

Proactive Socialization and Behavioral Self-Management

ALAN M. SAKS AND BLAKE E. ASHFORTH

*Faculty of Commerce and Administration, Department of Management, Concordia University,
Montreal, Quebec, Canada*

The purpose of this study was to examine behavioral self-management as a form of newcomer proactive socialization behavior. A longitudinal field study was conducted with a sample of 153 entry-level professionals who completed questionnaires during their first month of entry and 6 months after entry. The results indicated that self-management behavior was related to newcomers' general anxiety and stress at entry, and to internal motivation, ability to cope, and task-specific anxiety 6 months later. In addition, anxiety and stress at entry were found to mediate the relationships between self-management and ability to cope and task-specific anxiety. The research and practical implications of these findings are discussed. It is recommended that future research integrate the self-management and information seeking perspectives to provide a more complete theory of proactive socialization. © 1996 Academic Press, Inc.

As newcomers enter organizations they face the difficult task of learning the attitudes and behaviors that are necessary to perform new tasks and roles (Louis, 1980; Miller & Jablin, 1991). This transition period has been described as stressful for many newcomers (Katz, 1985; Nelson, 1987). Newcomers experience a "reality shock" as they encounter organizational life and begin to "learn the ropes" (Wanous, 1992). The uncertainty a newcomer feels about being able to cope with organization demands and the ambiguity concerning his or her role can also lead to stress and tension (Fisher, 1985). In fact, according to Wanous (1992), newcomers experience more stress right after entry than either before or after they have gained some experience, and this can result in undesirable consequences for individuals and organizations (Nelson, Quick, & Eakin, 1988; Wanous, 1992). Thus, it is important that the anxiety and stress that can accompany the socialization process be minimized so that newcomers can effectively learn the requisite attitudes and behaviors necessary to perform their roles and function in their organization.

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1994 Academy of Management meetings, Dallas, Texas. Address reprint requests to Alan M. Saks, Faculty of Commerce and Administration, Department of Management, Concordia University, 1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. W., Montreal, Quebec H3G 1M8, Canada.

Wanous (1992) has argued that the orientation period should be devoted to helping newcomers cope with "entry stress." Several studies in the socialization literature have in fact demonstrated that organizations can ease newcomers' transition and assist them in their socialization through a variety of practices. For example, Louis, Posner, and Powell (1983) found that interactions with peers, supervisors, and senior co-workers were among the most important socialization practices and were positively related to newcomers' job attitudes. Jones (1986) found that socialization tactics were related to personal and role outcomes. In particular, he found that individualized socialization tactics, which encourage newcomers to question the status quo and develop their own approach to their roles, were related to an innovative role orientation and to higher levels of role conflict and ambiguity. Institutionalized socialization tactics, which encourage newcomers to passively accept preset roles and the status-quo, were related to a custodial role orientation and to higher job satisfaction and commitment and lower intentions to quit. Jones argued that these results support the hypothesis that institutionalized socialization tactics lower newcomers' uncertainty and reduce anxiety.

Thus, there is evidence that organizations can, through the use of various socialization programs, influence newcomers' personal and role outcomes. While these programs and their outcomes can benefit newcomers and organizations, they reflect a traditional and limited approach to socialization since newcomers are treated as passive or reactive during the socialization process (Morrison, 1993a). As Morrison (1993a) notes, "they focus on what organizations do to newcomers, and on how newcomers respond, without addressing ways in which newcomers may take a *proactive* role" (p.557).

In response to the traditional approach to socialization, socialization research has begun to adopt a perspective that views newcomers as "proactive" agents in their own socialization (Miller & Jablin, 1991; Morrison, 1993a). According to Miller and Jablin (1991), newcomers can reduce uncertainty in their work environments through their own proactive efforts. To date, the emphasis on proactive socialization has been on information seeking and acquisition. For example, Morrison (1993ab) found that the frequency of information seeking was related to task mastery, role clarity, and social integration, as well as socialization outcomes such as satisfaction, performance, and intentions to leave. Ostroff and Kozlowski (1992) found that newcomers' acquisition of important information was related to their knowledge of different contextual domains, and both information and knowledge were related to higher satisfaction, commitment, and adjustment, and lower turnover intentions and stress.

In addition to information seeking, other forms of proactive behavior might also be useful for newcomers during their socialization. For example, newcomers who are proactive and adept at managing and structuring their early work experiences might experience more successful adjustment. The purpose

of this study was to investigate *behavioral self-management* as a form of newcomer proactive socialization behavior. We argue that newcomers who are active in self-managing their behavior will report lower levels of anxiety and stress during their first month of entry and more positive work adjustment after 6 months of work experience.

BEHAVIORAL SELF-MANAGEMENT

In recent years a number of writers have suggested that various approaches and theories of self-regulation can add a more proactive approach to organizational behavior (Aldag, Brief, & Kolenko, 1983; Brief & Aldag, 1981; Brief & Hollenbeck, 1985). Although various terms have been used to describe self-regulatory processes—such as self-management, self-leadership, and self-reinforcement—in the organizational literature self-management or behavioral self-management (BSM) has become the preferred term and the one used in this paper (Frayne & Latham, 1987; Gist, Stevens, & Bavetta, 1991; Latham & Frayne, 1989; Luthans & Davis, 1979; Manz, 1986; Stevens, Bavetta, & Gist, 1993; Tsui & Ashford, 1994).

Luthans and Davis (1979) were among the first to discuss the applications of BSM in the organizational literature. They defined BSM as the “deliberate regulation of stimulus cues, covert processes, and response consequences to achieve personally identified behavioral outcomes” (p.43). Manz and Snyder (1983) have described self-management as “the influence we exert over ourselves to help us achieve the self-motivation and self-direction we need to behave in desirable ways” (p.69). Within an organizational context, BSM involves a series of behaviors which enables one to structure and motivate their own work behavior by setting goals, practicing new and desired behaviors, keeping track of progress, and rewarding oneself for goal achievement. A newcomer, for example, might set goals for performing a new task (e.g., communicating more frequently with clients), practice the task outside of work, keep track of task performance, and reward oneself when the new task has been successfully performed.

Individuals who practice BSM have been found to display greater levels of performance motivation, and are better able to manage and cope with obstacles. Self-management has also been found to be related to cognitive, affective, and behavioral outcomes (Bandura & Cervone, 1983, 1986; Frayne & Latham, 1987). Although laboratory research has found that self-regulatory behavior is strongly related to performance motivation (Bandura & Cervone, 1983, 1986), very few studies have investigated self-management in organizational settings. One of the first was a study by Aldag et al. (1983) on self-reinforcement systems. They found that involvement in self-reinforcement was positively related to job involvement and several facets of job satisfaction. Brief and Hollenbeck (1985) examined the relationship between self-regulating activities and job performance. They found that the best pre-

dictors of job performance were goal difficulty, self-criticism, and an interaction between the ability to generate internal feedback and a preference for internal feedback.

More recently, BSM has received a considerable amount of attention in research on training. For example, Frayne and Latham (1987) and Latham and Frayne (1989) found that training in BSM increased trainees' job attendance. Gist et al. (1991) and Stevens et al. (1993) found that a self-management training intervention improved trainees' acquisition and maintenance of complex interpersonal skills. Gist, Bavetta, and Stevens (1990) found that self-management training improved trainees' ability to apply learned skills to a transfer task. Thus, there is evidence that BSM is related to work and training outcomes.

Since newcomers are to a large extent trainees who are learning to perform new tasks and roles, BSM might also be an effective strategy that is related to socialization outcomes. That is, newcomers who are proactive in managing their own behavior through self-management might be more successful in their socialization. Thus, the findings on trainees and self-management training might extend to newcomers and socialization.

PROACTIVE SOCIALIZATION AND BEHAVIORAL SELF-MANAGEMENT

Given the recent emphasis on proactive socialization and the effectiveness of self-management for trainee learning and skill acquisition, the purpose of this study is to examine BSM as the basis for newcomer proactive socialization. In fact, several writers have suggested that socialization research may benefit from a greater emphasis on the "self" and self-reinforcement systems (Aldag et al., 1983; Brief & Aldag, 1981). According to Aldag et al. (1983), this approach views individuals as "having the capacity to proactively structure situations and, at least to some extent, to manage their own destinies" (p.154). Furthermore, socialization theory and research has begun to focus more on learning and adaptation which "requires that individuals learn about their situations and regulate their behavior in order to meet goals and manage stress" (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993, p.170). One way for newcomers to effectively manage their socialization experiences and to lower stress would be through BSM.

In addition to being effective for trainees, BSM might also be an effective means of proactive socialization for newcomers who must learn the attitudes and behaviors necessary to perform new tasks and roles, and to function effectively in a new organizational setting. BSM can be expected to be more positively related to socialization outcomes for a number of reasons. First, newcomers who practice BSM might be more effective in their socialization due to a greater capacity to learn appropriate task strategies. According to Latham and Locke (1991), "training in self-regulation emphasizes the discov-

ery or learning of appropriate task strategies'' (p.234). As noted earlier, Gist et al. (1991) found that self-management training facilitates the acquisition and maintenance of complex skills, and Gist et al. (1990) suggested that self-management training strengthens the learning of training content and results in a greater command and orchestration of learned skills.

Second, BSM might also facilitate newcomers' socialization due to a reduction in newcomer anxiety and stress. For example, Gist et al. (1990) noted that self-management might facilitate skill generalization because it reduces negative arousal. Further, because ''self-management can be viewed as a set of strategies that aid employees in structuring their work environment'' (Manz, 1986, p.590), it may enable newcomers to provide themselves with a greater sense of structure, and thereby reduce the uncertainty and anxiety of their early socialization experiences. Thus, BSM might function as a substitute for other sources of structure in a highly uncertain and unfamiliar situation (Tsui & Ashford, 1994).

We argue in this paper that newcomers who practice BSM will report lower anxiety and stress during their first month of socialization, and that this will lead to greater skill development and learning as indicated by socialization outcomes after six months of socialization. As a result, newcomers who are proactive in self-managing their behavior will be more successful in their socialization. These arguments lead to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Behavioral self-management will be negatively related to newcomers' anxiety and stress during their first month of socialization.

Hypothesis 2: Behavioral self-management will be positively related to newcomers' internal motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, ability to cope, and negatively related to intentions to quit and anxiety after 6 months of socialization. In addition, behavioral self-management will be positively related to supervisor ratings of newcomers' job performance 10 months after socialization.

Hypothesis 3: Newcomers' anxiety and stress during the first month of socialization will mediate the relationship between behavioral self-management and the socialization outcomes.

METHOD

Study Design

The present study is a longitudinal field investigation. Data were collected from newcomers during the first month (3 weeks after entry) of entering their organization (Time 1), and again six months later (Time 2). At Time 1, participants completed a questionnaire to measure self-management behavior, general anxiety, and stress. Six months later (Time 2) they received the second questionnaire which measured the socialization outcomes. Supervisor rat-

ings of newcomers' job performance were obtained 10 months after entry (Time 3).

Research Site and Participants

Data were collected from newly hired entry-level accountants employed in 10 large and medium-sized accounting firms. The first questionnaire was mailed during the first month of entry to all newly hired entry-level accountants who entered one of the participating firms. A total of 198 participants completed and returned the first questionnaire (a response rate of 60%). Six months after entry, the second questionnaire was mailed to those participants who completed the first questionnaire. Questionnaires were returned by 154 of the 198 participants, representing a response rate of 78%. The overall response rate for participants completing both questionnaires was 46%. All analyses are based on those participants who completed both questionnaires. Because one questionnaire was not sufficiently completed, the final sample consists of 153. There are no significant demographic differences between those who returned and those who did not return the second questionnaire. The mean age of the 153 participants is 23.8 years, and 55% are male. All of the participants had at least an undergraduate degree, and over 80% had earned their degree in commerce and administration. Participants averaged less than 1 year of previous work experience.

Procedure

The questionnaires were sent to participants in a personalized envelope through their firm's internal mail. Each envelope contained a cover letter from the researchers, a letter from the (Canadian) Provincial Institute of Chartered Accountants encouraging them to participate in the study, the study questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Participants were asked to complete the questionnaires as part of a study on the training and development of accountants. They were told that participation was voluntary and that their individual responses were confidential. Participants were informed that their firms would receive a summary of the findings. Participants completed the questionnaires on their own time and returned them by mail to the first author.

Because the firms were in the middle of tax season at the time of the 6-month questionnaire, several firms requested that the job performance questionnaire wait until the end of tax season. Therefore, 10 months after newcomers entered their organization (Time 3), the job performance questionnaires were sent to the personnel coordinators at each firm who then distributed them to the supervisors/managers who were most familiar with each participant. Because three of the firms declined to participate in this part of the study, 128 questionnaires were sent to the other seven firms. The supervisors/managers were asked to complete and return the questionnaire directly to the

first author. A total of 112 completed questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 87.5%. Of the 153 participants who completed both questionnaires, job performance data were obtained for 91.

Measures

Behavioral self-management. BSM usually involves a series of interrelated processes through which individuals can carefully structure and guide their own behavior. Typically, this involves a number of dimensions or strategies that revolve around one's capacity to set goals, monitor progress, and reward oneself for goal accomplishment. In the present study, we used the framework outlined by Manz and his colleagues which consists of six behavioral strategies of self-management (Manz 1983; Manz & Sims, 1980). The six self-management strategies were measured by a scale developed by Manz (1983) in which each strategy is measured by a three-item scale. Subjects were asked to respond to each item on a 5-point Likert-type scale with anchors (1) Does not describe me at all to (5) Describes me very well.

A brief description and sample item of each self-management strategy is as follows: (1) *Self-observation*—observing one's behavior and its causes ("I try to keep track of how well I'm doing while I work"); (2) *Cueing strategies*—regulating the frequency of behaviors by creating or altering cues to remind one to do something or to focus attention on desirable behavior ("I try to arrange my work area in a way that helps me positively focus my attention on my work"); (3) *Self-goal-setting*—self-set goals provide direction and personal standards for judging and guiding one's actions ("I like to work toward specific goals I set for myself"); (4) *Self-reward*—rewarding oneself for goal attainment and desirable behavior ("When I have successfully completed a task, I often reward myself with something I like"); (5) *Self-punishment*—punishing oneself for failing to attain goals and undesirable behavior ("I tend to get down on myself when I have performed poorly"); and (6) *Rehearsal*—practicing desired behavior ("I often practice important tasks before I actually do them" (Manz, 1983; Manz & Simms, 1980).

Because this measure of self-management has not been validated in previous research, it is unclear whether the six strategies in fact represent six empirically distinct dimensions. Thus, we examined the factor structure of the strategies through confirmatory factor analyses, using LISREL 7 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1989). LISREL provides maximum likelihood estimates of specified relations, information which facilitates the identification and modification of misspecified relations, and various indices of the extent to which a model fits the observed data matrix.

A 6-factor model was compared to a null model and a general 1-factor model. In the 6-factor model, the 18 items (6 strategies \times 3 items) were specified to load on their respective strategies. In the 1-factor model, all 18 items were specified to load together. A covariance matrix of the items served

TABLE 1
Indices of Overall Fit of the Self-Regulation Strategies^a

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	RMSR	GFI	AGFI	NFI	PFI	TLI
1. Null	1285.21	135	.184	.481	.342	—	—	—
2. 1-factor	724.75	135	.098	.717	.641	.436	.436	.487
3. 6-factor	216.64	120	N/A ^b	.896	.852	.831	.739	.905
4. 5-factor (without Cueing Strategies)	157.58	80	.050	.909	.864	.877	.520	.886

^a RMSR-root mean square residual; GFI = Goodness-of-fit index; AGFI = Adjusted goodness-of-fit index; NFI = Normed fit index (relative to Model 1); PFI = Parsimonious fit index (relative to Model 1); TLI = Tucker-Lewis index (relative to Model 1).

^b RMSR was not obtained due to empirical underidentification, i.e., some factors were too highly correlated to be statistically differentiated.

as input. Our sample more than met the 5:1 ratio of respondents to parameters recommended by Bentler and Chou (1987).

The indices of fit include χ^2 , the goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), and the root mean square residual (RMSR). Although these indices indicate how closely a model corresponds with the data, they do not indicate how well a model performs *relative* to other models. Widely used indices of relative fit include the normed fit index (NFI: Bentler & Bonett, 1980), parsimonious fit index (PFI: James, Mulaik, & Brett, 1982), and the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI: Tucker & Lewis, 1973). Following Harris and Schaubroeck's (1990) recommendations, all three indices of relative fit are presented in addition to the indices furnished by the LISREL 7 program.

The results of the confirmatory analyses are presented in Table 1. The 6-factor model (see Model 3) clearly provides a better fit than the 1-factor model (see Model 2). This suggests that the 18 items comprising the six strategies should not be aggregated into a global factor.

However, the 6-factor model did not quite attain a GFI or AGFI of .900, the generally recognized threshold of adequate fit (Marcoulides, 1990). Inspection of the modification indices suggested the fit might be improved by deleting the Cueing strategy. As Table 1 indicates (see Model 4), this resulted in an improved GFI, AGFI, and NFI; however, it also resulted in a poorer PFI and TLI, which weight the improvement in fit by the loss in degrees of freedom. Thus, the fit indices do not uniformly indicate whether Model 3 or Model 4 provides the better fit. However, given the very poor internal consistency of the Cueing strategy ($\alpha = .31$), we selected Model 4. Accordingly, the Cueing strategy was not included in the subsequent analyses. The reliabilities for the remaining 5 self-management variables were acceptable (although self-observation was somewhat lower than the others, $\alpha = .62$): self-goal

setting $\alpha = .84$; self-reward $\alpha = .71$; self-punishment $\alpha = .76$; and rehearsal $\alpha = .82$.

Mediating Variables

General anxiety. A scale measuring general anxiety rather than task-specific anxiety was used on the first questionnaire because subjects completed this questionnaire during the first month of entry before they had acquired substantial work experience. In particular, we used the State version of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983). This scale consists of 20 items and asks participants to indicate the extent to which each item describes how they feel (e.g., calm, secure, tense, nervous). Participants rated their responses on a 4-point Likert-type scale with anchors (1) Not at all to (4) Very much so. The scale was formed by averaging participants' responses for the 20 items, with higher scores representing higher anxiety. The coefficient alpha measure of internal consistency was .93.

Stress. Stress was measured by Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, and Pinneau's (1980) somatic complaints scale, which is similar to stress measures used in previous studies on socialization and newcomer stress (Nelson & Sutton, 1990; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992). This scale consists of 10 items and asks participants to indicate if they have recently experienced any of the listed physical symptoms (e.g., shortness of breath, loss of appetite). In the present study, participants were asked if they had experienced any of these conditions since they began work in their firm. Participants made their responses on a 4-point Likert-type scale with anchors (1) Never to (4) Often. The scale was formed by averaging responses for the 10 items, with higher scores representing higher levels of stress. Coefficient α was .78.

Socialization Outcomes

The outcomes included in this study were based on those outcomes that have traditionally been considered relevant in the socialization literature, and at the same time, relevant to the literature on behavioral self-management. Therefore, we measured motivational and performance outcomes (internal motivation and job performance), affective and attitudinal outcomes (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to quit); and negative arousal/coping outcomes (anxiety and ability to cope). Unless otherwise noted, all were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale, with anchors (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree. Total scores were derived by averaging the items for each scale.

Internal motivation. Motivation was measured by the 4-item internal motivation scale from the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Sample items include: "I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well" and "I feel bad and unhappy when I discover that I have

performed poorly on my job.” The coefficient alpha measure of internal consistency was relatively low, .56.

Ability to cope. Ability to cope was measured by a 5-item scale adapted from House, Levanoni, and Schuler’s (1982) role ambiguity coping/ability scale. The items deal with handling problems on the job, figuring out what should be done to accomplish one’s work, and being sure of how to do one’s job. Sample items include: “I frequently don’t know how to handle problems that occur in my job” (reverse scored), and “When I need to solve a problem on my job, I usually can figure it out by myself.” Coefficient α was .87.

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured by a 3-item scale which assessed participants’ general satisfaction with their job. Two of the three items were from the Job Diagnostic Survey measure of general satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1980): “Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job,” and “I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in my job.” The third item from the JDS measure of general satisfaction was not used because it asks about thoughts of quitting and might not be independent of the intention to quit measure. We therefore included the following third item: “I would recommend working in my firm to a friend.” The coefficient α for the three items was .72.

Organizational commitment. Organizational commitment was measured by five items from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). The five items were chosen because they displayed the highest average item-total correlations in an item analysis of the total 15-item instrument (see Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1978). Sample items include: “I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization,” and “I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined.” Coefficient α was .89.

Intention to quit. Intention to quit was measured by a 3-item scale from Colarelli (1984). Sample items include: “I frequently think of quitting my organization” and “If I have my own way, I will be working in this organization one year from now” (reverse scored). Coefficient α was .75, which is identical to that reported by Colarelli.

Task-specific anxiety. Task-specific anxiety was measured by a scale designed specifically for this study and the job of entry-level accountant. *Task-specific* rather than general anxiety was measured on the second questionnaire because we felt that by this time participants would have enough work experience to be sufficiently familiar with their tasks and roles to be able to respond meaningfully to a task-specific measure. The scale consists of 10 items that assess participants’ feelings of apprehension and tension versus relaxation and comfort when performing the tasks of an entry-level accountant. Sample items include: “I often feel apprehensive and tense just thinking about having to work and interact with clients,” and “I am usually relaxed and comfortable about going on an on-site field engagement” (reverse scored). The scale was

formed by averaging participants' responses for the 10 items, with higher scores representing higher anxiety. Coefficient α was .80. (See the Appendix for all 10 items).

Job performance. Supervisors were asked to rate their subordinates' overall job performance on a 7-point Likert-type scale with anchors (1) Far below firm expectations to (7) Far above firm expectations. It should be noted that although the job performance questionnaire contained items designed to measure different dimensions of newcomers' job performance in addition to the overall measure, a considerable amount of missing data made it impossible to form a composite scale due to the low sample size. Therefore, we have only included the measure of overall job performance because it was the only item that was completed on all of the questionnaires. Although this poses a potential reliability problem, this concern is somewhat mitigated by the high correlation between the single-item measure of overall job performance and a composite measure of job performance as well as a measure of technical job performance ($r = .94$ for both correlations).

Control variables. The following variables were used as control variables: gender, years of previous work experience, and age.

RESULTS

Intercorrelation of Study Variables

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and intercorrelations of the study variables. Inspection of Table 2 indicates that the correlations among the five self-management variables were low to moderate. Thus, as indicated earlier, it appears that these five strategies of BSM are relatively independent. Second, several of the self-management variables were correlated with general anxiety and stress. Self-observation, self-set goals, and self-reward were negatively correlated with general anxiety, and self-punishment was positively correlated with general anxiety. Self-set goals was negatively related to stress, and self-punishment was positively related to stress. Third, the BSM variables were also related to several of the socialization outcomes. All of the self-management variables except for self-reward ($p = .06$) were positively related to internal motivation. Only self-punishment was significantly and negatively related to job satisfaction. Self-observation and self-set goals were positively related to ability to cope. Rehearsal was positively related to commitment. Self-observation and self-set goals were negatively related to task-specific anxiety, and punishment was positively related to task-specific anxiety. None of the self-management variables, however, were related to intention to quit, and only self-reward was related to job performance. Finally, the correlations between the control variables and the study variables were generally low and nonsignificant with few exceptions. Further analyses of these relationships were conducted using multiple regression analyses.

TABLE 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations of Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Self-management variables																			
1. Self-observation	3.70	.56	(.62)																
2. Self-goal-setting	3.82	.77	.47***	(.84)															
3. Self-reward	3.62	.70	.24***	.29***	(.71)														
4. Self-punishment	3.77	.74	.19**	.24***	.13*	(.76)													
5. Rehearsal	3.36	.81	.40***	.26***	.22**	.13	(.82)												
Mediating variables																			
6. General anxiety	1.92	.54	-.24**	-.24**	-.15*	.21**	.01	(.93)											
7. Stress	1.51	.43	-.12	-.14*	.01	.19**	.05	.29***	(.78)										
Socialization outcomes																			
8. Internal motivation	5.66	.70	.15*	.15*	.33	.19**	.19**	.09	-.05	(.56)									
9. Ability to cope	4.84	1.06	.17*	.23**	-.06	-.05	-.05	-.20**	-.23**	.07	(.87)								
10. Job satisfaction	4.54	1.21	.07	.08	-.06	-.13*	.07	-.21**	-.09	.10	.32***	(.72)							
11. Organizational commitment	4.59	1.22	.11	.11	.00	-.12	.14*	-.15*	-.11	.13	.28***	.77***	(.89)						
12. Intention to quit	2.70	1.28	-.06	-.06	.11	.12	-.03	.26***	.07	.01	-.29***	-.66***	-.71***	(.75)					
13. Task-specific anxiety	2.99	.83	-.22**	-.14*	-.08	.29***	-.10	.44***	.30***	.03	-.50***	-.34***	-.37***	.36***	(.80)				
14. Job performance	4.66	1.07	.03	-.09	-.23**	-.05	-.14	-.18*	-.20*	.01	.27**	.28**	.26**	-.15	-.07				
Control variables																			
15. Gender ^a	1.55	.50	.05	-.09	-.05	-.28***	.02	-.10	-.07	-.10	.03	.16*	.15*	-.08	-.13	.01			
16. Age	23.80	2.64	.00	.06	.02	-.04	.14*	.03	.01	-.07	-.01	.02	.05	.00	-.06	-.18*	.05		
17. Work experience	1.69	.98	.12	.13	.01	-.07	.12	.05	.06	.11	.14*	-.04	-.10	-.16	-.04	.05	-.04	.64***	

Note. Reliability estimates (Cronbach alpha) are indicated along the diagonal.

^a 1 = Female, 2 = Male.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

TABLE 3
Mediating Variables

Self-management variables	General anxiety	Stress
1. Self-observation	-.22**	-.14
2. Self-goal setting	-.21*	-.17
3. Self-reward	-.10	.04
4. Self-punishment	.30***	.24**
5. Rehearsal	.13	.11
R^2	.18	.09
F ratio	6.51***	2.98**

Note. Entries represent standardized regression coefficients.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

Multiple Regression Analyses

To further examine the relationships between BSM and socialization outcomes, multiple regression analyses were performed in which the mediating variables and the socialization outcomes were regressed on the five self-management variables. First, we regressed the mediating variables and the outcomes on the control variables. The results of these regressions indicated that the control variables did not explain a significant amount of variance in any of the outcomes. The control variables were therefore removed from the subsequent analyses.

Table 3 reports the multiple regression results for the mediating variables measured at Time 1. Inspection of Table 3 indicates that the self-management variables explained a significant amount of the variance in general anxiety ($R^2 = .18$, $p < .001$) and stress ($R^2 = .09$, $p < .01$). For general anxiety, the betas were significant for self-punishment (.30, $p < .001$), self-set goals (-.21, $p < .05$), and self-observation (-.22, $p < .01$) and approached significance for rehearsal (.13, $p < .10$). For stress, the beta for self-punishment was significant (.24, $p < .01$) and approached significance for self-set goals (-.17, $p < .10$).

Table 4 reports the results for the socialization outcomes. The self-management variables explained a significant amount of the variance in internal motivation ($R^2 = .07$, $p < .05$), ability to cope ($R^2 = .10$, $p < .01$), and task-specific anxiety ($R^2 = .17$, $p < .001$). However, the results were nonsignificant for job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to quit, and job performance.

For internal motivation, none of the betas were significant although the beta for self-punishment approached significance (.14, $p < .10$). For ability to cope, the beta for self-set goals was significant (.25, $p < .01$), and approached

TABLE 4
Socialization Outcomes

Self-management variables	Internal motivation	Ability to cope	Job satisfaction	Organizational commitment	Intention to quit	Task-specific anxiety	Job performance
1. Self-observation	.03	.15	.05	.06	-.06	-.22*	.16
2. Self-goal setting	.05	.25**	.10	.10	-.10	-.11	-.05
3. Self-reward	.06	-.12	-.09	-.05	.14	-.04	-.22*
4. Self-punishment	.14	-.11	-.16	-.17*	.14	.36***	.00
5. Rehearsal	.13	-.13	.06	.12	-.03	-.02	-.15
R^2	.07	.10	.04	.06	.04	.17	.08
F ratio	2.22*	3.28**	1.29	1.73	1.28	6.11***	1.48

Note. Entries represent standardized regression coefficients.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

significance for self-observation (.15, $p < .10$). For task-specific anxiety, the betas were significant for self-punishment and self-observation (.36, $p < .001$, and $-.22$, $p < .05$, respectively).

Mediation Analyses

To determine the extent to which newcomers' entry anxiety and stress mediated the relationship between BSM and the outcomes, we performed hierarchical multiple regression analyses. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), in order to test for mediation it is necessary to estimate three regression equations. First, it must be demonstrated that the independent variable (i.e., BSM) is related to the mediating variable(s) (anxiety and stress). As indicated in Table 3, the BSM variables explained a significant amount of the variance in both anxiety and stress. Thus, the first requirement for mediation is supported.

Second, the independent variable must be related to the dependent variable(s). As indicated earlier, BSM explained a significant amount of the variance in internal motivation, ability to cope, and task-specific anxiety. Thus, the second requirement is supported only for these outcomes. Therefore, the mediation analyses can only be conducted for internal motivation, ability to cope, and task-specific anxiety.

Finally, the dependent variable(s) must be regressed on both the independent variable and on the mediating variable(s). In order to demonstrate mediation it must be shown that the mediating variable(s) is related to the dependent variable(s) when the dependent variable(s) is regressed on both the independent variable and on the mediator. Therefore, if anxiety and stress mediate the relationship between BSM and the socialization outcomes, then the variance explained by BSM after anxiety and stress have been held constant should be lower than the variance explained by BSM alone (Baron & Kenny, 1986). In order to establish a model of complete mediation, the relationships between BSM and the outcomes must disappear when anxiety and stress are held constant. Anxiety and stress must also be shown to enhance the explanatory power of the model (James & Brett, 1984).

Table 5 presents the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses in which internal motivation, ability to cope, and task-specific anxiety were each regressed on anxiety and stress and then on the BSM variables. Anxiety and stress explained a significant amount of the variance in ability to cope ($R^2 = .07$, $p < .01$), task-specific anxiety ($R^2 = .23$, $p < .0001$), but not internal motivation. When the BSM variables were entered into the regression after anxiety and stress, they continued to explain seven percent of the variance in internal motivation ($p < .05$). However, the BSM variables explained much less of the variance in task-specific anxiety when anxiety and stress at Time 1 were controlled (R^2 change = .06, $p < .05$), compared to when the BSM variables were entered alone as indicated in Table 4 ($R^2 = .17$, $p < .001$). Similarly, the BSM variables explained much less of the variance in

TABLE 5
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses

Socialization outcomes	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Change in <i>R</i> ²	<i>F</i> change
Internal motivation				
1. Anxiety and stress	.12	.01		1.08
2. Self-management	.30	.08	.07	2.38*
<i>F</i> = 2.02*				
Ability to cope				
1. Anxiety and stress	.27	.07		5.87***
2. Self-management	.36	.13	.06	1.97
<i>F</i> = 3.14**				
Task-specific anxiety				
1. Anxiety and stress	.48	.23		22.09***
2. Self-management	.54	.29	.06	2.49*
<i>F</i> = 8.40***				

* *p* < .05.

** *p* < .01.

*** *p* < .001.

ability to cope when anxiety and stress at Time 1 were controlled (*R*²change = .06, n.s.), compared to when they were entered alone (*R*² = .10, *p* < .01).

Finally, we conducted supplementary mediation analyses on those specific BSM strategies that were found to be related to task-specific anxiety and ability to cope. As indicated in Table 4, only self-goal setting was related to ability to cope, and self-observation and self-punishment were related to task-specific anxiety. The results of the supplementary regression analyses indicated that self-goal setting explained 5% (*p* < .01) of the variance in ability to cope when entered alone and 3% (*p* < .05) of the variance when entered after anxiety and stress. For task-specific anxiety, self-observation and self-punishment explained 16% (*p* < .001) of the variance when entered alone, and 6% of the variance (*p* < .01) when entered after anxiety and stress.

In sum, these results provide some support for the hypothesis that anxiety and stress at Time 1 mediate the relationship between BSM and ability to cope and task-specific anxiety. In particular, anxiety and stress at Time 1 were found to partially mediate the relationship between BSM and task-specific anxiety, and to completely mediate the relationship between BSM and ability to cope. In addition, anxiety and stress were found to partially mediate the relationship between self-goal setting and ability to cope, and the relationship between self-observation and self-punishment with task-specific anxiety.

DISCUSSION

Socialization research has recently begun to adopt a new perspective in which newcomers are viewed as proactive agents in their own socialization

rather than as passive recipients of organizational socialization programs. Most of the research in this area has taken an information seeking perspective in which newcomers actively seek out information on various contextual domains from supervisors and co-workers in order to obtain task and role knowledge to reduce their feelings of uncertainty. This study contributes to the proactive socialization perspective by adding behavioral self-management as an additional means of proactive socialization behavior.

The results indicated that BSM was related to newcomers' general anxiety and stress during the first month of entry, and to internal motivation, ability to cope, and task-specific anxiety six months later. However, except for a few bivariate correlations, BSM was not related to affective or attitudinal outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to quit), or to job performance. The results also indicated that anxiety and stress during the first month of entry partly mediated the relationship between BSM and task-specific anxiety, and completely mediated the relationship between BSM and ability to cope. These findings add to previous research on newcomer stress which found that distress symptoms reported by newcomers prior to beginning a new job explained a considerable amount of the variance in distress 9 months later (Nelson & Sutton, 1990). The results of this study suggest that one way for newcomers to break this apparent distress-cycle might be through BSM which in this study was negatively related to general anxiety and stress at entry as well as to task-specific anxiety 6 months later.

The results also provide some insight into the relationship between specific self-management strategies and the socialization outcomes. For example, self-set goals, self-punishment, and self-observation were significantly correlated with several of the outcomes, while rehearsal and self-reward were only correlated with two of the outcomes. The results of the regression analyses indicated that self-set goals, self-punishment, self-observation, and self-reward were all related to at least one of the outcomes. The results of the supplementary analyses also indicated that anxiety and stress partially mediated the relationships between self-goal setting and ability to cope and between self-observation and self-punishment with task-specific anxiety.

That self-set goals were related to socialization outcomes should not be surprising as the goal setting literature provides ample support for the effects of goals on work outcomes (Locke & Latham, 1990), and laboratory research on self-regulatory processes have found that self-set goals are related to motivation and performance (Bandura & Cervone, 1983, 1986). What is perhaps most surprising is that self-punishment seemed to be a *negative* factor in relation to several of the outcomes. Newcomers who used self-punishment reported feeling more general anxiety and stress at entry, as well as more task-specific anxiety 6 months later. These findings seem to corroborate those of Brief and Hollenbeck (1985) who found that self-punishment had a detrimental effect on performance. Thus, although these results are preliminary,

they do suggest that self-punishment may increase the anxiety and stress of newcomers. Although we can only speculate at this time, self-punishment may reflect a self-critical stance which prevents one from deriving pleasure from achievements and exacerbates performance anxiety. According to Manz and Snyder (1983), excessive use of self-punishment and self-criticism are examples of dysfunctional self-management practices that can have negative implications for motivation, satisfaction, and performance. Therefore, although self-punishment has been part of self-management training programs (see Frayne & Latham, 1987), its role in the self-management process, and more importantly as part of training in BSM, needs to be more carefully investigated. Alternatively, self-punishment might indicate a more pervasive individual difference in which one is self-punitive and hypercritical across social domains.¹

An important direction for future research would be to build on the findings of this study by investigating the processes underlying the relationship between BSM and socialization outcomes. In the present study we did not actually measure socialization processes, but rather, a number of traditional socialization outcomes that have been linked to self-management. Therefore, it is important that future research on BSM and socialization investigate a more theoretically developed set of socialization processes and outcomes. For example, it has been suggested that BSM leads to greater learning and maintenance of complex skills (Gist et al., 1990, 1991). Thus, newcomers who practice BSM might experience greater and more rapid socialization because of enhanced learning and skill development, and a greater capacity to orchestrate the required knowledge and skills necessary to perform new tasks and roles. Therefore, future research should measure BSM in relation to newcomer learning, knowledge, and skill development.

The results also suggest that newcomers may benefit from training in BSM. As noted earlier, several studies have demonstrated that training in self-management is effective for improving job attendance (Frayne & Latham 1987; Latham & Frayne, 1989) and the acquisition and maintenance of complex interpersonal skills (Gist et al., 1991; Stevens et al., 1993). Thus, there is fairly strong evidence that training in BSM is effective. Tsui and Ashford (1994) recently suggested the use of orientation and training programs during socialization to teach self-management skills. They also noted that BSM can be encouraged and reinforced through norms and role models. Thus, there are both practical and research implications for self-management training as part of the socialization process. Given that skill in BSM requires experience and training (Latham & Locke, 1991), we would expect that self-management training for newcomers would result in even stronger relationships between BSM and socialization outcomes than those found in the present study.

¹ We thank one of the reviewers for this suggestion.

Future research on proactive socialization would benefit by integrating the BSM approach with the information seeking perspective. Although our intention was to explore BSM as a form of newcomer proactive behavior, there is good reason for future research on this topic to also include measures of information seeking which might function as a behavioral manifestation of self-management behavior.² Because information and feedback are important mechanisms of the self-management process, information seeking and BSM should be viewed as complementary approaches to proactive socialization. While the information seeking perspective delineates the methods, sources, and types of information sought by newcomers, the BSM approach indicates what newcomers do with this information to further proactively structure and manage their socialization experiences by setting goals, practicing desired behaviors, and administering rewards and punishments based on the evaluation of their behavioral outcomes. Further, the extent to which information seeking leads to socialization outcomes may depend on how well newly acquired information is learned, retained, integrated and orchestrated into successful performance which might be enhanced when accompanied by self-management. Thus, information seeking behavior may be most effective when it is combined with BSM. Therefore, a more comprehensive and complete theory of proactive socialization should include self-management and information seeking behaviors.

It is important that the results of this study be interpreted in accordance with its limitations. One limitation was that the extent to which participants actually practiced BSM appeared to be relatively moderate as the means for most of the self-management variables tended to be in the middle range, and the standard deviations were low. Nonetheless, that significant relationships were found attests to the relevance of BSM for newcomers. A second limitation was the use of self-report measures for self-management and the socialization outcomes. However, because self-management behavior is difficult to observe, and may occur outside of work and in private, individuals are probably the best source to report their self-management behavior. Further, because we obtained longitudinal data that measured self-management and socialization outcomes on separate questionnaires at different points in time, and job performance data was obtained from participants' supervisors, some of the biases of self-report data such as common method variance should be less of a problem. Since general anxiety and stress were measured on the first questionnaire, we cannot rule out common method variance for these variables.

Finally, some of the limitations in the measurement of the self-management variables and the socialization outcomes should be noted. Although the results

² We thank one of the reviewers for this suggestion.

of the confirmatory factor analyses of the self-management variables supported the existence of a six factor model, we had to drop the measure of cueing strategies due to its low reliability. Thus, we were unable to examine all six of the self-management variables. In addition, due to missing data we had to rely on a single item measure of job performance. These along with the low reliability for internal motivation, are also limitations that should be kept in mind when interpreting and generalizing the study findings.

In conclusion, the results of this study suggest that newcomer behavioral self-management during the first month of socialization is related to several socialization outcomes. This research contributes to the more traditional perspectives of socialization, and extends previous research on proactive socialization. Thus, it is recommended that future research further explore BSM as a form of newcomer "proactive" socialization behavior and as a complementary approach to the information seeking perspective.

APPENDIX

Task-Specific Anxiety Scale

Responses were measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree, to (7) Strongly Agree. (R) indicates reverse scoring. Higher scores reflect higher anxiety.

1. I tend to feel relaxed and comfortable when I am performing and documenting review procedures. (R)
2. I am usually relaxed and comfortable about going on an on-site field engagement. (R)
3. I often feel tense and apprehensive about going to work.
4. I often feel apprehensive and tense just thinking about having to work and interact with clients.
5. I often feel relaxed and comfortable when working and interacting with my co-workers. (R)
6. I tend to feel relaxed and comfortable when I am working and interacting with my supervisors/managers. (R).
7. I often feel relaxed and comfortable when working and interacting with clients. (R)
8. I sometimes feel tense and apprehensive while working on an engagement.
9. The thought of writing the Uniform Final Examination is distressful to me.
10. I tend to feel apprehensive and distressed when I am performing and documenting audit procedures.

REFERENCES

- Aldag, R. J., Brief, A. P., & Kolenko, T. A. (1983). An examination of self-reinforcement systems. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 154-158.

- Bandura, A., & Cervone, D. (1983). Self-evaluative and self-efficacy mechanisms governing the motivational effects of goal systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **45**, 1017–1028.
- Bandura, A., & Cervone, D. (1986). Differential engagement of self-reactive influences in cognitive motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **38**, 92–113.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **51**, 1173–1182.
- Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, **88**, 588–606.
- Bentler, P. M., & Chou, C. (1987). Practical issues in structural modeling. *Sociological Methods and Research*, **16**, 78–117.
- Brief, A. P., & Aldag, R. J. (1981). The “self” in work organizations: A conceptual review. *Academy of Management Review*, **6**, 75–88.
- Brief, A. P., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (1985). An exploratory study of self-regulating activities and their effects on job performance. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, **6**, 197–208.
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Harrison, R. V., & Pinneau, S. R. (1980). *Job demands and worker health*. Ann Arbor, MI: The Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Colarelli, S. M. (1984). Methods of communication and mediating processes in realistic job previews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **69**, 633–642.
- Fisher, C. D. (1985). Social support and adjustment to work: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Management*, **11**(3), 39–53.
- Frayne, C. A., & Latham, G. P. (1987). Application of social learning theory to employee self-management of attendance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **72**, 387–392.
- Gist, M. E., Bavetta, A. G., & Stevens, C. K. (1990). Transfer training method: Its influence on skill generalization, skill repetition, and performance level. *Personnel Psychology*, **43**, 501–523.
- Gist, M. E., Stevens, C. K., & Bavetta, A. G. (1991). Effects of self-efficacy and post-training intervention on the acquisition and maintenance of complex interpersonal skills. *Personnel Psychology*, **44**, 837–861.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1990). Confirmatory modeling in organizational behavior/human resource management: Issues and applications. *Journal of Management*, **16**, 337–360.
- House, R. J., Levanoni, E., & Schuler, R. S. (1982). *An empirical examination of the construct validity of the Rizzo, House and Lirtzman role scales: Toward a clarification of the nature of role conflict*. Paper presented at the annual mid-west meeting of the Academy of Management, Columbus, Ohio.
- James, L. R., & Brett, J. M. (1984). Mediators, moderators, and tests for mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **69**, 307–321.
- James, L. R., Mulaiik, S. A., & Brett, J. M. (1982). *Causal analysis: Assumptions, models, and data*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Jones, G. R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers’ adjustments to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, **29**, 262–279.
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. 1989. *LISREL 7: A guide to the program and applications* (2d ed.). Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.
- Katz, R. (1985). Organizational stress and early socialization experiences. In T. A. Beehr & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Human stress and cognition in organizations* (pp.117–139). New York: Wiley.

- Latham, G. P., & Frayne, C. A. (1989). Self-management training for increasing job attendance: A follow-up and a replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **74**, 411–416.
- Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Self-regulation through goal setting. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **50**, 212–247.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice–Hall.
- Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **25**, 226–251.
- Louis, M. R., Posner, B. Z., & Powell, G. N. (1983). The availability and helpfulness of socialization practices. *Personnel Psychology*, **36**, 857–866.
- Luthans, F., & Davis, T. R. V. (1979). Behavioral self-management—The missing link in managerial effectiveness. *Organizational Dynamics*, **8**(1), 42–60.
- Manz, C. C. (1983). *The art of self-leadership: Strategies for personal effectiveness in your life and work*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice–Hall.
- Manz, C. C. (1986). Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, **11**, 585–600.
- Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (1980). Self-management as a substitute for leadership: A social learning theory perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, **5**, 361–367.
- Manz, C. C., & Snyder, C. A. (1983, October). Systematic self-management: How resourceful entrepreneurs meet business challenges . . . and survive. *Management Review*, 68–73.
- Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Evaluation of confirmatory factor analytic and structural equation models using goodness-of-fit indices. *Psychological Reports*, **67**, 669–670.
- Miller, V. D., & Jablin, F. M. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics, and a model of the process. *Academy of Management Review*, **16**, 92–120.
- Morrison, E. W. (1993a). Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, **36**, 557–589.
- Morrison, E. W. (1993b). Longitudinal study of the effects of information seeking on newcomer socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **78**, 173–183.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1978). *The measurement of organizational commitment: A progress report*. Technical report No. 15, Department of Management, Graduate School of Management, University of Oregon.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **14**, 224–247.
- Nelson, D. L. (1987). Organizational socialization: A stress perspective. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, **8**, 311–324.
- Nelson, D. L., Quick, J. C., & Eakin, M. E. (1988). A longitudinal study of newcomer role adjustment in US organizations. *Work and Stress*, **2**, 239–253.
- Nelson, D. L., & Sutton, C. (1990). Chronic work stress and coping: A longitudinal study and suggested new directions. *Academy of Management Journal*, **33**, 859–869.
- Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1992). Organizational socialization as a learning process: The role of information acquisition. *Personnel Psychology*, **45**, 849–874.
- Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **42**, 170–183.
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., Lushene, R., Vagg, P. R., & Jacobs, G. A. (1983). *Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Stevens, C. K., Bavetta, A. G., & Gist, M. E. (1993). Gender differences in the acquisition of salary negotiation skills: The role of goals, self-efficacy, and perceived control. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **78**, 723–735.
- Tsui, A. S., & Ashford, S. J. (1994). Adaptive self-regulation: A process view of managerial effectiveness. *Journal of Management*, **20**, 93–121.

- Tucker, L. R., & Lewis, C. (1973). The reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, **38**, 1–10.
- Wanous, J. P. (1992). *Organizational entry: Recruitment, selection, orientation, and socialization of newcomers* (2nd ed.). Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Received: September 6, 1994