures.
Yes, it can work. But sometimes it creates misconceptions and people judge you with the level of chat sessions you are having with others.
A lot. The Full detailed needed for my position.

5. I am having well defined competency profile and KPIs for my position and its really helpful for me to keep check on performance through the KPIs.
Yes i do negotiate matters with my supervisor and seniors. As i have liberty to discuss our work related or any other professional issues with them.
Yes networking is really helpful. The more u discuss the more u learn. But sometimes few people drag it to the wastage of their official time and resources by discussing unofficial stuff.
I am working on the position of HR executive and technically I am handling all the policies and structure related things directly so up till now I know about each and every policy of my company.

6. I keep a performance check on myself. Yes I do manage myself in order to manage my activities.
I am not good in negotiations so this is a reason I try to impose the things so I try to negotiate a little. Yes I try to negotiate when I have to leave the work early.
Yes, in the job it really helps to make god networks. If you need to get something done from anyone and you are having bad relation with the other person than I think it’s done for you …
Yes, I know much about the company. As it is really important, and I try to keep myself really informed. And as this company is a small and simple company so there is not much, and complicated procedures and I know most of it.
7. Yes of course, when I get a target from my boss (line manager) I do personally set my own targets and I monitor them weekly basis or monthly basis to analyze whether I am performing well or not. Every time when I have some issues or problem I discuss it with my line manager or supervisor. Networking is very important especially when you are working in a field. You can get multiple feedbacks from your colleagues. You also came to know which opportunities you can avail. In uniliver we have to follow the rules and the policies. It is really imperative for us to know about policies. We had sessions regarding up-dation of policies on monthly basis.

8. Uniliver has its own measures of performance analysis like PDP (Performance Development Plan) but for my own work I do keep checking on my working style. There are different parameters to measure my performance like my analysis reporting system I do keep regular check on that. In uniliver culture is really supportive in the sense we have a right to talk with our HRBP (human resource business partners). If we have any kind of problem as I am a female and if I have some kind of reservations with other male colleagues we can discuss these issues with our HRBP. Networking may help in a job setting, it helps you to learn things and analyze situations, build good professional relationships because comfort zone is high and you can perform well. But there are some bad points as well in networking you get close to some people, you disclose your personal things with them, for this reason people used to manipulates you and blame you in front of other persons. So I must say that networking should be kept limited. In uniliver it’s a norm that one should have strength of the policies and structure of the company in beginning days. If anyone don’t have this ability and he does not know about the policies then his growth and career is not bright.

9. By writing reflective logs I keep an eye on my own performance that what I am attaining. I used to write reflective log on daily basis. No basically I am a trainee teacher and during training we are not that much into these things. We don’t need to negotiate such matters with our higher authorities. Some time I used to negotiate my ideas and opinions with my group members and they consider my opinion. I think networking is good for the environment basically good for your ownself. If you have a strong networking with other teachers they can help you. As I am a trainee teacher and if I face some difficulty in future I can reach those teachers. If I am not in a relationship with them so how can I get out of that difficult phase. Right now according to me during my job I am not so much into networking things. I don’t know much about their structure and policies. But there best policy is that they are going to teach their students in a playroom. They have the moto to teach their students with play and fun. Study with playing or study with fun.
Psychological Need Satisfaction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quotation (R=Respondent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>1. It’s more me that made me autonomous but then it’s definitely the company. You can feel that there is not much hierarchy in the company and you don’t have to follow blindly to your boss and everything. The company and especially in my department is always encouraging to get new ideas and new things from the young blood and newcomers. I think so that I am competent enough for the job but in the beginning it was different as I had applied for another job but that as my program of study was too different as I had school half of the time and half of the time I was at work so than they proposed me another position as the place where I had applied could not take me. Yes, I have close friends at the workplace including my boss. But I think my experience by having boss as a friend is not that good, so I think that I will try not to be so friendly with my boss ever again. It was the time when my manager who has been here working for a long time she introduced me to a lot of people and now when I go to lunch and I pass by many people who will like to ask me, “hey how is it going” this really makes me feel as I am part of this group and that they are really taking me along with them. This makes me feel that I really belong to this job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Satisfaction</td>
<td>2. I would like to make some changes if I am on my own and I am not reporting to the boss. As there was a long procedure for to release advertising equipment which was in a store I was in charge off. I had to get a prior approval from my boss and then get it entered in the SAP software of the finance department in order to take out even a small thing from the store even though I already had the keys to it. So, I would like to make this process fast enough so that things don’t get delayed due to thing long procedure rest all was fine. As I talked earlier there was nothing much to decide on my own and it was the procedure the program and the organization which made me autonomous for the present job. Yes, I think I was really competent enough for the job as there was nothing strategic to be done it took me a week to get to know all the work and slowly and gradually I became more and more competent. I was the highest paid and one of the most qualified paid in that position. The reason was that I was a bit over competent for the job in terms of education and all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I had a few close friends at my work place there was a girl of my age and same education we had good friendship, but we just use to discuss some things other than work.
The slow grasping of nature around and getting use to the environment made me become part of the group.

3. No I will be doing the things in the same manner and I will not take the decisions on my own and I will wait for my boss to be back or wait for him to decide and not myself. And actually, the boss is not there even though the boss is not that hard but still you can feel the ease of pressure and the environment is very light and calm. I remember once the boss and the other boss ever not there and there was a lot of laughter in the office and everyone was laughing.
I think it was my boss who felt this that I can be autonomous in my job and he was the one who gave me his own clients and told me that these are my special international clients and after today it will not be me who will be dealing with them directly but it will be you who will be taking care of them. And other then this I also think it was my competency which made me autonomous at work.
Yes I am competent enough for the job and at the beginning even I had few years of work experience already in another company so I always thought I will be working to add value for the company and I was really competent when I started and I think this was the reason that my boss started giving me responsibility right after two weeks of my work and progress.
Yes, basically I one of the youngest and the only girl of my age and we are good friend by now as it has been just few months, so I cannot say much but still she helps me at times with some extra work that I have and we are really good friends after this short time.
I guess it was not the beginning it was two months after as the whole company and most of the employees are French and I am a foreigner for them and their attitude with each other is much wormer amongst themselves. I never became at ease in the beginning and I really felt a part of the family almost after two months when I realized that they are trying to integrate me with themselves and they started asking about my weekend and other things and started helping with my work as they know I am knowing in the company.

4. My boss.
Yes.
Yes, I have a few very good friends at work.
Yes, with a very good friend. She works with me in my department.
My hard work, helping and friendly nature.

5. After completing one year on this position I am in the position to handle tasks independently but still I think i am doing it best because I am under right supervision.
The program and my boss. The step by step program she has developed is very effective to get the complete knowledge of every single domain u r working in. moreover, my boss is really very concern to make sure that her every team member is confident and skilled enough to work independently.
Yes.
Yes, my colleague working with me in the same organization is really close to me at work.
Not really, though we are very close, but we mostly discuss our concerns related to work.
Their helping and cooperating behavior.

6. I kept on doing the things the way I felt like and it was with time that I started feeling autonomous. And if I say it was because of my boss that it won’t be wrong as he was the person who kept putting on responsibilities on me.
I think I am competent for the documentation tasks. But there is some documentation that are really complicated so I did not feel that competent for the job overall but still I could learn all the complicated things.
Yes, that one of my age was a really nice friend and we use to talk to each other freely, but I do not think so that we were that good friends.
When I realized that fact that everyone was trying to help me in my problems and everyone is trying to take care of me and help me in growing my career I really felt like part of the company.

7. I believe to become autonomous is my job requirement. I have to take decisions at the spot because timely decisions really matters’ in our department or I should say in sales department.
Yes of course that’s why I am currently here. I also got the highest increment last year.
No, not really. I have professional colleagues but not such kind of close friends whom I am sharing my personal things.
No, I don’t share my personal issues with my professional colleagues.
Basically, in regional office I am the only person from my department. I am quite confident to manage my work alone, but I can also work in teams. I don’t feel hesitation to share my knowledge with other people.

8. Its combination of all three factors my boss, culture (overall environment at job place) and my job position.
Yes I feel myself competent enough for this job. As I am giving my best at this position and I am doing my work sincerely and honestly.
Not really but with some of my colleagues I have good understanding with them.
It depends, what I am going to share with them. But not specifically I disclose my personal life with them.
It’s more like behavior of the people and nature of group members. I adjust myself with their nature so that we can work together in a group.

9. Basically the program makes me work like an autonomous because there are some of the things we have to do by our own. We can make our own decisions at some point but all of the things was not like that as I have to report to my principal in some of the cases. I also have to take her opinion before taking my own decision.
Yes, I am competent enough for this job because I am selected from 300 candidates. I think am competent enough for this position that is the reason they choose me. Yes, there are two of them who came with me through the same program in the school. That is why they are closer to me. Not actually, more likely I share my work-related issues with them which i am facing during my training session. My friendly and jolly nature helps me to get closer to people in the group.
Appendix III: Qualitative Interview Guide:

Name:                              Job Experience:

How was the first day at work? Can you recall any memories?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

What was done by the company to ease your integration?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Did you receive any help from company members?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

What did you find different in the beginning?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

What was helpful during the first starting days of job? What did you do to overcome difficulties?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Did your job permit you to decide things on your own?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Can you describe the behavior of your supervisor?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

If you became your own boss will you try to change things around at work?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

What helped you become autonomous at work?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

What helped you become part of the group (organization)?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Do you think you were competent enough for the job and role you were assigned?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Have you made friends at work? Can you share personal matters with someone at work?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

What kind of behavior did you display during the whole socialization process regarding: creating networks, gathering information, performance check, creating networking, knowledge about the company? Explain the details.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Appendix IV: Univariate Outlier Test (Quantitative Study):
## Appendix V: Multivariate Outlier Test (Quantitative Study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Number</th>
<th>Mahala Nobis d-Squared</th>
<th>Probability_MD</th>
<th>Observation Number</th>
<th>Mahala Nobis d-Squared</th>
<th>Probability_MD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.61718</td>
<td>0.20207</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.81993</td>
<td>0.61061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.45304</td>
<td>0.02384</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.70976</td>
<td>0.43857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.04133</td>
<td>0.3853</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.21079</td>
<td>0.97583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.04957</td>
<td>0.00284</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.57287</td>
<td>0.66556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.81927</td>
<td>0.42034</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6.67828</td>
<td>0.08289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.06794</td>
<td>0.78482</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.55604</td>
<td>0.6694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.76639</td>
<td>0.18972</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.40656</td>
<td>0.22078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2971</td>
<td>0.72982</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.41383</td>
<td>0.32111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.65398</td>
<td>0.44811</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.44523</td>
<td>0.93075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.62985</td>
<td>0.65264</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.96739</td>
<td>0.5792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.16097</td>
<td>0.10404</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.67496</td>
<td>0.29877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.92657</td>
<td>0.07428</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.66862</td>
<td>0.64393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.87327</td>
<td>0.0487</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>7.50616</td>
<td>0.0574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.54828</td>
<td>0.31455</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.46089</td>
<td>0.32587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.34995</td>
<td>0.09577</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5.66684</td>
<td>0.12899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.20363</td>
<td>0.53123</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>7.0203</td>
<td>0.07125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.48457</td>
<td>0.00937</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.936</td>
<td>0.4016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.82189</td>
<td>0.03176</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4.44195</td>
<td>0.21753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.46666</td>
<td>0.68999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.06273</td>
<td>0.38205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.77911</td>
<td>0.0508</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.99947</td>
<td>0.80138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.92423</td>
<td>0.03032</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.84691</td>
<td>0.60478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.60484</td>
<td>0.00887</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.75199</td>
<td>0.28952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.10174</td>
<td>0.25069</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.05258</td>
<td>0.78853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.70345</td>
<td>0.05256</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.87383</td>
<td>0.83174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.31183</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.65962</td>
<td>0.64595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.29999</td>
<td>0.09789</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.76437</td>
<td>0.62272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.82281</td>
<td>0.12056</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.36172</td>
<td>0.3914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.35206</td>
<td>0.02496</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.37532</td>
<td>0.71133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.08499</td>
<td>0.10755</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.1966</td>
<td>0.97814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.68496</td>
<td>0.12799</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.3296</td>
<td>0.72212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.7104</td>
<td>0.05239</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.00409</td>
<td>0.80026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.77238</td>
<td>0.07952</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.74082</td>
<td>0.43334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.90157</td>
<td>0.40705</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.51082</td>
<td>0.91651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.52762</td>
<td>0.67591</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.70481</td>
<td>0.43941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.29107</td>
<td>0.09828</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.20925</td>
<td>0.75079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.99163</td>
<td>0.11202</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1.83601</td>
<td>0.60713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.65464</td>
<td>0.01375</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>8.37668</td>
<td>0.03884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.42666</td>
<td>0.01527</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.47962</td>
<td>0.47899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.59582</td>
<td>0.01412</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1.87902</td>
<td>0.59789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.37123</td>
<td>0.00988</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12.46846</td>
<td>0.00594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.46212</td>
<td>0.48218</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.27394</td>
<td>0.1528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.61743</td>
<td>0.20205</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>7.31679</td>
<td>0.06246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.70544</td>
<td>0.4393</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1.72008</td>
<td>0.63248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.56522</td>
<td>0.13479</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2.92536</td>
<td>0.40328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.23175</td>
<td>0.2375</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1.74177</td>
<td>0.62769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.32139</td>
<td>0.95596</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.71008</td>
<td>0.6347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.48154</td>
<td>0.47864</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.88521</td>
<td>0.40966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.87561</td>
<td>0.07597</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.64405</td>
<td>0.44982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.09161</td>
<td>0.16521</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2.1446</td>
<td>0.54294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0259</td>
<td>0.79499</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.97635</td>
<td>0.57733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.05258</td>
<td>0.78853</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.99568</td>
<td>0.5733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.94963</td>
<td>0.11409</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.55604</td>
<td>0.6694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.29999</td>
<td>0.09789</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.95148</td>
<td>0.81299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.09618</td>
<td>0.06889</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0.61918</td>
<td>0.89203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.35601</td>
<td>0.0392</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.7575</td>
<td>0.43054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.16584</td>
<td>0.16005</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>6.70712</td>
<td>0.08184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.61879</td>
<td>0.45421</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1.66813</td>
<td>0.64404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.09095</td>
<td>0.16526</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>5.39735</td>
<td>0.14491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.64747</td>
<td>0.19951</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.22441</td>
<td>0.74716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.83825</td>
<td>0.07724</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1.94727</td>
<td>0.58342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.62415</td>
<td>0.30501</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>2.52692</td>
<td>0.47045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.5899</td>
<td>0.45926</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4.18406</td>
<td>0.24226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.21121</td>
<td>0.06546</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.37277</td>
<td>0.49872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.78178</td>
<td>0.28601</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.56797</td>
<td>0.90373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.35959</td>
<td>0.5012</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.38317</td>
<td>0.33623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.54482</td>
<td>0.90894</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2.07419</td>
<td>0.55715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.21277</td>
<td>0.23939</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3.83495</td>
<td>0.27985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.46795</td>
<td>0.68969</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4.00595</td>
<td>0.26082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.9007</td>
<td>0.59327</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.02272</td>
<td>0.79575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.63522</td>
<td>0.65143</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.46918</td>
<td>0.92561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.02702</td>
<td>0.16983</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.59538</td>
<td>0.3086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.2908</td>
<td>0.34893</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.29597</td>
<td>0.51329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.83932</td>
<td>0.11969</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1.26116</td>
<td>0.73838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.07738</td>
<td>0.25323</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.64405</td>
<td>0.44982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.81169</td>
<td>0.12114</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.23466</td>
<td>0.7447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.03819</td>
<td>0.16902</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.94641</td>
<td>0.39996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.98388</td>
<td>0.57576</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1.18242</td>
<td>0.75722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.44387</td>
<td>0.32811</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.12146</td>
<td>0.7719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.48165</td>
<td>0.21393</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.8006</td>
<td>0.84932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.20444</td>
<td>0.10208</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1.49269</td>
<td>0.68396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.56966</td>
<td>0.90334</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3.44138</td>
<td>0.32845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.02889</td>
<td>0.38719</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.22247</td>
<td>0.35858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.08758</td>
<td>0.55443</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>3.1762</td>
<td>0.36525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.08895</td>
<td>0.77974</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>4.07107</td>
<td>0.25389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.78198</td>
<td>0.12271</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.69446</td>
<td>0.63817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.57598</td>
<td>0.90191</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.97523</td>
<td>0.26415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.98845</td>
<td>0.26271</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.23454</td>
<td>0.23723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.11282</td>
<td>0.77398</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5.22771</td>
<td>0.15586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.0315</td>
<td>0.79363</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.61718</td>
<td>0.20207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.56466</td>
<td>0.2066</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>9.45304</td>
<td>0.02384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.27881</td>
<td>0.09881</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.04133</td>
<td>0.3853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.94748</td>
<td>0.81396</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>14.04957</td>
<td>0.00284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.1179</td>
<td>0.3738</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2.81927</td>
<td>0.42034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.97773</td>
<td>0.80664</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1.06794</td>
<td>0.78482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.85968</td>
<td>0.18237</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>4.76639</td>
<td>0.18972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>9.01443</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1.2971</td>
<td>0.72982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.85713</td>
<td>0.18256</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.65398</td>
<td>0.44811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>4.2409</td>
<td>0.2366</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.62985</td>
<td>0.65264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.87331</td>
<td>0.83186</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>6.16097</td>
<td>0.10404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.92856</td>
<td>0.11514</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>6.92657</td>
<td>0.07428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.21289</td>
<td>0.74991</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>7.87327</td>
<td>0.0487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.17585</td>
<td>0.24309</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>3.54828</td>
<td>0.31455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.82057</td>
<td>0.84454</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6.34995</td>
<td>0.09577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.29916</td>
<td>0.72933</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2.20363</td>
<td>0.53123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.54769</td>
<td>0.67131</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>11.48457</td>
<td>0.00937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1.06794</td>
<td>0.78482</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>8.82189</td>
<td>0.03176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.64127</td>
<td>0.65007</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1.46666</td>
<td>0.68999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.05539</td>
<td>0.38316</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>7.77911</td>
<td>0.0508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.66241</td>
<td>0.3003</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>8.92423</td>
<td>0.03032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>3.48521</td>
<td>0.32268</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>11.60484</td>
<td>0.00887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.46795</td>
<td>0.68969</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>4.10174</td>
<td>0.25069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.95325</td>
<td>0.17525</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>7.70345</td>
<td>0.05256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>3.31183</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI: Histograms