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A NEW ROLE FOR NEWCOMER PRE-ENTRY EXPECTATIONS DURING ORGANIZATIONAL ENTRY: EXPECTATION EFFECTS ON JOB PERCEPTIONS
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Dr. John P. Wanous, Advisor

A longitudinal field study was conducted which surveyed new bank tellers during training and their first month on the job. The coworkers of new tellers were also surveyed. Two hypotheses were tested. First it was predicted that newcomer pre-entry expectations would influence how they perceived the job once they were working, and that the ambiguity of social information received by newcomers would moderate this relationship. Second, it was hypothesized that work group perceptions would influence newcomer perceptions and that this relationship would be moderated by the ambiguity of social information. Ambiguity was measured as the uncertainty of work group perceptions, disagreement among work group members, and the frequency of interaction between newcomers and their coworkers. Support was found for the influence of both pre-entry expectations and work group perceptions. Very weak support was found for the moderating effects of social information ambiguity. However, expectation and social information effects were moderated by the content of perceptions. This study also examined three
possible relationships between newcomers' job perceptions and job attitudes and performance. The influence of perceptions alone, the discrepancy between newcomer and work group perceptions, and met expectations were compared. Met expectations were not related to job attitudes. Perceptions alone influenced satisfaction and commitment. Perceptual congruency influenced satisfaction and commitment beyond the effect of perceptions alone. None of the three perceptual measures predicted performance. Results are discussed in terms of their implications for the met expectations, realistic job preview, and organizational socialization literatures.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Organizational socialization is the process through which an individual comes to learn the behaviors, values, and knowledge which are necessary for adapting to an organizational role and becoming a participative organizational member (Louis, 1980; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Socialization implies more than learning how to perform the tasks associated with one's job. It also involves developing a perceptual scheme which allows for the interpretation of organizational events in a manner which makes sense to the newcomer and coincides with scheme shared by insiders (Louis, 1980; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Van Maanen & Schein (1979, p. 212) suggest that the results of socialization include "a readiness to select certain events for attention over others, a stylized stance towards one's routine activities, (and) some ideas as to how one's behavioral responses are viewed by others...". Thus, an important aspect of the socialization process is how the newcomer comes to perceive and interpret the organizational environment (Jones, 1983; Louis, 1980; Reichers, 1987).

There is a long line of literature which states that the organizational environment, like any other social environment, is not a given but is constructed according to members' personal and shared perceptions of the environment (Naylor, Pritchard, & Ilgen, 1980; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978; Schneider, 1975; Weick, 1979). It has also been argued
that organization members tend to share the same perceptions of their environment (Schneider, 1975) and that they develop common interpretative frameworks to deal with the environment (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Newcomers differ from longstanding members in that they do not possess the local interpretative schemes shared by members (Louis, 1980). For example, insiders may view assignment to a particular task as a reward. Thus, task assignment is perceived as an indication of management's evaluation of their performance. However, a newcomer may not perceive or misinterpret the performance-task assignment link and, thereby arrive at a different interpretation of the event. Van Maanen (1977) observed that newcomer police recruits were often unaware that local interpretative schemes existed and did not realize that they were unfamiliar with them.

Although organizational socialization has been described as a process by which newcomers come to develop shared perceptions of the work environment, little empirical work has addressed the issue of the factors which influence early job perceptions. The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the influence of newcomer pre-entry expectations on their subsequent perceptions of the job. Newcomer pre-entry expectations have been accorded a great deal of attention in the organizational entry process in terms of the met expectations hypothesis (Porter & Steers, 1973), the realistic job preview literature (Premack & Wanous, 1985; Wanous, 1980), and stage models of socialization (Buchanan, 1974; Feldman, 1976, 1981; Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975; Schein, 1978; Van Maanen, 1976). However, these lines of literature mainly propose that it is the discrepancy between pre-entry
expectations and organizational "reality" which influences early job adjustment.

Furthermore, expectations about the job have not been studied in previous job perception literature represented by the task characteristics approach (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hackman & Oldham, 1975, 1976) and the social information processing approach (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Pre-entry expectations will be treated as a third source of information which can influence newcomer job perceptions beyond information provided by objective job characteristics and social information.

A second purpose of the proposed study is to examine the relationship between early job perceptions and subsequent job attitudes, performance, and turnover. Various literatures have proposed three ways in which perceptions of job characteristics are related to reactions to the job. The met expectations and realistic job preview literature propose that job attitudes and behavior are a function of the discrepancy between pre-entry expectations and subsequent perceptions of whether those expectations have been met. The job attributes approach (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hackman & Oldham, 1975, 1976) stipulates that there is a direct relationship between perceptions of job characteristics and reactions toward the job and that this relationship is moderated by growth need strength. The socialization literature implies that reactions to the job are a function of the discrepancy between newcomer perceptions and the perceptions of insiders. Previous literature has not conceptually nor empirically integrated these three lines of thought.

The first part of this review discusses the influence of pre-entry expectations on subsequent job perceptions. First, an explanation of why
and how pre-entry expectations are likely to influence the newcomer's subsequent job perceptions will be given. Second, previous frameworks for studying the development of job perceptions will be discussed. Finally, the effect of expectations on subsequent perceptions will be integrated with the met-expectations/realistic job preview literature. The second part of this chapter outlines the different ways in which early job perceptions can be linked to attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. Finally, in the third section, a model will be presented which integrates the relationship between pre-entry expectations, subsequent job perceptions, and the link between job perceptions and attitudinal and behavioral responses to the job.
CHAPTER I
LITERATURE REVIEW

The Effect of Expectations on Job Perceptions

During the past decade, scholars have come to view perceptions of the work environment as a result of an active process on the part of the perceiver (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977, 1978; Schneider, 1975; Weick, 1979). Thus, job perceptions are influenced by a variety of factors. The issue of how individuals come to perceive and interpret characteristics of their jobs has been mainly addressed from two frameworks: the job characteristics approach (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hackman & Oldham, 1975, 1976; Turner & Lawrence, 1965) and the social information processing (SIP) approach (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Although most conceptual and empirical work on job perceptions has focused on social influences or assumed that perceptions reflect objective characteristics, many authors have pointed out that there are a variety of other factors which can potentially influence perceptions of the work environment (e.g., Griffin, 1983; O'Reilly et al., 1980; Thomas & Griffin, 1983). Thus, two important questions need to be explored: (1) What other factors influence perceptions of the job?; and (2) What conditions affect the relative impact of the different sources of influence?
Schneider (1983) has criticized both the task characteristics and SIP literature for taking a decidedly situationist perspective and ignoring the role of individual attributes and their interaction with the situation as influences on the perception of and reaction to the work environment. Therefore, another general class of variables to consider are individual attributes. Although this issue has not received a great deal of conceptual attention or theoretical development, a few studies have examined the main effects of individual differences on task perceptions and reactions (O'Connor & Barrett, 1980; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1979; O'Reilly et al., 1980; Weiss & Shaw, 1979). These studies lend some support to the main effects of individual differences (see Thomas & Griffin, 1983). However, specific individual differences have not been systematically studied by more than two studies. Also, the SIP literature (see Thomas & Griffin, 1983) has acknowledged that individual differences can moderate the role between social cues and perceptions. However, at the core, each approach to job perceptions postulates that it is environmental information, either social or objective, which is the primary influence on job perceptions.

The proposed study takes an interactionist perspective on the formation of job perceptions by treating newcomer expectations as an individual attribute whose influence on task perceptions is moderated by the ambiguity of environmental information, either social or objective. Thus, the individual is depicted as playing an active role in the perceptual process. Newcomer pre-entry expectations are posited as a third source of influence on job perceptions for three reasons. First, there is a cognitive and motivational basis for expectation effects on
perceptions. Second, considering pre-entry expectations as an influence on job perceptions integrates the socialization and job perceptions literatures. Third, if pre-entry expectations influence subsequent perceptions, there will be important implications for the prescriptions offered by the RJP and met-expectations literature. Each of these issues is treated in detail below.

**Reasons for Expectation Effects on Perceptions**

The social schema literature (Hastie, 1981; Higgins & Bargh, 1987; Marcus & Zajonc, 1985; Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Taylor & Crocker, 1981) indirectly suggests that one's expectations about an event will influence perceptions, interpretations, memory, and judgments about the event when information about the event is ambiguous. In general, "schema theory" hypothesizes that individuals possess cognitive structures (schemata) representing organized prior knowledge which has been abstracted from experience (Brewer & Nakamura, 1984; Fiske & Linville, 1980; Marcus & Zajonc, 1985; Neisser, 1976; Rumelhart, 1984; and Taylor & Crocker, 1981). These knowledge structures are generically referred to as schemata which serve to guide information processing by directing the search for information, providing a framework for the encoding and retrieval of information, and influencing how stored knowledge will be subsequently used. The underlying theme to this body of literature is that an individual's personal cognitive representation of knowledge, based on past experience, guides the selective processing and use of current environmental information in such a manner that goes beyond the information provided.
Before arguing that pre-entry expectations about jobs will influence perceptions of jobs in a manner similar to schematic effects, the link between schemata and expectations must be developed. At the conceptual level, this is difficult to achieve because most authors in the area of social cognition concede that the schema concept is ill-defined (Fiske & Linville, 1980; Hastie, 1981; Marcus & Zajonc, 1985; Taylor & Crocker, 1981). Close examination of different conceptualizations of the schema concept yield quite different definitions. These range from Neisser's (1976) conception of a schema as a highly structured perceptual framework with a physiological basis, to the general conception of a schema as a world view (Marcus & Zajonc, 1985). Furthermore, the basic concept of schemata has been referred to by many names such as frames (Minsky, 1975), scripts (Schank & Abelson, 1977), and implication molecules (Abelson & Reich, 1969). The issue of schema definition and structure is beyond the scope of the present paper. Wyer and Gordon (1984) provide an indepth review of this issue. For the purposes of the present dissertation, it is difficult to link pre-entry expectations and schemata at the conceptual level because of the diversity of opinion concerning the schema concept. However, as described below, at the operational level it is more feasible to link expectations and schemata.

At the conceptual level pre-entry expectations about the job would appear to be a byproduct of one's schema concerning different aspects of the job. For example, if one has a coworker schema which contains the attributes "friendly" and "helpful", then it is likely that a newcomer would expect his or her new coworkers to be friendly and helpful, in the absence of other information. However, it is possible that
stated expectations are not solely derived from one's cognitive representation of the work world. They may be due in part to other factors, such as preferences. Thus, at a conceptual level the link between schemata and pre-entry expectations is unclear.

At the operational level, the connection between a schema and an expectation about an event is more easily drawn. Schemata can be viewed as hypothetical constructs used to explain the results of many studies which could not be explained by associationist models of cognition. Operationally, schema research demonstrates that when a subject is shown an ambiguous event and provided with a prime (or label) for the event, the perception, memory, and judgment of the event are influenced by the prime. In schematic terms, the prime activates a certain schema which serves to guide information processing. In other words, providing subjects with information about a stimulus is taken as the equivalent of activating subjects' schemata. The priming procedure can also be thought to evoke expectations about the stimuli to be encountered. In this sense, priming is similar to interventions which serve to manipulate newcomers' pre-entry expectations because subjects are told what they will be encountering in a future situation. Pre-entry expectations may also serve as a "natural prime" because they provide information about a future event. For example, if a newcomer expects to receive a great deal of feedback from the supervisor, he or she would be primed to consider any type of communication from the supervisor as being an evaluation of performance.

A frequently cited study by Zadny and Gerard (1974) serves as a prototypical example of how social schema research on memory is conducted. Subjects in this study watched a videotape of two people
exploring a room and discussing police, theft, and drug use. Prior to watching the film, subjects were primed by being told that the actors were either burglars, students waiting for a friend, or friends trying to hide drugs. In schematic terms, the prime had served to activate a schema. It could also be argued that the prime led to specific expectations about what was going to occur in the film. For example, subjects in the burglar condition would expect the actors to look for valuable objects and those in the drug condition to examine possible hiding places. Zadny and Gerard found that in a free recall task, subjects provided with the burglars prime recalled more theft related items than did those in the other groups. This finding was interpreted to mean that those in the burglar condition based their recall on the schema which had been activated during priming.

The body of research concerning the effects of social schemata on social information processing is large and has been reviewed by many authors (Hastie, 1981; Higgins & Bargh, 1987; Marcus & Zajonc, 1985; Rumelhart, 1984; Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Taylor & Crocker, 1981). This literature provides several findings which can be pertinent to the effects of pre-entry job expectations on subsequent job perceptions.

First, ambiguous stimuli can be comprehended when subjects are provided with a label for the stimuli (Bransford and Johnson, 1973). It appears that the label allows for selective attention and better organization of information than that permitted by the stimulus alone. Early expectations which allow newcomers to label ambiguous stimuli as a familiar event should lead to the interpretation of ambiguous stimuli which is in line with expectations.
Second, schemata have also been demonstrated to influence memory in two ways. First, it has been concluded that information which is relevant to the prime is better recalled than irrelevant information (Marcus & Zajonc, 1985) when irrelevant information is defined as information which is not related (i.e., neither consistent nor inconsistent) to the prime. Therefore, when expectations act as a prime, newcomers would be less likely to remember information which is considered to be irrelevant to the expectation than that which is either consistent or inconsistent. Second, priming subjects about a stimulus can lead to the recall of attributes of the stimuli which were never observed (Bartlett, 1932; Bower, Black, & Turner, 1979; Bransford & Franks, 1971; Cantor & Mischel, 1977; Snyder & Uranowitz, 1978; Spiro, 1977). This is called an intrusion effect. Recent reviews have been sceptical about this effect (Higgins & Bargh, 1987; Marcus & Zajonc, 1985; Wyer & Gordon, 1984). The implication for the effects of newcomer's expectations would be that newcomers would "remember" information which was generated by the expectation but never encountered in the environment.

Third, schemata have been demonstrated to influence judgments, evaluations, and causal attributions about stimuli in a manner which goes "beyond the information given" (Bruner, 1957). In general schemata provide rules for combining, distorting, and discounting information which serves as the basis for interpretation and inference (Marcus & Zajonc, 1985). Langer and Abelson (1974) demonstrated the influence of schemata on judgments. Traditional psychotherapists watched a videotape of an interview between two men. Half were told that the interviewee was on job interview and the others were told that he was a mental patient.
Those who thought the target to be a mental patient rated him as more mentally ill than those who thought him to be a job applicant. Thus, newcomers' expectations about events can influence their evaluation of these events beyond the information which is provided by the environment.

In conclusion, expectations can influence job perceptions through several cognitive mechanisms. First, expectations can guide selective attention. Second, they can influence interpretation of ambiguous stimuli. Third, memory will be better for relevant information than for information considered irrelevant. Furthermore, expectations may determine what aspects of the environment are perceived as relevant or important. Fourth, they may lead to the memory of information which was not actually encountered. Finally, expectations can influence evaluations and judgments about stimuli. However, these effects will only occur when the environmental information is sufficiently ambiguous and when the newcomer has the information processing goal of comprehending the information or forming an impression (Small & Wyer, 1986).

Pre-entry expectations may also influence subsequent job perceptions via motivational mechanisms. Cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) states that when people perceive a discrepancy between their attitudes or attitudes and behavior, they become uncomfortable and are motivated to reduce the discrepancy. Newcomers entering a new job have already made the decision to join the organization, and, thus, must have relatively positive expectations and attitudes about what the job is like and how they will feel about it. An underlying basis for the RJP literature is that newcomers often have inflated expectations (Wanous,
1980). Also, according to Soelberg's (1967) conceptualization of the organizational choice process, individuals will engage in a decision confirmation process whereby they distort information about their favorite alternative in order to make this choice seem more attractive. According to dissonance theory, individuals would be motivated to maintain these positive expectations and feelings about the new job. Thus, when there is leeway in how different aspects of the job can be interpreted, it would be to the newcomer's advantage, from a dissonance perspective, to interpret or perceive the event as being congruent with previous expectations.

Cognitive dissonance is only one of several psychological theories which can be used to explain the relationship between pre-entry expectations and subsequent job perceptions. For example, when newcomers encounter aspects of the job environment that can be interpreted as discrepant with their expectations, they may perceive these aspects as being very negative in contrast to what they expected. There has been no empirical research which has directly examined the relationship between pre-entry expectations and subsequent job perceptions. Therefore, there is no a priori evidence which suggests that dissonance theories are the most useful in explaining the relationship between expectations and perceptions. However, marketing research concerning the disconfirmation of consumer expectations through product trial (Anderson, 1973; Cardozo, 1965; Oliver, 1976; Olshavsky & Miller, 1972; Olson & Dover, 1979; Woodside, 1972) bears some evidence on this issue.
In general, disconfirmation of consumer expectations research involves evoking expectations about a product, providing subjects experience with a product that disconfirms their expectations, and then comparing the post-trial perceptions and attitudes towards the product with those of a control group who were not led to expect anything in particular (Olson & Dover, 1979). This research is relevant here because it examines the impact of pre-trial expectations on perceptions of qualities of a product which is similar to the impact of pre-entry expectations on subsequent perceptions of qualities of the job (e.g. social climate, task attributes).

Anderson (1973) directly addressed the question of which of four different theories best explained the relationship between product expectations and subsequent perceptions of the product (a pen) on a variety of dimensions. The four competing theories were: (1) Cognitive Dissonance/Assimilation (Product perceptions would vary directly with the level of expectations.); (2) Contrast (Product perceptions would vary inversely with the level of expectations.); (3) Generalized Negativity (Product perceptions would always be negative when there is a discrepancy between expectations and product performance.); and (4) Assimilation-Contrast (Product perceptions would vary directly with expectations up to a point. When the discrepancy between expectations and actual product performance became extremely large, perceptions would be inversely related to expectations.). Anderson also tested a null hypothesis stating that there is no relationship between pre-trial expectations and post-trial perceptions of the product.
Anderson's results supported the Assimilation-Contrast theory. That is, he found perceptions of the pen moved toward pre-trial expectations only when the discrepancy between expectations and actual performance was small and less obvious. When the discrepancy between actual pen performance and expectations was large and unambiguous, there was an inverse (contrast) relationship between expectations and perceptions. These results support the hypothesized relationship between pre-entry expectations and subsequent job perceptions. Job perceptions are expected to be positively related to pre-entry expectations only when environmental information about the job is ambiguous and not obviously discrepant with expectations.

Newcomers may also be motivated to perceive ambiguous information as being congruent with their expectations because this will allow them a sense of control over the situation. There is a long line of literature in psychology which depicts individuals as implicit scientists who are motivated to predict, understand, and control their environment (Kelly, 1955; Wegner & Vallacher, 1977). Thus, they develop theories, hypotheses, and expectations about their environment. Diverse areas of literature, such as the work on actor-observer attribution differences and stereotyping (see Wegner & Vallacher, 1977), have demonstrated that individuals will interpret information in a way that promotes their sense of prediction by confirming their implicit hypotheses or expectations. According to Louis (1980, in press), newcomers' primary goal is to reduce uncertainty in interpreting their environment.

Wanous and Colella (1989) argue that the beneficial effects of RJPs result, in part, because they allow newcomers to predict what will
happen to them on the job. In this case, newcomers feel a sense of control prior to entering the job. Once on the job, newcomers can increase or continue their sense of control and predictability by interpreting and perceiving certain aspects of the job in a manner which is congruent with what they expected. This would be particularly likely when information about the environment is ambiguous or absent, as is often the case for newcomers.

**Other Approaches to Job Perceptions.**

 Previous research has mainly focused on two sources of influence on employee perceptions of the work environment: objective task attributes and social information. These approaches are discussed below in terms of how they relate to the formation of newcomers' early job perceptions.

 The job characteristics approach to job reactions was developed in order to explain the relationship between objective job or task attributes and employee reactions to their job such as commitment, satisfaction, performance, and turnover (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Turner & Lawrence, 1965). Hackman & Oldham (1975, 1976) developed the most common form of this model by presenting the job attribute-job reaction relationship in terms of a need satisfaction model whereby this relationship is moderated by the individual's growth need strength (GNS). Roberts and Glick (1981) and Fried and Ferris (1987) provide reviews of this literature.

 Implicit in this model is the assumption that employee perceptions of job characteristics are equivalent to the objective characteristics of the job (Roberts & Glick, 1981). This assumption is evident in the empirical research done on task attributes which frequently attempts to
assess objective task/job characteristics with perceptual measures such as the JDI (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) or the JCI (Sims, Szilagyi, & Keller, 1976). It has been concluded that the relationship between task attributes and responses to the job is stronger when job attributes are assessed by perceptual measures compared to objective measures (Fried & Ferris, 1987; Roberts & Glick, 1981).

The job characteristics model has been criticized on several grounds (Roberts & Glick, 1981; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977). Most important to the present dissertation is the question of the relationship between perceived job characteristics and objective characteristics. Several authors (e.g., Blau & Katerberg, 1982; Griffin, 1983; Roberts & Glick, 1981; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977, 1978, Shaw, 1980) have suggested that there are other influences on job perceptions, such as individual personality differences and social information. The socialization literature (Jones, 1983; Louis, 1980; Reichers, 1987; Van Maanen, 1976; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) also take this position by suggesting that the way newcomers come to perceive, understand, and interpret their new environments is an outcome of the socialization process. Furthermore, the assumption that jobs consist of objective characteristics independent of the perceiver has been called into question (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977, 1978). In fact, Hackman & Oldham (1975) obtained a median correlation of .51 between incumbent and supervisors’ perceptions of the same job. Jenkins, Nadler, Lawler, and Cammann (1975) found that the correlations between trained observers’ perceptions of various job attributes and incumbents’ perceptions ranged from .14 to .48. These findings suggest
that perceptions of the same job vary according to the position of the perceiver.

However, there is evidence that objective characteristics do have some influence on subjects' perceptions of their jobs (Fried & Ferris, 1987; Thomas & Griffin, 1983). This is most likely when the characteristic of the job is unambiguous. However, the socialization of newcomers is not about how they come to interpret obvious aspects of the job but rather how they come to perceive and interpret less objectively obvious aspects. As discussed above, the more ambiguous the information conditions, the more likely that expectations will influence perceptions.

Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) proposed that social information is an important influence on individual employee attitudes toward the job, behavior, and expressed needs. One way in which social information influences attitudes and behavior is by influencing how an individual perceives and interprets characteristics of the job. Social information can affect perceptions of the work environment by providing the individual with an interpretative framework for understanding complex environmental stimuli and by directing attentional processes by making certain features of the environment more salient compared to others. Thus, social information is depicted as influencing perceptions through the same cognitive mechanisms as pre-entry expectations.

Thomas and Griffin (1983) reviewed 10 empirical studies which examined the effects of social cues on perceptions of task characteristics, satisfaction, and performance along with other miscellaneous outcomes (e.g., role ambiguity). Seven of these studies were conducted in the laboratory with student subjects (Griffin, 1983;
O'Connor & Barrett, 1980; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1979; Shaw & Weekley, 1981; Slusher & Griffin, 1980; Weiss & Shaw, 1979; White & Mitchell, 1979). Two studies were field surveys (Oldham & Miller, 1979; O'Reilly, Partlette, & Bloom, 1980) and one was a field experiment (Griffin, 1983). Thomas & Griffin concluded that social cues affect perceptions of task characteristics.

The SIP approach to job perceptions is useful for learning how newcomers come to perceive and interpret their new environments. Several writers have discussed the importance of social interaction and social information during the sense making process which is crucial to the socialization experience (Feldman, 1976, 1983; Katz, 1980; Louis, 1980; Mead, 1932; Reichers, 1987; Van Maanen, 1976, 1977). Katz (1980) has argued that employees are most susceptible to social influence early in their careers because, in Lewinian terms, they are "unfrozen". Newcomers are viewed as relying primarily upon social interaction and feedback when forming their view of the new environment.

From the SIP perspective, Vance and Biddle (1985) conducted a laboratory study to determine if task experience moderated the relationship between social cues and perceptions of the job (task characteristics, group interaction, and group performance). Subjects received verbal social cues from confederate coworkers either 7 or 25 minutes into the 35 minute task period. They found an interaction between social cues and experience. Cues had more of an impact when they were presented early in the experiment. This finding supports the contention that social information is most important when employees are least experienced.
Proponents of the social information approach to job perceptions assume that social information will always be less ambiguous and open to interpretation than information inherent in other aspects of the job environment. The majority of SEP studies have been conducted in the laboratory where social cues were made extremely unambiguous and salient. Also, subjects enter these experiments with few expectations based on previous, similar experiences (Katz, 1980). These conditions do not reflect the newcomer's early organizational experiences. When newcomers enter a new organization, they do not share the common perspective and thus social interactions will be open to their interpretations. Also, early in the entry process, newcomers may not have access to the social information passed between more experienced members because they have not passed through the inclusionary boundaries of the group (Schein, 1971; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Thus, newcomers must rely on other sources of information when perceiving and interpreting their environment.

Several writers (Jones, 1983; Katz, 1980, Louis, 1980) have briefly mentioned that when social information is absent, newcomers will rely on their own expectations derived from past experiences. However, this issue has not been developed. Work concerning the sense making of newcomers has mostly considered newcomers to be tabula rasa with respect to having an interpretative scheme for the new environment (Katz, 1980). The socialization literature has remained situationist (Jones, 1983; Schneider, 1983) by primarily focusing on the impact of environmental influences on the perceptions of newcomers. By considering the role that pre-entry expectations play in the outcomes of early sense making processes, the
other treatments of pre-entry expectations.
The role of newcomers' pre-entry expectations has received a great deal of attention in the organizational entry literature (Wanous, 1977, 1980). However, the major concern has been with whether or not expectations are perceived as met and whether they are realistic. The proposed study is unique to the expectations literature because it presents expectations as influences on subsequent job perceptions rather than a baseline against which perceptions are evaluated.

The effect of expectations on subsequent job attitudes and behaviors (not perceptions) has been traditionally studied in terms of the "met expectations" hypothesis. Porter and Steers (1973) articulated this position as follows: "The concept of met expectations may be viewed as the discrepancy between what a person encounters on the job...and what he expects to encounter...when an individual's expectations - whatever they are - are not substantially met, his propensity to withdraw would increase. (p. 152)".

In general, research on the met expectation hypothesis involves correlating the difference between early expectations and subsequent job perceptions or just the initial level of expectations with a variety of outcome measures. According to Porter and Steers' (1973) formulation, satisfaction and, consequently, turnover are the outcomes most likely to be influenced by unmet expectations. Wanous and Premack (1987)
conducted a meta-analysis of 20 met expectation studies which examined
the effects of met expectations on five outcomes (organizational
commitment, job satisfaction, intention to remain, job performance, and
job survival). They found that when the Porter and Steers definition of
met expectations was strictly adhered to, all variance between studies
was due to statistical artifacts. In this case, met expectations were
positively correlated with commitment (.30), satisfaction (.32), intention
to remain (.20), performance (.07), and job survival (.18).

A related line of literature is the realistic job preview (RJP)
literature which basically argues that realistic pre-entry expectations
result in higher satisfaction and lower turnover than unrealistic
expectations. This literature suggests that providing newcomers with
realistic pre-entry information will result in more realistic expectations
which will then lead to positive outcomes. The realism of early
expectations is generally operationally defined in one of two ways: (1)
lower expectations are more realistic expectations; or (2) the discrepancy
between initial expectations and subsequent post-entry perceptions, where
a smaller discrepancy indicates more realistic expectations (Premack &
Wanous, 1985).

RJPs have been hypothesized to have positive effects for a
variety of reasons. First, RJPs may serve as a "vaccination" which
innoculates an individual with a small dose of organizational reality
(Wanous, 1980). The vaccination effect should result in lower (supposedly
more realistic) expectations. Therefore, individuals will be less likely
disappointed by unmet expectations. Second, RJPs can lead to
self-selection (Wanous, 1980). When provided with realistic job
information, individuals will have a sound basis for deciding whether the job will meet their own needs. Third, RJPs can work by creating personal commitment to the organization (Reilly, Brown, Blood, & Malatesta, 1981; Wanous, 1980). If an individual believes that a job choice decision was made without coercion, commitment to that decision is greater than when the decision was coerced or otherwise externally controlled (Bem, 1970). Fourth, RJPs may increase the respect and trust that a newcomer feels toward the organization (Wanous & Colella, 1989). Finally, RJPs may provide the newcomer with information which allows for better coping skills once in the organization (Ilgen & Seely, 1974).

There have been six reviews of the RJP literature to date (McEvoy & Cascio, 1985; Premack & Wanous, 1985; Reilly, Brown, Blood, & Malatesta, 1981; Wanous, 1977, 1980; Wanous & Colella, in press). The most comprehensive review was conducted by Premack and Wanous (1985) and subsequently supported by the most recent review by Wanous and Colella (in press). Premack and Wanous conducted a meta-analysis of 21 studies examining the effects of RJPs (compared to control groups) on climate perceptions, commitment, coping, initial expectations, job satisfaction, performance, self-selection, and job survival. Overall, they found that RJPs had modest effects. Effects were strongest for initial expectations (d=-.34), commitment (d=.19, with significant variance between studies), job satisfaction (d=.05), self-selection (d=.12), and job survival (d=.12). The effect size for performance was moderated by the method of RJP presentation (d= -.04 with written RJP, d=.32 with audiovisual RJP).
Organizational socialization scholars have also incorporated the notion that pre-entry job expectations are an important influence on newcomers' subsequent adjustment and reactions toward the job. Several stage theories of socialization (Buchanan, 1974; Feldman, 1976, 1981; Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975; Schein, 1978; Van Maanen, 1976) have incorporated the accuracy or realism of pre-entry expectations into the initial or anticipatory stage of the socialization process. These models all focus on how realistic or how close to organizational "reality" expectations are.

Feldman's (1976) three stage model is a good example because it is the only model which has been empirically tested by more than one study. Feldman hypothesized that the realism of pre-entry expectations was a crucial component of the first stage of socialization, anticipatory socialization. Realism was thought to directly affect processes occurring during the second stage, accommodation. These processes are initiation to the task, initiation to the group, congruence of evaluation, and role definition.

In a cross-sectional, correlational study of 118 hospital employees, Feldman (1976) found that the self-reported realism of employees' pre-entry expectations only had direct influence on role definition and, consequently, an indirect influence on general satisfaction. Dubinsky, Howell, Ingram, and Bellenger (1986) conducted a similar study using 189 sales managers. With respect to the effects of realism, they replicated Feldman's findings and also found realism to be related to a stage three process, resolution of conflicting demands at work. It should be noted that these studies both measured realism by asking subjects to remember
how realistic their expectations were rather than objectively measuring realism prior to entry into the organization. Thus, they were examining perceived realism.

The met expectation, RJP, and socialization approaches to the role of newcomer expectations in early adjustment assume that newcomers' pre-entry expectations are independent from their subsequent perceptions. These approaches are more interested with the within-person discrepancy between expectations and perceptions rather than the between-person correlation between expectations and perceptions. It is well documented across a variety of occupations that newcomers' on-the-job perceptions are lower than their pre-entry expectations and that these perceptions tend to become lower with increasing tenure (Bray, Campbell, & Grant, 1974; Dunnette, Arvey, & Banas, 1973; Wanous, 1976). However, it has yet to be investigated whether those individuals with higher pre-entry expectations have relatively higher perceptions than those with low pre-entry expectations.

It appears that the met expectations, RJP, and socialization approaches are in direct conflict with the predictions made in the present dissertation. The traditional approaches to realistic expectations argue that the lower the initial expectations, the better, because they are more likely to be met. On the other hand, the current dissertation argues that the higher the initial expectations, the better because perceptions of the job will be more positive. These two opposing views can be integrated when one considers the moderating influence of the amount, saliency, and ambiguity of environmental (e.g., inherent in the task, social) information.
The met expectations, RJP, and socialization approaches to the role of expectations assume that newcomers are passive with respect to how they perceive the environment. The implicit assumption is that pre-entry expectations are compared to an existing organizational "reality". However, it has been sufficiently argued elsewhere (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977, 1978; Weick, 1979; Reichers, 1987), that environments are enacted and cognitively constructed by the individuals within the environment. As argued above, perceptions of organizational "reality" can be influenced by a variety of sources of information. If there is a sufficient amount of salient, unambiguous environmental information available to newcomers, they will be able to test whether this information matches what they expected. Under these circumstances, it would be best to manipulate pre-entry expectations so that they are close to the information likely to be encountered on the job.

On the other hand, as argued above, newcomers may not have access to sufficient environmental information about certain aspects of the job. It is under these conditions that pre-entry expectations would most likely influence subsequent job perceptions. Hence, when individuals are placed in a highly ambiguous environment or when there are few socialization efforts made on the part of the organization, two outcomes will result. First, expectations will more likely be perceived as met because perceptions are based on expectations. Second, high initial expectations will lead to more positive outcomes than negative expectations because high expectations will lead to positive perceptions.

Close examination of the RJP literature yields two findings which may also serve to integrate the seemingly discrepant positions on the
effects of pre-entry expectations. First, conclusive, strong empirical evidence has not been found that demonstrates lowered expectations are a mechanism through which RJP$s influence satisfaction and turnover (Breaugh, 1983; Colarelli, 1984; Dugoni & Ilgen, 1981; Reilly et al., 1981). From an RJP framework, this suggests that RJP$s affect outcomes through different mediators such as self-selection or increased commitment to choice. However, this dissertation would suggest that the mediating effects of lowered or "realistic" expectations are moderated by the ambiguity of post-entry environmental information. In an ambiguous environment, lowered expectations would lead to worse perceptions than inflated expectations and the newcomer would not encounter information which lead to the perception of unmet expectations. Hence, lower expectations would not be related to increases in satisfaction and job survival. Lowered expectations should only be related to satisfaction and, consequently, turnover in situations where the newcomer is likely to encounter salient, unambiguous environmental information which would lead to the perception that the expectation was met or unmet.

Second, there may be an early critical period where lowered expectations resulting from RJP$s may actually increase turnover (Meglino & Dinisi, 1987; Wanous & Colella, 1989). Several studies have found that subjects who received RJP$s had higher turnover rates early on than control groups, although this difference disappeared over time (Avner, Gusastello, & Alderman, 1982; Dean & Wanous, 1984; Meglino & Dinisi, 1987). A possible explanation is that low expectations led to low perceptions which escalated in the negative direction because newcomers had not been exposed to information which put their perceptions in
perspective. If expectations are low to begin with, this may lead the newcomer to attend to and more readily recall negative aspects of the environment. The self-fulfilling prophecy may also come into play when the newcomer's expectations influence the behavior of the work group so that they subsequently behave in a manner which is consistent with the newcomer's expectations. In this case, the newcomer has created a negative environment. These effects may wear off over time because, through the socialization process, the newcomer is exposed to information which challenges overly negative expectations.
The Relationship between Job Perceptions and Outcomes

So far the current paper has focused primarily on how and why pre-entry expectations may influence job perceptions. However, job perceptions have not been traditionally considered an outcome of primary interest. Rather, the focus has been to determine how perceptions of the job are related to behavioral and attitudinal reactions to the job. As discussed below, several different hypotheses have been presented about how perceptions relate to outcomes (e.g., satisfaction, commitment, and turnover). Little has been done to integrate these different conceptions of how job perceptions relate to job outcomes, particularly in the context of the organizational entry process. The second purpose of this study is to examine the strength of different hypotheses concerning the relationship between job perceptions and outcomes.

Several lines of thought concerning the relationship between job perceptions and outcomes have been proposed which can be grouped into three categories: (1) the met expectations (ME) approach; (2) the direct influence (DI) approach, and (3) the perceptual congruence (PC) approach. Considering pre-entry expectations as an influence on subsequent job perceptions calls attention to the differences between these different conceptualizations of the relationship between job perceptions and reactions to the job.

The ME approach to the relationship between job perceptions and outcomes is exemplified by the met expectations, RJP, and socialization stage model literatures reviewed above. Basically, this position states that it is the discrepancy between pre-entry expectations and subsequent perceptions which influences outcomes. The ME approach is not concerned with the level of job perceptions. Presumably, a newcomer who has negative perceptions of the environment which are congruent with initial negative expectations would react
more favorably toward the job than one who had positive perceptions which were discrepant with very positive expectations. Met expectations and realistic expectations have been found to have modest effects on commitment, satisfaction, intention to remain, and job survival (Premack & Wanous, 1985; Wanous & Premack, 1987).

However, the ME approach assumes that expectations and perceptions are independent. If the information environment is ambiguous and expectations influence perceptions, then most newcomers will likely experience their expectations to have been met and realistic. Therefore, it would be expected that the ME approach would not explain the relationship between perceptions and outcomes when newcomers are in a situation which allows for expectations to influence perceptions because of low variance in met expectations.

The direct influence approach suggests that the level of perceptions is directly and positively related to the level of attitudes toward the job and subsequent behaviors. For example, those who perceive coworkers as supportive and their job as interesting will be more satisfied than those who perceive coworkers as competitive and their job as boring. The DI approach is derived directly from the job characteristics literature and indirectly from the SIP literature.

The job characteristics approach (Hackman & Oldham, 1975, 1976) argues that perceptions of task attributes directly influence employee reactions to the job (satisfaction, turnover, absenteeism, and performance). Five core task attributes have been proposed by Hackman & Oldham (1974, 1975, 1976): (1) variety; (2) autonomy; (3) task identity; (4) feedback; and (5) task significance. Perceptions of these five dimensions are then reduced to a single index, the Motivating Potential Score (MPS).
In their qualitative reviews of job characteristics studies, Roberts and Glick (1981) and Fried and Ferris (1987) concluded that empirical evidence supports a main effect of job perceptions on job reactions. This main effect is analogous to a direct influence of perceptions on job reactions. Fried and Ferris (1987) also conducted a meta-analysis of the relationship between each of the five task dimensions along with the MPS and five outcomes (overall satisfaction, growth satisfaction, internal work motivation, performance, and absenteeism). The estimated true validity coefficient between MPS and each outcome were as follows:

- MPS-overall satisfaction: 0.63 (n of studies = 20)
- MPS-growth satisfaction: 0.77 (n = 22)
- MPS-internal work motivation: 0.53 (n = 17)
- MPS-performance: 0.08 (n = 13)
- MPS-absenteeism: -0.32 (n = 3)

Hackman and Oldham (1974, 1975, 1976) postulated that higher-order growth need strength (GNS) moderates the MPS-job reaction relationship. Those with high GNS are thought to be more responsive to the MPS of their jobs than those with low GNS. Empirical studies have demonstrated a weak moderator effect for GNS (Roberts & Glick, 1981). Fried and Ferris (1987) found that performance was the only outcome for which there was consistently (i.e., overall job characteristics and MPS) high variance between studies, indicating that the job characteristic/MPS-performance relationships are moderated. Fried and Ferris conducted a second order meta-analysis on the MPS-performance relationship, breaking the analysis down into high and low GNS groups. As predicted by Hackman and Oldham (1975; 1976), the estimated true validity
coefficient for the low GNS group (.10) was much lower than that of the high GNS group (.45). Empirical research has also been conducted to determine the moderating effects of various work values, personality traits, and needs, however, these results have also been mixed and inconclusive (see Roberts & Glick, 1981).

Katz (1978) found that tenure moderated the relationship between task perceptions and job satisfaction. Specifically, he found that of the five core job dimensions, only task significance and feedback from the job were positively and significantly correlated with satisfaction for newcomers with three or less months tenure. For this group, autonomy was negatively and significantly related to satisfaction. For those with more than three months tenure, autonomy was positively related to satisfaction as predicted by the job characteristics model. Perceptions of all five core dimensions were most strongly correlated with satisfaction for groups with four months to three years tenure. After three years tenure, correlations between task perceptions and satisfaction diminished until all were nonsignificant for those with 15 years or more tenure. Katz interpreted these results in terms of socialization processes which occur throughout one's career. For example, newcomers are most satisfied when they perceive their job as providing them with information which allows them to establish situational identities. Those with longer tenure were most influenced by the perceived challenge of their jobs.

Katz's findings are particularly relevant to the current study because they suggest that perceptions of different aspects of the environment will be differentially related to outcomes, specifically satisfaction, as a function of tenure. It is expected that perceptions of aspects of the job which would
influence the newcomer's sense of belonging to the organization and situational identity would be directly related to satisfaction.

The SIP literature also suggests a direct relationship between perceptions of job characteristics and reactions to the job. Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) state that social information influences reactions to the job through a variety of direct and indirect mechanisms. This dissertation is concerned with the relationship between perceptions of the job and reactions to the job, thus only this aspect of the SIP model is considered. From the SIP framework social information can indirectly influence reactions by influencing perceptions. Salancik & Pfeffer (1978) do not elaborate on how perceptions influence reactions to the job but they do suggest that judgements or attitudes toward the job are a "monotonic function" of perceptions of the job. Overall, the SIP literature has not been concerned with the perceptions-reaction relationship, but rather with the social cue-reaction relationship.

The perceptual congruence approach to the relationship between job perceptions and reactions to the job focuses on the congruence between newcomers' perceptions of the job environment and insiders' perceptions. The PC approach is derived from the socialization literature (e.g., Louis, 1980; Reichers, 1987; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) which has long stated that an important outcome of the socialization process is how the newcomer comes to perceive and interpret the job environment. From a socialization perspective, it can be argued that one goal of socialization is to develop newcomer perceptions which are congruent with those shared by the existing work group (Glaser & Strauss, 1964; Katz, 1980; VanMaanen & Katz, 1979; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). However, little empirical work has been done which examines the relationship between the congruence of newcomer and insider perceptions and
outcomes such as newcomer commitment, satisfaction, turnover, intrinsic motivation, and performance.

VanMaanen & Katz (1979) did examine the relationship between police newcomer-insider perceptual congruence and performance and promotability ratings obtained from the newcomers' sergeants. As predicted by the PC hypothesis, the police recruits whose perceptions were congruent with the shared perceptions of insiders received more favorable ratings than those whose perceptions differed from the shared perspective. However, if insiders hold negative perceptions of the environment and newcomers adapt this perceptual scheme through socialization, it would be likely that negative outcomes would result (Katz, 1980, VanMaanen, 1975). For example, VanMaanen (1975) found that newcomer police recruits who adopted the shared perceptual framework had lower intrinsic motivation than those who had incongruent perceptions. However, the recruits who embraced the shared perceptual scheme received more positive performance ratings, despite their lower motivation and effort.

These results suggest that the PC approach best predicts outcomes associated with how the newcomer is evaluated by the organization (e.g., performance ratings, promotions). However, it is unclear how the congruency between newcomer perceptions and insider perceptions will be related to other outcomes representing the newcomer's reaction to the job. In order to clarify the predictions made by the PC approach to the relationships between job perceptions and outcomes, four possible situations defined by the positivity/negativity of newcomer and insider perceptions are represented in the table below. Outcomes are divided into newcomer reactions (e.g., satisfaction, commitment, turnover) and organizational evaluations (e.g., performance ratings).
When newcomer and insider perceptions are both positive (cell I), and hence congruent, it is reasonable to assume that the newcomer will have positive reactions to the job and that the organization will favorably evaluate the newcomer. In a cell II situation, where newcomer perceptions are positive and insider perceptions are negative, it is difficult to predict what type of reactions the newcomer will have. Based on the DI approach to the perceptions-reactions relationship, it would be predicted that the newcomer would have positive reactions. However, the newcomer's perceptual scheme is incongruent with those of insiders, therefore, this may result in feelings of not "fitting in" which lead to lower commitment and satisfaction. To the extent that the organization values the adaptation of the status quo, cell II newcomers would receive negative evaluations from the organization because their perceptual scheme differs from the shared scheme. This was evidenced in Van Maanen's (1975) study of police recruits.

When both newcomer and insider perceptions are negative (cell III), it is again difficult to predict newcomer reactions. From the DI perspective, negative perceptions should lead to negative reactions. From the PC perspective, the congruency between newcomer and insider perceptions should result in feelings of fitting in to the organization or work group which would likely lead to high commitment, satisfaction, and low turnover. Because insiders have remained with the organization but continue to have negative perceptions about the job,
this situation would be characterized by group norms and values which somehow serve to retain employees in spite of their negative perceptions of the job. In this case, it would appear that the congruence between insider and newcomer perceptions would lead to a positive organizational evaluation of the newcomer. This prediction was also supported by VanMaanen (1975).

Finally, in cell IV where newcomer perceptions are negative and the shared perceptions of insiders are positive, it is likely that newcomers will have negative reactions to the job for two reasons. First, from the DI perspective, the newcomer's negative perceptions will lead to negative reactions. From the PC perspective, the newcomer's perception will be incongruent with the shared perceptual scheme. Also, it is likely that the organization would negatively evaluate this newcomer who would appear to have a "bad attitude".

The PC approach is based on the assumption that organizations or particularly work groups value newcomers' assimilation to the status quo. This may not be the case (Katz, 1980), particularly when the status quo is negative or inconducive to the goals of the organization. Given this assumption, the PC approach should be predictive of evaluation outcomes, in all cells. The PC approach to the perceptions-outcome relationship is not particularly useful for predicting newcomer reactions toward their jobs as evidenced by situations II and III.

The relationship between newcomer-insider perceptual congruence and outcomes is examined in the present study for two reasons. First, empirical evidence on this issue is lacking (Katz, 1980). Research on perceptual congruency has focused on the similarity between supervisor and subordinate job perceptions, rather than the similarity among coworkers' perceptions. In general, this line of research has shown that congruency between subordinate and
supervisor job perceptions does not affect job reactions (i.e., satisfaction) beyond the effects of the subordinate perceptions alone (Hatfield & Huseman, 1982; Turban & Jones, 1988; Wexley, Alexander, Greenwalt, & Couch, 1980; White, Crino, & Hatfield, 1985). However, Turban and Jones (1988) did find that congruency explained organizational evaluation outcomes (i.e., performance ratings) above and beyond subordinates' job perceptions alone.

Second, there are implications for whether it is beneficial to induce realistic expectations prior to entry or provide the newcomer with information which insures that their perceptions will come to match insider perceptions. If it is found that congruence between newcomer and insider perceptions is positively related to outcomes, no matter what the sign of the perceptions, then inducing pre-entry expectations which are congruent with insiders or providing salient, unambiguous information would be the best course of action to insure positive reactions to the job. If it is the sign of the newcomers' perception (DI approach) which is most strongly related to outcomes, rather than the congruence with insider perceptions, then realistic expectations or indoctrination programs may lead to negative outcomes.

VanMaanen and Schein's (1979) theory of the relationship between socialization tactics and newcomers' responses to their roles (custodianship, content innovation, role innovation) is relevant to this issue. In general, VanMaanen and Schein argue that the type of socialization practice employed serves to induce different role reactions on the part of newcomers. Although role reactions are distinguished by the way newcomers respond to the knowledge, strategy, and mission of their new job (Schein, 1971; VanMaanen & Schein, 1979), these different orientations could also be distinguished on the congruency between the way newcomers perceive and interpret the
environment in comparison to insiders. A custodian role response would involve coming to perceive the environment in congruence with the status quo. A content innovative role response would suggest moderate perceptual congruence with the newcomer perceiving aspects of the job in different ways which allow for reformation in the way the job is carried out. Finally, a role innovative response suggests that the newcomer perceives the environment in a totally different manner than insiders which leads to reactions against the accepted strategy and mission of the job. Thus, the organization can influence the perceptual congruity between newcomers and insiders through the use of different socialization tactics.

Jones (1986) conducted an empirical study on new MBA managers to test the hypothesis that different socialization strategies lead to different role responses. He found that institutionalized tactics led to custodian responses and individualized tactics led to innovative responses. Most important to the current thesis was his finding that the social and informational aspects of socialization methods were the most important influence on subsequent role reactions. This loosely suggests that when socialization tactics provide an environment with unambiguous, specific, and salient social/environmental information, newcomers will come to perceive the environment in a manner which is congruent with the status quo. When such an environment is lacking, the perceptions of the newcomers will be more likely influenced by their own personal attributes such as what they expected prior to entering the organization. This supports the contention that the saliency and ambiguity of environmental information moderates the expectations-perceptions relationship. However, the question still remains as to how perceptions will be related to newcomer responses to the job.
Integration of the ME, DI, and PC Approaches.

The central thesis of this dissertation is that newcomer pre-entry expectations will be positively related to their subsequent perceptions of the job when they are placed in environments where unambiguous and salient information about the job is lacking. If this is found to be true, then there will be important implications for each approach to explaining the relationship between perceptions and outcomes.

The ME hypothesis is predicted only to explain newcomer reactions to their jobs when perceptions are not influenced by expectations. When perceptions are influenced by expectations, it would be expected that newcomers would be likely to perceive their expectations as being met. Therefore, there would be no variance in met expectations and the ME hypothesis would not predict reactions to the job. Inducing "realistic" or lower expectations in this case would be superfluous as long as there is not salient and unambiguous environmental information to counteract initial expectations.

When expectations influence perceptions, the DI approach would recommend allowing initial expectations to be inflated. Again, this is under the condition that social and other environmental information is lacking.

Finally, the PC approach suggests that in terms of organizational evaluation outcomes, it is best to foster expectations which are congruent with those of insiders and provide newcomers with experiences which prevent previous expectations from influencing perceptions when expectations are not congruent with shared perceptions. The PC approach does not make clear predictions in terms of newcomer personal reaction outcomes. In this sense, the proposed study will clarify the PC approach to explaining the relationship between job perceptions and outcomes.
A schematic model of the research issues examined in the proposed study is depicted in Figure 1. Basically, there are two sets of issues to be examined: (1) the relationship between pre-entry expectations and subsequent perceptions of the job; and (2) the relationship between perceptions of the job and subsequent reactions to the job. As shown in Figure 1, newcomers' early job perceptions are depicted as being influenced by their pre-entry expectations (the expectation effect) and by insiders' shared perceptions (the socialization effect). Both the expectation effect and socialization effect are moderated by the ambiguity of environmental information received by the newcomer. There are also likely to be other influences on newcomers' early perceptions, such as individual personality characteristics; however, these influences are beyond the scope of the current study. The second part of the model depicts the relationship between job perceptions and outcomes. There are three possible ways in which newcomer perceptions can influence subsequent outcomes. First, the discrepancy between newcomer pre-entry expectations can have a negative influence on outcomes, particularly satisfaction and commitment. This is the met expectations effect. Second, perceptions may be positively and directly related to outcomes. This is the direct influence effect. Finally, the discrepancy between newcomer perceptions and insider perceptions may influence outcomes. This is the perceptual congruence effect. It is expected that this discrepancy will be negatively related to outcomes representing the organization or work
Figure 1. Model of research issues.
group's evaluation of the newcomer; however, the sign of this relationship with respect to personal reaction outcomes is open to question.

The first set of hypotheses concerning the relationship between pre-entry expectations and subsequent perceptions deal with the conditions under which expectations are likely to influence perceptions.

Hypothesis 1: Newcomer pre-entry expectations will be positively related to perceptions of the job.

Hypothesis 1a: The relationship between newcomer pre-entry expectations and their subsequent job perceptions will be moderated by the ambiguity of social information received by the newcomer. As ambiguity becomes greater, expectations will be most strongly related to perceptions.

It can be argued that hypothesis 1 simply predicts that there will be high test-retest reliability of the expectation/perception scales. Therefore, hypothesis 1 and 1a must be considered together.

Hypotheses 2 and 2a concern the influence of social information on newcomers' job perceptions.

Hypothesis 2: Work group perceptions will be positively related to newcomers' job perceptions.

Hypothesis 2a: This relationship will be moderated by the ambiguity of social information received by the newcomer. As social information becomes more ambiguous, work group perceptions will have a weaker influence on newcomer job perceptions.

Work group perceptions are most likely to influence newcomer perceptions through the passage of social information. As this information becomes more ambiguous, it is more open to newcomers' own interpretations. Therefore, in ambiguous information environments, the relationship between
newcomer and work group perceptions should be weaker than in clear cut information environments.

The relationship between perceptions and outcomes will be examined from the ME, DL, and PC frameworks. The purpose of this study is not to determine which approach is best, but rather to determine the relative influence of (1) the discrepancy between newcomer pre-entry expectations and their perceptions, (2) newcomer perceptions alone, and (3) the discrepancy between newcomer perceptions and insider perceptions on outcomes of interest.
CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Sample:

Four Ohio banks participated in this study. Initially, seven banks were contacted by letter and presented a proposal. Two of these did not hire enough tellers to make participation feasible. A copy of the solicitation letter and proposal are presented in Appendix A.

Newly hired bank tellers and their work groups served as subjects. New tellers were surveyed three times during their first three to four months in the host organization. One hundred and twenty seven responded to the first questionnaire administered on the first day of training (return rate = 90.7%). Ninety six responded to the second questionnaire following training (return rate = 71.1%). Forty three have responded to the third questionnaire administered after the new tellers had been on the job for one month (return rate = 55.8%).

New tellers participated in waves over an eight month period. A new wave began each time one of the banks began a new training class. Class sizes ranged from two to sixteen. Training sessions lasted from seven to fourteen days.

The newcomers' work groups were surveyed prior to newcomers' entry. Three banks sent questionnaires to all tellers and head tellers, the other surveyed only those from branches with newcomers. Overall, 295 inside tellers responded (return rate = approximately 40%). The total sample of inside tellers will be referred to as insiders. One hundred and fourteen of these tellers were in branches with newcomers. This
subsample of inside tellers will be referred to as workgroups. No responses were obtained from 7 work groups. The n for the remaining workgroups ranged from 1 to 8, with a mean of 3.7 respondents.

Demographic information for both newcomers and insiders is presented in Appendix B. Eighty one percent of newcomers and eighty eight percent of insiders were female. Sixty seven percent of newcomers and insiders were full-time tellers. The remainder were part-time. Insiders had a mean tenure of 41.87 months in their branches.

Procedure:

Most data were collected by questionnaires administered to both newcomers and their immediate work groups. Turnover and performance information was collected from supervisors, usually the branch manager. Newcomers received their first questionnaire during the first day of formal classroom training (Time 1). The author met with new tellers to describe the purpose of the study and insure confidentiality, and then allowed them time to fill out the questionnaire. The second questionnaire was administered during the last day of training (Time 2) by the training instructor. Finally, training personnel sent the tellers questionnaire after they had been working for one month (Time 3). Tellers were allowed to fill out the questionnaire during their free time at work.

Inside tellers completed one questionnaire at the beginning of the study. Included with this questionnaire was an introductory memo from Bank management and from the author. These tellers were allowed to fill out these questionnaires while at work. The new tellers' supervisors were also surveyed after the newcomer had been working for one month to
obtain performance data. Below is the schedule for questionnaire administration.

**EMPLOYEES TO BE SURVEYED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>NEWCOMERS</th>
<th>WORK GROUP</th>
<th>SUPERVISOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Newcomer's Training (Time 1)</td>
<td>Pre-Training, Time 1 Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Newcomer Completes Training, Prior to Starting Job (Time 2)</td>
<td>Post-Training, Time 2 Questionnaire</td>
<td>Work Group Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Month After Newcomer has been on the Job (Time 3)</td>
<td>On-the-Job, Time 3 Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisory Performance Ratings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a list of the general information which was collected on the questionnaires listed on the schedule. A copy of the work group questionnaire and introductory memo is presented in Appendix C. Newcomer Time 1, Time 3, and supervisory rating questionnaires are presented in Appendix D.

**Newcomer Time 1 Questionnaire**
* Demographic Information
* Previous Work Experience
* Pre-Entry Expectations about specific aspects of the teller job, and general task characteristics.
* Expected Satisfaction, Commitment, and Other Attitudes toward the Job

**Newcomer Time 2 Questionnaire**
* Pre-Entry Expectations: Same as those used on the Newcomer Time 1 Questionnaire.
* Expected Satisfaction, Commitment, and Other Attitudes toward the Job
Newcomer Time 3 Questionnaire

* Perceptions of the Job Environment: These questions are essentially the same as the expectation questions concerning specific aspects of the teller job and task characteristics.
* Certainty of Perceptions
* General Job Satisfaction, Commitment, and Other Attitudes toward the Job
* Checklist of Socialization Methods which the newcomer has experienced
* Frequency of Interaction with Coworkers

Work Group Questionnaire

* Demographics
* Tenure on the Job and the Work Group
* Certainty of Perceptions
* Perceptions of the Job Environment: Same as those assessed by newcomer Time 3 questionnaire.
* Job Satisfaction, Commitment, and Other Attitudes toward the Job
* Checklist of Socialization Methods used on Newcomers
* Amount of Interaction with Newcomers in the Branch

Because data were continuously collected from different work sites at different times, host organizations took responsibility for administering questionnaires 2 and 3. The author administered questionnaire 1 as described above. Completed questionnaires were sent directly to the author in order to insure confidentiality. The author also called some new tellers at work to remind them to respond to questionnaire 3.

Measures:

An inventory of the measures used in this study is presented in Appendix E. All measures except for demographics, certainty of perceptions, frequency of interaction, and socialization methods come from previously published scales.

Demographics. All subjects provided the following demographic information: 1) sex; 2) race; 3) education; 4) age; and 5) marital status; 6) children.
Work Experience. Newcomers were asked whether they had previous work experience in the host organization, and if so, what were their positions. They were also asked if they held similar jobs in different organizations. Work group members stated their tenure in months as a teller and in their current branch.

Job Expectations and Perceptions. The pre-entry expectations of newcomers, post-entry perceptions of newcomers, and perceptions of the work group and supervisors were collected for the same items. Expectation questions were in expectation format. Expectation/perception items covered two general domains: 1) specific aspects of the teller job; and 2) task characteristics. Expectations and perceptions of task characteristics were assessed because most research on the influences of job perceptions have been concerned with perceptions of task characteristics. Other aspects of the teller job were studied because these domains were thought by incumbents to be important with respect to satisfaction toward and performance on the teller job.

Expectations and perceptions about task characteristics and social interaction were assessed by questions from the Job Characteristics Inventory (JCI) (Sims, Szilagyi, & Keller, 1976). This scale measures four core task dimensions: task variety (3 items), autonomy (5 items), feedback (5 items), and task identity (3 items). One interpersonal dimension, friendship opportunities (6 items) was also used. Respondents indicated on a 6-point Likert scale how much of a characteristic their job contains. Only positively scored items were used.

Nineteen tellers and head tellers were interviewed to determine which aspects of the job are important to incumbents or were likely to be
Interviews were conducted with tellers from different banks and branches to determine these areas. They were asked which aspects of the job led to satisfaction or dissatisfaction, why tellers quit, what surprised newcomers, and what did newcomers have difficulty finding out about. Seven content areas resulted: customer relations (5 items), supervisory support (8 items), stress (4 items), hours (2 items), working with coworkers (2 items), promotions (3 items), pay (3 items). Respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with statements reflecting these areas using a 6-point Likert scale. These scales correspond to those used in other research concerning the expectations of bank tellers (e.g., Dean & Wanous, 1984).

The means and standard deviations for each of the twelve content areas are presented in Table 1. Table 2 depicts the correlations among scales and coefficient alphas. These statistics were derived from all insiders (n = 295) responses. Alphas range from .199 (stress) to .874 (feedback).

In order to make further analyses more parsimonious, the twelve content domains were combined into three general perceptual domains based on the correlations among scales and on item content. These areas are: social aspects; reward aspects; and task characteristics of the job. The social aspects domain (16 items) is comprised of the supervisory support, working with coworkers, and friendship opportunity scales. The reward domain (6 items) represents the promotion and pay scales. The task characteristic scale (16 items) is comprised of the task variety, autonomy, feedback, and task identity scales. Means and standard deviations for these three scales are presented in Table 3.
Table 1. Means and standard deviations of 12 job perceptions and attitudes derived from all insiders (n=295).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTITUDES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTO</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWM</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCEPTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK</td>
<td>4.069</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: SAT = Satisfaction, COM = Commitment, INTO = Intention to Turnover, IWM = Internal Work Motivation, JI = Job Involvement CR = Customer Relations, SS = Supervisory Support, ST = Stress, P = Pay, WC = Working w/Coworkers, PR = Promotion, H = Hours, TV = Task Variety, AU = Autonomy, FK = Feedback, TI = Task Identity, FO = Friendship Opportunities

NOTE: Scales for attitudes and teller job perceptions range from 1 (Disagree Strongly) to 6 (Agree Strongly). Scales for task characteristics perceptions range from 1 (None) to 6 (Very Much).
Table 2. Correlations between 12 perceptions and attitudes, with alphas in the diagonal. Based on all insider responses (n = 295).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>INTO</th>
<th>IWM</th>
<th>JI</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTO</td>
<td>- .758**</td>
<td>- .562**</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWM</td>
<td>.332**</td>
<td>.500**</td>
<td>- .292**</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td>~ .260**</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.209**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>.185**</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.503**</td>
<td>.563**</td>
<td>~ .436**</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td>.239**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>- .233**</td>
<td>- .020</td>
<td>.173**</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.274**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>~ .379**</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>.220**</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>~ .142**</td>
<td>.166**</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>.456***</td>
<td>.527**</td>
<td>~ .400**</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.193**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.109*</td>
<td>.206**</td>
<td>~ .185**</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td>.113*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>.331**</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td>~ .275**</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>.299**</td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>~ .262**</td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>.180**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>~ .281**</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.300**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.234**</td>
<td>~ .158**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.185**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>~ .190**</td>
<td>.122*</td>
<td>.128*</td>
<td>.184**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: SAT = Satisfaction, COM = Commitment, INTO = Intention to Turnover, IWM = Internal Work Motivation, JI = Job Involvement, CR = Customer Relations, SS = Supervisory Support, ST = Stress, P = Pay, WC = Working w/Coworkers, PR = Promotion, H = Hours, TV = Task Variety, AU = Autonomy, FK = Feedback, TI = Task Identity, FO = Friendship Opportunities

* p < .05
** p < .01

Continued
Table 2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>.272**</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.588**</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>.520**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.239**</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>-0.141**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.615**</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.403**</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>FK</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>FO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td></td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>.187**</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>.437**</td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SAT = Satisfaction, COM = Commitment, INTO = Intention to Turnover, IWM = Internal Work Motivation, JI = Job Involvement, CR = Customer Relations, SS = Supervisory Support, ST = Stress, P = Pay, WC = Working w/Coworkers, H = Hours, TV = Task Variety, AU = Autonomy, FK = Feedback, TI = Task Identity, FO = Friendship Opportunities

* p < .05, ** p < .01
Table 3. Means and standard deviations of 3 general perceptions for all insiders (n = 295).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWD</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: SOC = Social Aspects, RWD = Reward Aspects, TASK = Task Characteristics.
among the scales are presented in Table 4. Alphas were .850, .793, and .858 for the social, reward, and task scales, respectively.

Although expectation and perception questions were the same, except for appropriate wording, response formats differed. When newcomers indicated their expectations (Time 1 and Time 2), they indicated the probability (chances out of 10) that each response would describe their future job. On the 6-point rating scale, newcomers gave six responses for each question in the form of a number from 0 to 10. The probabilities assigned to each response added up to 10 within each question (see New Teller Questionnaire #1, Appendix D). In contrast, newcomer Time 3 and insider perceptions were measured by checking the one response which best describes the job.

This procedure for measuring expectations is adapted from Greenhaus, Seidel, and Marinis (1983) in order to avoid the problems associated with discrepancy scores (Cronbach & Furby, 1970; Wall & Payne, 1973). This method also allows for the strength or certainty of pre-entry expectations to be assessed. This was measured as the standard deviation of responses within each item. The mean response reflects the level of the expectation.

Certainty of Perceptions. For each perception question, respondents were asked to indicate whether they are certain or uncertain of their responses. Certainty ratings are made by circling certain or uncertain. Based on all insiders' responses, alphas of .718, .621, .835 were obtained for uncertainty of social, reward, and task perceptions, respectively. Means and standard deviations of certainty scores for the
Table 4. Correlations with alphas in the diagonal for 3 general perception domains and attitudes based on all insiders (n = 295).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>RWD</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWD</td>
<td>.561**</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>.659**</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.568**</td>
<td>.417**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>.481**</td>
<td>.586**</td>
<td>.458**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTO</td>
<td>-.394**</td>
<td>-.464**</td>
<td>-.364**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWM</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td>.375**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SOC = Social Aspects, RWD = Reward Aspects, TASK = Task Characteristics, SAT = Satisfaction, COM = Commitment, INTO = Intention to turnover, IWM = Internal Work Motivation, JI = Job Involvement.

* p<.05
** p<.01
original 12 domains are presented in Table 5. This information is presented in Table 6 for the 3 general domains.

**Job Attitudes.** Five job attitudes were measured: satisfaction, commitment, intention to turnover, internal work motivation, and job involvement. A variety of pre-published scales were used to measure these attitudes. All items were in the form of statements to which the respondents indicated on a 6-point Likert scale the extent to which they agree or disagree. On the newcomer Time 1 questionnaire, these items were reworded so that respondents indicated how they *expected* to feel once on the job.

Satisfaction was measured using the general job satisfaction scale from the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). This scale was developed to provide "an overall measure of the degree to which the employee is satisfied and happy with the job" (p. 162). The scale is comprised of five items.

Organizational commitment was measured by the short form of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) (Porter & Smith, 1970) in which the six reversed scored items are omitted from the original form. There are nine items. This scale measures the general affective reaction and loyalty towards the organization, thus it is a measure of general attitudinal commitment.

Intention to turnover was measured by two items from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ) (Seashore, Lawler, Mirvis and Cammann, 1982). Internal work motivation was measured by three items comprising the JDS internal work motivation
scale (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). Job involvement was measured with a three item index from the MOAQ (Seashore, et al., 1982).

Alphas for the attitude scales ranged from .610 (internal work motivation) to .866 (commitment). Means and standard deviations, based on all insiders, are presented in Table 1. Alphas and correlations for attitudes and the original 12 perceptual domains are presented in Table 2. Correlations between attitudes and the 3 general perceptual domains are presented in Table 4.

**Checklist of Socialization Methods.** Newcomers indicated which of nine socialization practices they have personally experienced. Insiders indicated which practices are applied to newcomers in their work group. These nine socialization practices were: formal orientation program, formal training program, on-the-job training, associating with other new tellers, mentor, supervisor aid, help from support staff, interactions with other tellers at work, and recreational activities with other employees. These were derived from Louis, Posner, and Powell's (1983) study which involved surveying personnel officials, college placement officers, and new hires to determine commonly used socialization practices. Discussions with personnel officers, branch managers, and tellers have indicated that this list is feasible and comprehensive for the teller job.

**Frequency of Interaction.** Newcomers were asked to rate the frequency with which they engage in discussions about different topics with their coworkers. The work group was also asked to indicate how frequently they engage in these interactions with newcomers in general. Responses are on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from never or rarely to every day. Items reflect the following content areas: general interactions
(2 items, alpha = .425), general attitudes (2 items, alpha = .628), social (5 items, alpha = .780), rewards (4 items, alpha = .643), and task characteristics (8 items, alpha = .819). Individual items are presented in the item inventory (Appendix E). Table 5 presents the means and standard deviations for the 12 original domains. Table 6 depicts this information for the 3 general domains.

**Realism of Expectations.** Realism of newcomers’ pre-entry expectations is measured as the congruence between each newcomer’s expectations and their subsequent perceptions of the corresponding job characteristic. Three different indices of met expectations were used. First, in order to avoid the problems associated with discrepancy scores, an index of realism was computed based on Greenhaus et al.’s (1983) methodology. Recall that each newcomer indicated at Time 1 the probability that each response category would describe their future job (expectation). Later, they checked the response that they felt best described their job (perception). For example, for the item "How much variety will there be (is there) in your job?", a newcomer may indicate that there is a 70% chance that they will encounter a moderate amount of variety (a rating of 7 for level 4) and a 30% chance that they will encounter a little amount (a rating of 3 for level 3). Later, the newcomer perceives the job to contain a moderate amount of variety (checks level 4). The realism score would be the probability indicated in the expectation for the level indicated in the perception. In this example, the newcomer would have a realism score of 7 for this particular item; that is, the newcomer had expected a 70% chance that the perceived level would occur. Realism ratings can range from 0 (unrealistic) to 10
Table 5. Means and standard deviations of perceptual certainty and frequency of interaction between insiders and new tellers for all insiders (n = 295).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teller Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK GROUP - NEWCOMER INTERACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FK</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: SAT = Satisfaction, COM = Commitment, INTO = Intention to Turnover, IWM = Internal Work Motivation, JI = Job Involvement CR = Customer Relations, SS = Supervisory Support, ST = Stress, P = Pay, WC = Working w/Coworkers, PR = Promotion, H = Hours, TV = Task Variety, AU = Autonomy, FK = Feedback, TI = Task Identity, FO = Friendship Opportunities
Table 6. Means and standard deviations of certainty and interactions about 3 general perceptions for all insiders (n = 295).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWD</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY OF NEWCOMER-WORKGROUP INTERACTIONS</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWD</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDE</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: SOC = Social Aspects, RWD = Reward Aspects, TASK = Task Characteristics.

a Uncertain responses were scored as 0, certain as 1. Higher scores mean higher certainty.

b Frequency of interaction scales ranged from 1 (Never or Rarely) to 6 (Every Day).
Realism scores were averaged across items in each perception domain to derive a composite realism score for each scale. This realism index will be referred to as RE.

It may also be important to consider whether expectations are under met or over met. Most research has primarily assumed that expectations are under met, and thus, the issue of what happens when expectations are over met has been unresolved (Wanous & Premack, 1987). Thus, a second measure of met expectations was to sign the RE scores described above. Scores for which newcomer Time 3 perceptions were greater than Time 1 expectations were positive, those for which perceptions were less than expectations were negative. This measure of met expectations is referred to as realism signed (RES).

Finally, a third measure of met expectations was included to make this research comparable to other studies. In this case met expectations were defined as the difference between newcomer Time 3 perceptions and newcomer Time 1 expectations.

**Congruency between Newcomer and Insiders' Perceptions.** The degree of congruence between newcomers' job perceptions and those of their work group was measured using the D statistic (Cronbach & Gleser, 1953, cf. Turban & Jones, 1988). D statistics for each scale were computed by summing (within each content area) the squared difference between the newcomer's response on each item and the mean work group response. The larger the D score, the more the newcomer's perception of the job varies from the mean of the work group.

**Ambiguity of Social Information.** This construct refers to the extent that social information about a particular aspect of the job
received by the newcomer is open to interpretation. This construct is difficult to measure directly without in-depth observation of the information that newcomers actually receive from the peers. However, this study examines three reasonable indicators of ambiguity: (1) the frequency of interaction between newcomers and their work groups concerning each of the three content areas; (2) the perceptual certainty of the work group; and (3) the variance, or disagreement, among work group members' perceptions.

The certainty of work group perceptions can be thought of as an indication of the ambiguity of social information that will be received by newcomers for two reasons. First, if the work group is uncertain about their own perceptions, then they may pass on equivocal, and thus, ambiguous, information to the newcomers. For example, an unsure insider may say "Being a teller might be one way of getting into management but I'm not really sure". On the other hand, a certain coworker may report "Tellers never get promoted. This is a dead end job.". Second, if insiders are uncertain about their own perceptions, then objective information is probably ambiguous.

Uncertainty of work group perceptions was calculated as follows: 1) For each group member, a scale uncertainty score was constructed by averaging the the certainty of subjects responses to each item within the scale; 2) These scale uncertainty scores were then averaged across members within each work group; 3) The result is one mean uncertainty score, for each (social, reward, and task) content area, for each workgroup. Mean group uncertainty scores were standardized into z scores across the three content areas, and were scored so that high
scores reflect high uncertainty and low scores reflect certainty. Scores were standardized so that they could be combined in future analyses. The higher the uncertainty score, the more ambiguous the social information.

High variance among work group perceptions of the job are taken as an index of high ambiguity for two reasons. First, if the work group disagrees among themselves, then they will send conflicting cues to the newcomer. Thus, the newcomer has a choice of cues to attend to and heed. Second, if there are strong and unambiguous objective cues, insiders should demonstrate little variance in their perceptions of that domain.

Disagreement among coworkers was operationalized as the standard deviation among work group members perceptions within each work group. Again, this variable is standardized across domains and scored so that high scores reflect high variance and disagreement and low scores reflect agreement. Therefore, high values of disagreement scores reflect high ambiguity.

Frequency of interaction between newcomers and their work group is not conceptually related to the ambiguity of the information which is passed. However, interaction frequency can affect ambiguity in two ways. First, this variable indicates the degree to which social cues are being passed. The presence of social cues should be greater when there is frequent social interaction. It is possible that insiders may be quite certain of their perceptions and agree among themselves, however, they do not share this information with the newcomer. Thus, the newcomer may be in an ambiguous environment. According to this logic, infrequent interactions should indicate highly ambiguous environments.
In this case, frequency of interaction can be thought of as a direct index of ambiguity. This variable was operationalized by first averaging the frequency of interaction items within each of the 3 perceptual domains for each newcomer. These items reflect how frequently the newcomer reported interacting with his or her work group. Then, mean interaction scores were reversed scored and standardized across domains so that higher scores reflect little interaction, and thus, high ambiguity.

A second way in which interaction frequency may influence social information ambiguity is by amplifying the effect of uncertainty of work group perceptions and disagreement among work group members. If uncertain members are passing on equivocal information, then frequent information may lead to a more ambiguous environment. On the other hand, if insiders are very certain and interact frequently, newcomers should received a great deal of unequivocal information. If insiders disagree and pass conflicting cues, then frequent interaction would lead to more ambiguous information. However, frequent interactions should lead to very clear cut, unambiguous, information when the work group agrees.

Thus, two more indicators of ambiguity were considered. The first is the interaction between work group uncertainty and the frequency of interactions. This is operationalized as the standardized uncertainty score multiplied by the raw, unreversed frequency of interaction score. Thus, high uncertainty scores paired with frequent interactions indicate highly ambiguous situations. The second is the interaction between standardized disagreement scores and frequency of interaction. This was
operationalized by multiplying standardized disagreement scores by the raw, unreversed frequency of interaction score. High standard deviations among group perceptions paired with high frequency of interactions reflects a very ambiguous environment.

Some preliminary analyses were carried out to determine whether the three components of ambiguity should be combined to form a composite ambiguity score. The means and standard deviations for ambiguity indices are presented in Table 7. Table 8 displays the correlations among the three components. Neither uncertainty (UC) or standard deviation (SD) of group perceptions are significantly correlated with frequency of interaction (FI). UC correlates significantly and negatively with SD for both the social and task content areas. This relationship was not significant for the reward domain. This suggests that the more the work group disagrees among themselves about social and task characteristics, the more certain they are of their own perceptions. This finding makes combining uncertainty and standard deviations of work group perceptions problematic. Therefore, UC and SD will be treated separately. Because FI does not significantly correlate with UC or SD, it will be treated as a separate indicator of ambiguity.

It was also suggested above that the interactions UC X FI and SD X FI be considered as indicators of ambiguity. However, these two indices do not provide much more information than that provided by UC or SD alone. The correlations between uncertainty (UC) and the UC X FI interaction are .726, .853, and .747 for the social, reward, and task domains, respectively. The correlations between SD and the SD X FI
Table 7. Means and standard deviations of information ambiguity indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Domain</th>
<th>Uncertainty of Work Group Perceptions (n = 33 groups)</th>
<th>SD of Work Group Perceptions (n = 32 groups)</th>
<th>Frequency of Interaction (n = 42 newcomers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Raw Mean: 0.054, SD: 0.060, Z: -0.974, SD: 0.398</td>
<td>SD of Work Group Perceptions</td>
<td>Frequency of Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward: 0.114, SD: 0.094, Z: -0.574, SD: 0.622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task: 0.048, SD: 0.057, Z: -1.008, SD: 0.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \) Scores are reversed so that higher scores reflect greater uncertainty of work group perceptions. Scale ranges from 0 to 1.

\( ^b \) Higher scores indicate higher disagreement among work group members.

\( ^c \) Scores are reversed so that higher scores indicate less interaction between the newcomer and the work group. Scale ranges from 1 to 6.
Table 8. Correlations among information ambiguity indicators for each perceptual domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Domain</th>
<th>UC w/FI n = 33</th>
<th>SD w/FI n = 32</th>
<th>UC w/SD n = 177a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-.313*</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-.633**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.559**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: UC = Uncertainty of work group perceptions. Scores are reversed so that higher scores reflect greater uncertainty of work group perceptions. Scale ranges from 0 to 1.

Note: SD = Standard deviation of work group perceptions. Higher scores indicate higher disagreement among work group members.

Note: FI = Frequency of interaction between newcomers and work groups. Scores are reversed so that higher scores indicate less interaction between the newcomer and the work group, scale ranges from 1 to 6.

a UC/FI and SD/FI have n's of 33 and 32 because they can only be calculated on cases for which their are 1) newcomer Time 1 data, 2) newcomer Time 3 data, and workgroup data for newcomers. The UC/SD calculations are based on all insider data, n=177 groups, 295 subjects.

* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01
interaction are .834, .856, and .921, respectively for the social, reward, and task content areas. All correlations are significant at the p < .001 level. This suggests that the interaction indices provide little more information than UC and SD alone. Thus, the interaction indices will not be used as independent measures of ambiguity.

**Performance.** Subjective performance ratings were obtained from supervisors after the newcomer had been on the job for one month. The ratings were made by the person responsible for conducting formal performance appraisals. The rater was usually the branch manager. The form used to make these ratings is presented in Appendix E. The four items representing global performance ratings were averaged to form one global score. The alpha for this scale is .902.
The means for newcomer attitudes, performance, expectations and perceptions for each time period are presented in Table 9. The mean level of newcomer expectations/perceptions did not significantly differ across time periods. Within subject ANOVAS yielded $F(2, 62)$ values of 0.38, 0.99, and 1.29 for social, reward, and task domains, respectively. Newcomer Time 1 perceptions of rewards and tasks were significantly more positive than work group perceptions ($t(420) = 8.404$ and 3.29, $p < .01$, for rewards and tasks, respectively). Time 3 perceptions were not significantly different from insider perceptions for the social, reward, or task domains ($t(336) = 0.00, 0.63, \text{and} 0.792$, respectively).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that newcomer pre-entry expectations would be positively related to their subsequent Time 3 job perceptions. The correlations between newcomer pre-entry Time 1 expectations and their subsequent Time 3 job perceptions are depicted in Table 10. In terms of Time 1 pre-entry expectations, this hypothesis was supported for only the task characteristics domain. The correlation between Time 1 expectations and Time 3 perceptions was $0.507$ ($p < .05$), thus, expectations accounted for 25.7% of the variance in subsequent perceptions. Although positive, the correlations between social and reward expectations with respective perceptions were not significant.

It also appears that Time 1 expectations about task characteristics were related to the other Time 3 perceptions of social aspects ($r = .425$,
Table 9. Means and standard deviations of all variables for newcomers at Times 1, 2, and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newcomers Pre-Entry</th>
<th>Newcomers Post-Train.</th>
<th>Newcomers 1 Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTITUDES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTO</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWM</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEHAVIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTATIONS/PERCEPTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWD</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CERTAINTY OF PERCEPTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FREQUENCY OF NEWCOMER-WORKGROUP INTERACTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: SAT = Satisfaction, COM = Commitment, INTO = Intention to Turnover, IWM = Internal Work Motivation, JI = Job Involvement, SOC = Social Aspects, RWD = Reward Aspects, TASK = Task Characteristics, PERF = Performance

a Uncertain responses were scored as 0, certain as 1. Higher scores mean higher certainty.
Table 10. Correlations of newcomer Time 3 perceptions with newcomer expectations at Time 1, Time 2, and mean work group perceptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME 1</th>
<th>EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>n = 40</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>RWD</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.425***</td>
<td>.269*</td>
<td>.507***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME 2</th>
<th>EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>n = 35</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>RWD</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.296*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.292*</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.327*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK GROUP PERCEPTIONS</th>
<th>n = 33</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>RWD</th>
<th>TASK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.426***</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWD</td>
<td></td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td></td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SOC = Social aspects, RWD = Rewards, Task = Task Characteristics

* p < .10
** p < .05
*** p < .01
p < .01) and rewards (r = .269, p < .10). In other words, Time 1 expectations about tasks significantly predicted perceptions of all three content areas, with the effect being strongest for task perceptions. This finding suggests a general expectation effect which is observed when task expectations are considered.

Interestingly, Time 2 post-training expectations did not, overall, prove to be stronger predictors of later perceptions than Time 1 expectations. Overall, Time 2 expectations had the same general pattern of effects as did Time 1 expectations. On the diagonal, only the relationship between Time 2 expectations and Time 3 perceptions concerning tasks approached significance (r = .327, p < .10). Again, a general expectation effect was found for task expectations which correlated significantly with Time 3 perceptions of rewards (r = .355, p < .05).

Hypothesis 1a stated that the relationship between newcomer expectations and their subsequent job perceptions would be moderated by the ambiguity of social information so that the effect of expectations would become greater as ambiguity became greater. In order to test this hypothesis, moderated regressions were conducted in which newcomer Time 3 perceptions were first regressed on expectations alone. Next, perceptions were regressed on both expectations and ambiguity, which yielded the increment in $R^2$ due to the main effect of ambiguity. Finally, perceptions were regressed on 1) expectations, 2) ambiguity, and 3) the interaction between expectations and ambiguity. This gives the increment in $R^2$ due to the moderating effects of ambiguity on the expectations-perceptions relationship. This procedure was taken from
Cohen and Cohen (1983). These analyses were carried out separately for each perceptual domain and for each of the three indices of ambiguity (uncertainty, standard deviation of work group perceptions, and frequency of newcomer–work group interactions).

Table 11 depicts the total and incremental $R^2$s for predicting Time 3 perceptions from 1) Time 1 expectations alone, 2) expectations and ambiguity; and 3) expectations, ambiguity, and the expectations X ambiguity interaction. The sign of the interaction effect is also presented. $R^2$s for the main effect of expectations do not exactly match each other or the $R^2$s resulting from Table 10 because each analysis uses a different number of subjects. For example, the analyses reported in Table 10 were calculated on the 40 newcomers who filled out both Time 1 and Time 3 questionnaires. The analyses reported in the first column of results in Table 11, where uncertainty of work group perceptions indicates ambiguity, were calculated using 32 subjects who had filled out both Time 1 and Time 3 questionnaires and for which there were work group certainty ratings. This discrepancy in results also exists for the relationship of Time 2 expectations and work group perceptions with Time 3 perceptions.

Overall, the $R^2$s presented in Table 11 support the conclusions drawn above about the direct effects of Time 1 expectations on Time 3 perceptions. There were very weak direct effects for the reward dimension, moderately weak effects for the social dimension, and significant, positive effects for the task dimension. $R^2$s for task perceptions range from .209 to .258 ($p < .01$ for all).
With respect to Time 1 expectations, hypothesis la was not supported, regardless of how ambiguity was measured. Out of the nine possible cells in Table 11, the increment in \( R^2 \) due to the interaction term only approached significance for two cells (the moderating effect of FI for the social domain and the moderating effect of SD for the reward domain). However, contrary to predictions, both of these interaction effects were negative. According to hypothesis la, the interaction effect should be positive because as ambiguity becomes greater, the relationship between expectations and perceptions should become greater.

In order to more closely examine these interaction effects, the interactions are plotted in Figures 2 and 3. Two separate regression lines, depicting the relationship between expectations and perceptions, are presented for ambiguity scores which are one standard deviation above and below the mean. Because each of the three ambiguity indices was standardized, a value of -1 or +1 was entered into the regression equations. Figure 2 demonstrates that when there is frequent interaction between newcomers and work groups (FI = -1), expectations about social aspects are positively related to perceptions of social aspects. On the other hand, expectations are not related to social perceptions when there is infrequent interaction (FI = +1). The results presented in Figure 3 demonstrate a positive relationship between reward expectations and perceptions when the standard deviation among work group perceptions is low. Again, there is no relationship between expectations and perceptions when SD is high, indicating high ambiguity. These results are directly contradictory to predictions.
Figure 2. Moderating effects of frequency of interaction on the relationship between newcomer Time 1 expectations and Time 3 perceptions of social aspects.

Regression Equation: \( y = 0.241 \times \text{EXP} + 1.414 \times \text{FD} - 0.304 \times \text{EXP} \times \text{FD} + 3.326 \)

Figure 3. Moderating effects of standard deviation of work group perceptions on the relationship between newcomer Time 1 expectations and Time 3 perceptions of rewards.

Regression Equation: \( y = 0.115 \times \text{EXP} + 1.346 \times \text{SD} - 0.255 \times \text{EXP} \times \text{SD} + 3.553 \)
When Time 2 expectations are used to predict Time 3 perceptions (see Table 12), the results are similar to the results using Time 1 expectations. The R²'s using expectations alone are strongest for the task domain and weakest for the reward domain. The signs of the moderating effects are the same for six out of nine cases. When signs do differ, the moderating effect is very small and not significant. In this set of analyses, three moderating effects were significant or approached significance. SD moderated the relationship between social expectations and perceptions (incremental R² = .138, p < .10) and between reward expectations and perceptions (incremental R² = .116, p < .10). UC moderated the relationship between expectations and reward perceptions (incremental R² = .139, p < .05). However, only the moderating effect of SD on the social expectations-perception relationship was in the predicted positive direction.

These moderating effects are depicted in figures 4, 5, and 6. Figure 4 illustrates the moderating effects of SD on the Time 2 social expectations - Time 3 perceptions relationship. In support of hypothesis 1a, expectations have a positive relationship to perceptions when there is high variance among work group perceptions (SD = +1), indicating high ambiguity. On the other hand, there is a weak negative relationship between expectations and perceptions under low variance (i.e., unambiguous) conditions. This negative relationship suggests a contrast effect which could result if newcomers are confronted with a great deal of consistent information which refutes their expectations.

Figure 5 depicts the negative moderating effect of UC on the reward expectation - perception relationship. The relationship is strongest
Table 12. Moderated regression results for predicting newcomer Time 3 perceptions from Time 2 expectations (EXP) and the interaction between expectations and social information ambiguity (AMB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Domain</th>
<th>UC n=27 R²</th>
<th>SD n=27 R²</th>
<th>PI n=34 R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² exp</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.077*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² exp + amb</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² exp + amb exp X amb</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign exp X amb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² exp</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² exp + amb</td>
<td>.217*</td>
<td>.209**</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² exp + amb exp X amb</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>.139**</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign exp X amb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² exp</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.108*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² exp + amb</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² exp + amb exp X amb</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign exp X amb</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: UC = Uncertainty of work group expectations. Higher values reflect more uncertainty. SD = Standard deviation of work group perceptions. PI = Frequency of newcomer-work group interactions. Higher scores reflect less interaction.

*p<.10, **p<.05, ***p<.01
Figure 4. Moderating effects of standard deviation of work group perceptions on the relationship between newcomer Time 2 expectations and Time 3 perceptions of social aspects.
Figure 5. Moderating effects of uncertainty of work group perceptions on the relationship between newcomer Time 2 expectations and Time 3 perceptions of rewards.

Regression Equation: $y = -0.411(\text{EXP}) + 2.813(\text{UC}) - 0.843(\text{EXP} \times \text{SD}) + 5.440$

Figure 6. Moderating effects of standard deviation of work group perceptions on the relationship between newcomer Time 2 expectations and Time 3 perceptions of rewards.

Regression Equation: $y = 0.322(\text{EXP}) + 1.756(\text{SD}) - 0.373(\text{EXP} \times \text{SD}) + 2.740$
when the work group is uncertain (UC = +1). However, it is negative, i.e., the more positive the Time 2 expectation, the more negative the subsequent perception. On the other hand, when the work group was certain of their perceptions (UC = -1), the relationship was weaker, but positive. It should also be noted that uncertainty of work group perceptions had a significant main effect on newcomer perceptions of rewards (see Tables 11 and 12). This main effect was negative indicating that as work groups become more uncertain of their own perceptions of rewards, newcomers' perceptions become more negative. Furthermore, work group perceptions of rewards and uncertainty of perceptions were significantly and negatively correlated (r = -.253, p < .001). Work groups which are more uncertain of their reward perceptions have more negative perceptions.

Given the findings above and the finding that work group perceptions have a much stronger impact on newcomer reward perceptions than newcomer expectations (see Table 10), it is not surprising that there is a contrast effect occurring under high uncertainty conditions. Under uncertain conditions, negative work group perceptions are a major influence on newcomer perceptions. Those newcomers who entered with the most positive expectations will most likely receive information from coworkers which strongly refutes their positive expectations. This reality shock may lead the newcomers to have more negative perceptions than they would have had otherwise due to the large discrepancy between initial expectations and information gathered from coworkers.

Finally, Figure 6 depicts the moderating effects of SD on the reward expectation - perception relationship. Contrary to predictions,
Time 2 expectations are weakly related to perceptions when there is disagreement among coworkers (SD = +1), and a weak positive relationship when there is agreement (SD = -1).

Another possible moderator of expectation effects is the strength or certainty of the initial expectation. Recall that this variable was operationalized as the standard deviation of newcomer responses within each item on the Time 1 questionnaire. For example, a teller who responded to an item by assigning a 2 to five different responses (e.g., agree, disagree) would have a higher standard deviation for that item than another who assigned 5 points to each of two adjacent responses. The first teller would be less certain or have a weaker expectation than the latter. It is likely that weak expectations will have less of an effect on subsequent perceptions than strong expectations.

This prediction was tested using moderated regression analyses, the results of which are presented in Table 13. The increment in $R^2$ due to the interaction of expectations and strength of expectations was not significant or substantial for any perceptual domain. It appears that the strength of the initial expectation does not moderate the expectation effect.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that work group perceptions would be positively related to newcomer Time 3 perceptions. Examination of Table 10 indicates that this hypothesis was supported with respect to social and reward perceptual domains. Work group perceptions accounted for approximately 18.2% ($p < .05$) and 12.2% ($p < .05$) of the variance in social and reward perceptions, respectively. This finding is in direct contrast to the influence of newcomer expectations on perceptions, which
Table 13. Regression results for predicting newcomer Time 3 perceptions from Time 1 expectations (EXP) and the interaction between EXP and strength\(^a\) of expectations (EXP X ST) (n=40).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Domain</th>
<th>(R^2) exp</th>
<th>(R^2) exp + st</th>
<th>(R^2) exp + st + exp X st</th>
<th>(R^2) exp X st</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>.277(^\ast\ast\ast)</td>
<td>.279(^\ast\ast\ast)</td>
<td>.279(^\ast\ast\ast)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Strength of expectations is operationalized as the standard deviation of within item responses, thus, higher scores reflect weaker expectations.

\(^*\) \(p < .10\), \(^**\) \(p < .05\), \(^***\) \(p < .01\)
were only significant with respect to the task domain. It appears that social information influences perceptions of extrinsic job factors, such as social and reward aspects, while expectations are more likely to influence perceptions of intrinsic factors such as task characteristics. Therefore, the content of work perceptions (e.g., extrinsic vs. intrinsic) can be considered a moderator of expectation and socialization effects. This issue will be discussed later in detail.

Hypothesis 2a stated that the relationship between work group perceptions and newcomer perceptions would be negatively moderated by the ambiguity of social information so that as information became more ambiguous, work group perceptions would have less of an effect on newcomer perceptions. Overall, hypothesis 2a was supported in 1 out of nine cells. Table 14 presents the results of moderated regression analyses where newcomer Time 3 perceptions are regressed on work group perceptions, ambiguity, and the interaction between work group perceptions and ambiguity.

Figure 7 depicts the moderating effects of FI on the social work group perception – newcomer perception relationship. As predicted by hypothesis 2a, work group perceptions are positively related to newcomer perceptions when there is frequent interaction between newcomers and the group (FI = -1). On the other hand, the relationship becomes very weak when there is little interaction (FI = +1).

Only one other moderating effect was significant with respect to the relationship between work group and newcomer perceptions. Figure 8 depicts the moderating effect of SD on the task work group perceptions = newcomer perceptions relationship. This effect was negative, such that
Table 14. Moderated regression results for predicting newcomer Time 3 perceptions from work group perceptions (WGP) and the interaction between WGP and social information ambiguity (AMB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Domain</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>FI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>n=32</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² wgp</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td>.181**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² wgp + amb</td>
<td>.190**</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² wgp + amb</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sign wgp x amb</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² wgp</td>
<td>.097*</td>
<td>.113*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² wgp + amb</td>
<td>.204**</td>
<td>.107**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² wgp + amb</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sign wgp x amb</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² wgp</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² wgp + amb</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R² wgp + amb</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sign wgp x amb</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: UC = Uncertainty of work group expectations. Higher values reflect more uncertainty. SD = Standard deviation of work group perceptions. FI = Frequency of newcomer-work group interactions. Higher scores reflect less interaction.

* p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01
Figure 7. Moderating effects of frequency of interaction on the relationship between work group perceptions and newcomer perceptions of social aspects.

Figure 8. Moderating effects of standard deviation of work group perceptions on the relationship between work group perceptions and newcomer perceptions of tasks.
there was a strong positive relationship between work group and newcomer perceptions under high SD conditions. This relationship becomes very weak when the is low variance among work group perceptions. This finding is contrary to hypothesis 2a.

Another set of moderated regressions were conducted using the mean number of socialization experiences reported by the newcomer as an index of ambiguity. A general argument can be made that work group perceptions should have a stronger effect on newcomer perceptions when the newcomer is exposed to many socialization experiences. Thus, a positive moderating effect was predicted. Based on the results of these analyses (see Table 15), it appears that the number of socialization experiences does not moderate the effects of work group perceptions on newcomer perceptions because none of the interaction terms resulted in significant increases in $R^2$.

In conclusion, expectations about task characteristics were related to subsequent perceptions of tasks. Work group perceptions were related to newcomer Time 3 perceptions of social and reward domains. Attempts to find moderators of these relationships, for the most part, were unsuccessful. Hypothesis 1a was only supported in 1 out of 18 possible cells in Tables 11 and 12. Hypothesis 2a was only supported in 1 out of nine cells in Table 14.

The second issue addressed in this study was the relationship between newcomers' job perceptions and their job attitudes and performance. Three possible relationships were discussed: the direct influence approach (DD); the met-expectations approach (ME); and the
Table 15. Regression results for predicting newcomer Time 3 perceptions from mean work group Perceptions (WGP) and the interaction between WGP and mean number of socialization methods (SM) (n=34).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Domain</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{wgp} )</td>
<td>.183***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{wgp + sm} )</td>
<td>.278***</td>
<td>.095*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{wgp + sm + wgp \times sm} )</td>
<td>.341***</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign ( wgp \times sm )</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{wgp} )</td>
<td>.090*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{wgp + sm} )</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{wgp + sm + wgp \times sm} )</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign ( wgp \times sm )</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{wgp} )</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{wgp + sm} )</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2_{wgp + sm + wgp \times sm} )</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sign ( wgp \times sm )</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .10 \), ** \( p < .05 \), *** \( p < .01 \)
perceptual congruency approach (PC). The purpose of the following analyses was to determine the relative strength of each of these effects.

Table 16 presents the amount of variance explained in job attitudes and performance by newcomer perceptions, the difference between newcomer and work group perceptions, and each type of met expectations measure. Over all three perceptual domains, newcomer job perceptions have significant direct effects on satisfaction (mean $R^2 = .149$), commitment (mean $R^2 = .219$), and intention to turnover (mean $R^2 = .109$). Relationships between social and reward perceptions and internal work motivation ($R^2 = .097$ and .073, respectively) approached significance ($p < .10$). Only perceptions of rewards are significantly related to job involvement ($R^2 = .203$, $p < .01$). Performance is marginally related to perceptions of task characteristics ($R^2 = .115$, $p < .10$). Overall, newcomer job perceptions are an important influence on job attitudes, particularly satisfaction and commitment.

The difference between newcomer perceptions and work group perceptions ($D$) was significantly related to satisfaction with respect to social and reward domains ($R^2 = .176$ and .122, respectively) and to commitment for all three domains (mean $R^2 = .227$). Perceptual congruence was particularly important with respect to social aspects of the job because $D$, in this case, accounted for 16.2% of the variance in internal work motivation and 20% of the variance in job involvement.

The effects of met expectations were relatively weaker, regardless of how they were operationalized and the perceptual domain. Met expectations operationalized as realism (RE) were only significantly related to commitment for the social domain ($R^2 = .118$, $p < .05$). Met
Table 16. \( R^2 \)'s for predicting job attitudes and performance from newcomer perceptions (P), discrepancy between newcomer and work group perceptions (D), and met expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Domain</th>
<th>MET EXPECTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>.111**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>.113**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTO</td>
<td>.110**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWM</td>
<td>.097**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF (n=27)</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>.213***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>.249***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTO</td>
<td>.127*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWM</td>
<td>.073***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF (n=27)</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>.123**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>.294***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTO</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWM</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF (n=27)</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: RE = Realism of expectations, RES = Signed realism of expectations, MED = Difference between expectations and perceptions. SAT = Satisfaction, COM = Commitment, INTO = Intention to turnover, IWM = Internal work motivation, JI = Job involvement, PERF = Performance

* \( p < .10 \)

** \( p < .05 \)

*** \( p < .01 \)
expectations, operationalized as realism signed (RES), about social aspects, were only significantly related to satisfaction ($R^2 = .158$, $p < .01$). Finally, met expectations operationalized as the difference between newcomer perceptions and Time 1 expectations (MED) only significantly affected satisfaction with respect to reward perceptions ($R^2 = .124$, $p < .05$).

Met expectations are not considered in further analyses because they do not appear to have meaningful relationships to job attitudes when used alone as a predictor. The three significant relationships mentioned above, along with the marginally significant relationships, are about what you would expect to find by chance given the experiment-wise error rate. Furthermore, a hierarchical regression was carried out on the three significant relationships to determine if met expectations accounted for significant increments in $R^2$ beyond the effects of perceptions. In each case the resulting incremental $R^2$ was .000. Interestingly, met expectation effects were the weakest for the task domain, which was the only perceptual domain to be influenced by pre-entry expectations. This finding supports the contention that met expectations should have weakest effects when expectations influence perceptions.

Because both newcomer perceptions and perceptual congruency were shown to predict several attitudes, the next step in this series of analyses was to determine whether the discrepancy between newcomer perceptions and work group perceptions accounted for a significant increment in $R^2$ beyond the effects of newcomer perceptions alone. This was accomplished by a set of hierarchical regressions in which each job attitude was regressed first on newcomer perceptions and then on
newcomer perceptions and D. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 17.

Again, $R^2$s for the effects of perceptions on attitudes vary between Tables 16 and 17 because the analyses are based on different n's and subsamples of subjects. Newcomer Time 3 perceptions still account for significant variance in satisfaction and commitment across all three perceptual domains (mean $R^2$s = .115 and .214, respectively). These analyses show a weaker relationship between perceptions and intentions to turnover than that derived from the larger sample. The mean $R^2$ is .080. Job involvement is only significantly influenced by perceptions of rewards ($R^2 = .256, p < .001$). Newcomer perceptions are not significantly related to internal work motivation or performance.

The discrepancy between newcomer and work group perceptions lead to a significant increment in $R^2$ for satisfaction for the social domain ($R^2 = .156, p < .05$) and a marginally significant increment for the reward domain ($R^2 = .082, p < .10$). The incremental $R^2$ is significant across all three domains for commitment (mean $R^2 = .168$). D with respect to social aspects also accounts for a significant amount of unique variance in internal work motivation ($R^2 = .154, p < .05$) and job involvement ($R^2 = .193, p < .05$). D is not related to intentions to turnover or performance for any domain.

It is important to note that D is positively related to job attitudes. As the discrepancy between newcomer perceptions and work group perceptions becomes larger, newcomers' attitudes, particularly satisfaction and commitment, become more positive. This finding is in contrast to the socialization literature which implies that it is best for
Table 17. Hierarchical regression results for predicting job attitudes and performance from newcomer perceptions (PERC) and the discrepancy between newcomer and work group perceptions (D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Domain</th>
<th>SAT (n=34)</th>
<th>COM (n=34)</th>
<th>INTO (n=34)</th>
<th>IWM (n=34)</th>
<th>JI (n=34)</th>
<th>PERF (n=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{perc}$</td>
<td>.135**</td>
<td>.190**</td>
<td>.104*</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{perc + D}$</td>
<td>.291***</td>
<td>.493***</td>
<td>.132*</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.156**</td>
<td>.303***</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.154**</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{sign}_{perc}$</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{sign}_{D}$</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{perc}$</td>
<td>.125**</td>
<td>.205***</td>
<td>.091*</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.256***</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{perc + D}$</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.331***</td>
<td>.099*</td>
<td>.026*</td>
<td>.286***</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.082*</td>
<td>.126**</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{sign}_{perc}$</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{sign}_{D}$</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{perc}$</td>
<td>.085*</td>
<td>.246***</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{perc + D}$</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.322***</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.082*</td>
<td>.054***</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.076*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{sign}_{perc}$</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{sign}_{D}$</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: SAT = Satisfaction, COM = Commitment, INTO = Intention to turnover, IWM = Internal work motivation, JI = Job involvement, PERF = Performance

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$
newcomers to come to share the same perceptual framework as insiders. On the other hand, this finding is congruent with Van Maanen's (1975) study of police recruits in which attitudes were more positive for those recruits who did not adopt the same perceptual framework as insiders.

In conclusion, it was found that newcomer perceptions of social, reward, and task domains are strong predictors of satisfaction and commitment and moderately strong predictors of intention to turnover. The discrepancy between newcomer and insider perceptions is also strongly related to satisfaction and commitment. It also seems that the agreement between newcomers and their work groups concerning social aspects of the job is particularly important because it is strongly related to four out of the five attitudes. Performance was not significantly or substantially related to any of the perceptual predictors.

A recent body of literature (Gerhart, 1987; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1983; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986; Staw & Ross, 1985) has adopted a dispositional approach to job perceptions based on the finding that job attitudes are somewhat stable within individuals across jobs and over time. Analyses were conducted to determine if new tellers' job attitudes were stable from Time 1 to Time 3. Specifically, hierarchical regressions were conducted to determine if Time 3 attitudes could be predicted by newcomers' expected attitudes at Time 1. An attempt was then made to determine if Time 3 perceptions and newcomer-work group discrepancies improved predictions beyond the effects of expected attitudes. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 18. These results are only presented for satisfaction and commitment attitudes because previous results were consistently strongest for these two attitudes. Satisfaction
Table 18. Regression results for predicting newcomer Time 3 satisfaction and commitment from Time 1 satisfaction and commitment expectations (EXP) and Time 3 perceptions + newcomer workgroup discrepancy (P&D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Domain</th>
<th>Time 3 Attitude</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{\text{exp}}$</td>
<td>.227***</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{\text{exp} + \text{P&amp;D}}$</td>
<td>.432***</td>
<td>.520***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increment</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>.477***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{\text{exp}}$</td>
<td>.227***</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{\text{exp} + \text{P&amp;D}}$</td>
<td>.366***</td>
<td>.484***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increment</td>
<td>.139*</td>
<td>.441***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{\text{exp}}$</td>
<td>.227***</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{\text{exp} + \text{P&amp;D}}$</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>.358***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increment</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.315***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10
**p < .05
***p < .01

n = 32
and commitment are also the primary dependent variables considered in other literature.

Time 1 satisfaction expectations accounted for 22.7% ($p < .01$) of the variance in newcomers' Time 3 satisfaction. Time 3 perceptions and discrepancies regarding the social domain, together, resulted in a significant increment in $R^2$ (.205, $p < .05$). The increment due to reward perceptions and discrepancies ($R^2 = .139$, $p < .10$) approached significance. Time 3 perceptions and discrepancies about tasks did not account for a significant amount of unique variance in Time 3 satisfaction. All effects were positive.

Time 1 commitment expectations were not significantly related to Time 3 commitment attitudes ($R^2 = .043$). For each domain, Time 3 perceptions and discrepancies, together accounted for significant increments in $R^2$. Incremental $R^2$s were .477, .441, and .315 ($p < .01$) for social, reward, and task domains, respectively. All relationships were positive.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

In accordance with other literature concerning the level of newcomer expectations (Wanous, 1980), the new tellers in this study had inflated pre-entry expectations concerning reward and task aspects of the job. Newcomer expectations concerning these domains were significantly different from insider perceptions. In contrast, newcomers had very realistic expectations about the social aspects of the job.

Based on these findings and the state of the current literature focusing on the effects of pre-entry expectations, it would be recommended that RJP's be used during recruitment to lower inflated reward and task expectations. However, this study examined this issue more closely by considering the impact of two factors, expectations and social information, on how newcomers come to form perceptions of the job. The results of this study lead to a different conclusion than that presented above.

The major issue in this dissertation is the idea that newcomers' pre-entry expectations may influence or color their subsequent perceptions of the job. This role for pre-entry expectations is unique to the organizational entry literature which has previously considered expectations only in terms of whether or not they are met. This study provided support for the expectation effect hypothesis with respect to perceptions of task characteristics and very weak support for the hypothesis that this effect is moderated by the ambiguity of social
information. In addition, the strength of the initial expectations did not moderate their effects on subsequent perceptions.

This study also empirically supported the socialization effect or the social information processing hypothesis (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) that employees' perceptions are influenced by their coworkers, particularly with respect to perceptions of social and reward domains. Contrary to predictions, the socialization effect was not moderated by the ambiguity of social information as measured, or by the number of socialization experiences.

The empirical findings point out several important issues. One interesting finding is that the influence of pre-entry expectations and work group perceptions on newcomer Time 3 perceptions appears to be moderated by the content of the perceptions. Only expectations about task characteristics significantly influenced perceptions. On the other hand, work group perceptions about the other two domains, social and reward aspects, significantly influenced subsequent newcomer perceptions. One way to distinguish between these areas is to consider task characteristics as intrinsic aspects of the job and social and reward aspects as extrinsic domains (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975). Porter et al. describe intrinsic rewards as those which are experienced and controlled by the individual. The only role that the organization can play is to provide conditions which facilitate the experience of intrinsic rewards. Theories of work design, from which the importance of task attributes is derived, focus on the intrinsic rewards present in jobs. On the other hand, extrinsic rewards are those which are provided by the
organization and are clearly tangible. Pay, promotion, social support, and acceptance are clear examples of extrinsic rewards.

The empirical results of this study suggest that internal sources of information (i.e., pre-entry expectations) influence perceptions of intrinsic job aspects more so than external sources of information. Several other studies (e.g., O'Connor & Barrett, 1980; Wanous, 1974) have found individual differences to have main effects on subjective perceptions of task characteristics. This conclusion appears to be contrary to other studies demonstrating that both objective and social cues influence task perceptions (Thomas & Griffin, 1983). However, the sample size in this study was relatively small, thus power was low. Work group perceptions explained 4.8% of the variance in newcomer perceptions of task characteristics, while expectations explained 25.7% of the variance. With a larger sample size, the correlation between work group and newcomer perceptions would be significant. The important question may not be whether each source of information affects perceptions but what is the relative strength of each source in doing so.

On the other hand, this study found that external sources of information were stronger predictors of newcomer perceptions of external domains (social and rewards) than were expectations. Studies looking at the effect of different sources of information on job perceptions have primarily focused on perceptions of task attributes. This finding suggests that social cues may have an even stronger influence on other perceptual content areas.

One explanation for the differential effects of expectations and work group perceptions on newcomer perceptions of intrinsic and extrinsic
Job facets can be derived from the social cognition literature concerning the influence of information processing goals on how social information gets processed (Cohen, 1981; Cohen & Ebbesen, 1979; Marcus & Zajonc, 1985; Srull & Wyer, 1986). Earlier it was argued that pre-entry expectations may represent or serve as a schema which guides attention and interpretation processes. According to the information processing goal literature (see Srull & Wyer, 1986 for a review), schemata (or expectations) should only influence perceptions of the environment when the individual has the goal of forming an impression or making an evaluative judgement. This is the type of goal which would seem most likely to be used by individuals who are trying to judge intrinsically motivating aspects of the job. For example, questions may be "How much feedback do I receive?, Is it enough?" or "How much control do I have over this job?".

On the other hand, extrinsic rewards are controlled by external sources. Thus, in order to obtain external rewards such as promotion or social acceptance, newcomers must learn the external contingencies involved in doing so. This would involve the information processing goal of simply gathering external information and remembering it. This type of goal would also be active when a newcomer attempts to learn the new role through modeling supervisors and coworkers. Modeling has been demonstrated to be one way in which newcomers learn new behaviors (Naylor, Pritchard, & Ilgen; 1980; Weiss, 1977). Under these conditions, it is unlikely that individuals use schema driven information processing strategies, but merely form direct memory traces of events (Srull & Wyer,
Hence, perceptions of external job aspects should be most influenced by external information, as was found in the present study.

One area for future research would be to follow up on the notion that perceptions of intrinsic and extrinsic factors of the job are influenced differentially by internal and external sources of information. The applied benefit of this line of research is clear. If we know which types of perceptions are most heavily influenced by external information, then we will be aware of the areas in which organizations can influence perceptions. Alternatively, if the organization wishes to influence perceptions which are most heavily influenced by personal characteristics, such as expectations, the appropriate focus of organizational action would be selection. This line of thought coincides with the recent body of literature which has suggested that job attitudes may be the result of dispositional factors (Pulakos & Scmitt, 1983; Staw et al., 1986; Staw & Ross, 1985).

One criticism that can be aimed at the reported relationships between pre-entry expectations and on-the-job perceptions is that it is simply a measure of test-retest reliability. Several points can be made against this argument. First, the size of the expectation effect varied across perceptual domains so that when the expectation effect was strong, the social information effect was weak, and vice versa. There is no reason to expect that the reliability of the scales would vary across dimensions. Second, the response format was different for expectation and perception scales. This weakens the argument for common method variance. Finally, if the observed expectation effect was solely an index of reliability, then Time 2 expectations should have been more highly
correlated with Time 3 perceptions than were Time 1 because time between measurements was shorter. Overall, this was not observed. The average correlation between Time 1 expectations and Time 3 perceptions was .309 compared to an average correlation of .250 for Time 2 expectations.

Overall, little evidence was found for the hypothesized moderating effects of social information ambiguity on expectation and social information effects. Hypothesis 1a concerning the moderating effects of ambiguity on the expectations-Time 3 perceptions relationships was only supported in 1 out of 18 cells in Tables 11 and 12. The standard deviation moderated the relationship between newcomer Time 2 expectations and Time 3 perceptions of social aspects of the job. This moderating effect approached significance. Expectations were more strongly related to subsequent perceptions under high standard deviation (i.e., high ambiguity) conditions.

Four other moderating effects were found which were significant or approached significance: 1) FI moderating the Time 1 - Time 3 relationship, 2) SD moderating the Time 1 - Time 2 reward relationship, 3) SD moderating the Time 2 - Time 3 reward relationship, and 4) UC moderating the Time 2 - Time 3 reward relationship. However, these relationships were negative contrary to predictions. In the case of the first three relationships, expectations were only related to perceptions as conditions became more clear cut, i.e., as there was less interaction and more agreement among work group perceptions. This is exactly contrary to predictions. The fourth moderating effect was negative because there appeared to be a contrast effect of reward expectations on perceptions.
under conditions of high uncertainty. As explained earlier, this finding may be due the influence of work group perceptions on newcomer reward perceptions and the negative correlation between work group perceptions and their uncertainty of their perceptions.

Because of the small sample size, the variation of the magnitude and sign of moderating effects between Time 1 and Time 2 analyses, and variations across content domains, it is difficult to draw conclusions about why some moderating effects were not substantial and why others were in the opposite direction as predicted. Taken as a whole, these results do not suggest that social information ambiguity as measured moderates the expectation-perception relationship.

One possible explanation for lack of or inconsistencies in ambiguity moderating effects is that expectations are related to perceptions due to factors other than cognitive processes. Recall that hypothesis 1 and 1a were derived from the social cognition literature. If expectations act as a schema for guiding the cognitive processing of information, then the characteristics of that information (e.g., sign, ambiguity, saliency) are very important. However, it may be possible that expectations about tasks were related to perceptions of tasks because both are a function of a third dispositional variable. In other words, early expectations and subsequent job perceptions may reflect enduring individual qualities, dispositions, or values. This idea is related to research focusing on a dispositional approach to job attitudes (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, Abraham, 1989; Gerhart, 1987; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1983; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986; Staw & Ross, 1985). This work has focused on assessing the stability of general job attitudes (e.g., satisfaction)
within individuals across different jobs. It is suggested here that job perceptions of specific aspects of the job (in this case task characteristics) may also remain stable within individuals.

The idea that pre-entry job expectations may be the result of dispositional factors or values has important implications for the organizational entry literature. It points out a need to determine where pre-entry expectations come from. It is usually assumed that they are formed based on information gathered during the recruiting process (Wanous, 1980). This may be true for extrinsic job factors such as pay, promotions, social relations, etc. On the other hand, expectations about more intrinsic job factors may be based on work values or dispositional factors. In this case it would be very difficult to manipulate pre-entry expectations. Future research should focus on the origin of pre-entry expectations. Work also needs to be done to determine the extent to which early expectations and job perceptions are malleable. One way to assess these questions is to conduct a series of laboratory experiments in which "pre-entry" expectations, values, and dispositions are measured. Then subjects would be randomly assigned to different job preview conditions and "working" environments. This design would allow for the evaluation of the relative impact of individual and situational determinants on job expectations and perceptions.

Hypothesis 2a, concerning the moderating effects of ambiguity on the work group perceptions-newcomer perceptions relationship, was supported in one out of nine cells in Table 14. The frequency of newcomer-work group interactions uniquely accounted for 10.8% of the variance in newcomer social perceptions. This moderating effect was
negative such that work group perceptions were only related to newcomer
perceptions when there was frequent interaction. SD was found to
significantly moderate the relationship between work group and newcomer
perceptions of tasks, however, contrary to hypothesis 2a, this effect was
positive so that the relationship was strongest under conditions of high
disagreement.

Two other moderators were explored. It was found that the
strength of intitial expectations did not moderate the expectation effect.
Also, the number of socialization methods did not sufficiently moderate the
socialization effect.

One reason for overall lack of ambiguity effects may due to the
way ambiguity was measured. Logical arguments were previously made for
using uncertainty of work group perceptions, disagreement among work
group perceptions, and frequency of newcomer-work group interactions as
indices of ambiguity. Preliminary empirical work suggested that these
three components be kept separate rather than combined into a composite
index. Subsequent analyses assessing the moderating effects of each of
the three indices proved this to be a correct procedure because each
index differed in respect to sign and magnitude of moderating effect.
Overall, frequency of interaction had the weakest moderating effect. The
average incremental $R^2$ over the three domains in Tables 11, 12, and 14
was .039. For uncertainty of work group perceptions, the average
incremental $R^2$ was .042. Overall, the standard deviation of work group
perceptions had the strongest moderating effect with a mean incremental
$R^2$ of .065. This was also the only moderator that provided any support
for hypothesis 1a.
One possible problem with these indices of social information ambiguity is that they are difficult in determining the ambiguity of objective information which is necessary in determining the ambiguity of all information received by the newcomer. For example, there may be high disagreement among work group members about the amount of supervisory support. This could be because objective information on this issue is ambiguous or lacking. The disagreement could also be due to the fact that individual coworkers receive different clear cut objective information. In other words, the supervisor is clearly supportive of some employees but not of others. One way to handle this problem in future research is to have researchers observe and rate different characteristics of the work environment. Those aspects of the job of which raters are uncertain or disagree would then be construed as ambiguous domains.

Another problem with these indices of ambiguity is that they correlated negatively with each other. The relationship between standard deviations among work group perceptions and uncertainty of work group perceptions is somewhat puzzling. It was implicitly assumed, a priori, that these two variables would be positively correlated. The more tellers agreed in their perceptions, the more reinforcement there would be for those perceptions, and consequently, the more certain tellers would be of these perceptions. Because standard deviations and uncertainty of work group perceptions were generally negatively correlated, it suggests that the more work group members disagreed among themselves, the more certain they became of their perceptions. This implies that a group polarization effect was occurring within each branch. Future work should
look at which characteristics of the work group foster the polarization effect.

Finally, uncertainty and, to a lesser degree, the standard deviation of work group perceptions, had main effects on newcomer perceptions of rewards. This is evidenced in Tables 11, 12, and 14 by the incremental $R^2$ for the ambiguity index. As work groups became more uncertain of their perceptions, newcomers had more negative perceptions of rewards. As work groups agreed more in their perceptions, newcomers had more negative perceptions of rewards. As mentioned earlier, uncertainty of work group perceptions was significantly and negatively correlated with the level of the groups' reward perceptions. Thus, when the work group is uncertain, they are most likely passing on negative information to newcomers. The standard deviation of work group perceptions was not significantly correlated with the mean work group perceptions of rewards. However, overall, work groups had lower reward perceptions than newcomers. Therefore, in a situation where the work group agrees, it will most likely be sending negative information to the newcomer. In a correlational design, these main effects make it even more difficult to observe a moderating effect of ambiguity.

This study was exploratory in its attempt to measure the ambiguity of social information. Furthermore, this was a correlational field study in which there was no control of the type of information sent to newcomers. Little research exists which can be brought to bear on this issue. Clearly this is one area for future research. The next step in this line of inquiry should be to conduct a laboratory study in which expectations and characteristics of environmental information are varied to see which
aspects of the information (if any) moderate expectation effects. In this
design, indices of ambiguity can be kept independent from the sign of the
information being sent to subjects.

The practical implication of this phase of the study is that
lowering newcomers' expectations through the use of RJP s can be
dangerous, particularly with regard to task characteristics. Those
newcomers with lower expectations had more negative perceptions.
Unfortunately, this study did not yield findings which clearly delineate
the factors which moderate expectation effects. One possibility is the
intrinsic-extrinsic job aspect distinction made above. In this case it would
be suggested that RJP s about intrinsic job factors not be given. This
suggestion is contrary to the RJP literature which postulates that RJP s
will be most effective on less concrete job aspects (Wanous, 1980).

The theoretical implication of this study is that it supports an
interactionist model of the formation of job perceptions. Although the
hypotheses concerning the interaction between the effect of expectations
and information ambiguity were not supported, the existence of another,
environmental moderator was suggested by the empirical results of this
study (i.e., the content of the perceptual domain). As discussed above,
future research needs to be conducted which examines which features of
different perceptual domains are critical to moderating the effects of
different sources of information on newcomer job perceptions.

The second purpose of this study was to assess the relative impact
of DI, PC, and ME approaches to the relationship between job perceptions
and job attitudes and performance. Overall, it was concluded that met
expectations, regardless of how they were measured, were not an
important influence on job attitudes and performance. Interestingly, this relationship was particularly weak with respect to expectations about task characteristics. This finding supports the logic that initial met expectations will not be important for aspects of the job that are influenced by expectations. Perhaps met expectations were not related to attitudes because, as shown in Table 9, the mean level of expectations/perceptions did not significantly change over time periods. This suggests that at an aggregate level, expectations were generally met.

Newcomer perceptions influenced satisfaction, commitment, and, to a lesser degree, intentions to turnover. This finding is not particularly surprising since these aspects of the job were studied because past research has shown them to be related to satisfaction and commitment. Of more interest is the finding that the discrepancy between newcomer and work group perceptions was related to commitment in all cases, satisfaction with respect to social and reward domains, and both internal work motivation and job involvement with respect to the social domain. As depicted in Table 17, all of these relationships are positive which suggests that as the discrepancy between newcomer and work group perceptions becomes larger, newcomers' attitudes become more positive. This is in contrast to the literature concerning manager-subordinate perceptual congruency which has generally found agreement between manager and subordinate perceptions to be unrelated to subordinate job attitudes beyond the effects of perceptions alone (Hatfield & Huseman, 1982; Turban & Jones, 1988; Wexley et al., 1980; White et al., 1985). However, this finding is congruent with Van Maanen's (1975) study of
police recruits where he found that those who did not adopt the shared perceptual framework had more positive work attitudes than those who did.

Earlier in this dissertation a four cell categorization scheme was developed to classify possible perceptual congruency situations and resulting outcomes. The four cells were created based on the signs of newcomer and work group perceptions: 1) both positive; 2) newcomer positive - work group negative; 3) both negative; and 4) newcomer negative - work group positive. A positive relationship between discrepancy scores and newcomer reactions was predicted to occur in cell 4, where newcomer perceptions are negative and insider perceptions are positive. In this situation it was predicted that newcomers would have negative job reactions because of the direct effect of their negative perceptions, and/or perceptual disagreement with the work group. The results of this study could also fit into cell 2 where newcomer perceptions are positive and work group perceptions are positive, but only if the direct effect of newcomer perceptions overrides the effect of the discrepancy between newcomer and work group perceptions. However, if this explanation was feasible, then the discrepancy shouldn't account for variance in attitudes beyond the direct effects of newcomer perceptions.

One possible explanation is that new tellers who disagree with the work group may have a different orientation toward the job. For example, they may view the teller job as a way of getting into management and thus a learning experience. This difference in orientation may not be related to how tellers specifically perceive the job, but it may influence overall satisfaction and commitment. It was also suggested that perceptual
congruency between the work group and newcomers would be positively related to performance evaluations. This was not found. Perceptual congruency was not significantly or substantially related to performance.

The empirical evidence suggests that when newcomers come to adopt the shared perspective, they are less satisfied and committed than those who disagree with the work group. It is not possible to fully test the predictions made for each discrepancy situation using the data from this study. The sample size is too small to break subjects into groups reflecting the four cell classification scheme. Future research which allows for this indepth analysis will be very useful in determining the importance and implications of the socialization literature's basic assumption that it is desirable for newcomers to adopt the common perceptual framework. Katz (1980) called attention to this issue. This dissertation outlines a framework for studying this question.

A secondary issue addressed by this study is whether newcomer attitudes at Time 3 could be predicted from their expected attitudes at Time 1. It was found that Time 1 satisfaction expectations accounted for 22.7% of the variance in Time 3 satisfaction. Time 1 commitment expectations only accounted for 4.3% of the variance in newcomer Time 3 commitment. It appears that the new tellers displayed stability in satisfaction attitudes but not commitment attitudes. This coincides with other studies which have found stability in satisfaction over time (Pulakos & Wexley, 1983, Staw et al., 1986; Staw & Ross, 1985). Recently, Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham (1989) reported evidence which suggests that job satisfaction may reflect a genetic disposition. On the other hand, organizational commitment, as measured in this study, concerns
commitment to the particular organization, thus, this is a very situation specific attitude. Therefore, newcomer commitment could not be predicted by expectations reported before newcomers had experienced working in their respective organizations.

Another question examined was whether newcomer Time 3 perceptions and perceptual congruence regarding specific job aspects predicted Time 3 attitudes beyond the effects of Time 1 expectations. In other words, because expected satisfaction strongly predicts subsequent satisfaction, is it necessary to concern ourselves with the way in which newcomers actually perceive specific aspects of the environment? The empirical results suggest that the mediating factors of Time 3 perceptions and perceptual congruency are important, beyond the effects of expectations, in predicting satisfaction. Time 3 perceptions and perceptual congruence accounted for practically all explained variance in Time 3 commitment. The one exception to this conclusion is the incremental effect of task perceptions and congruency on satisfaction which was not significant.

There are several limitations present in this research. The first is the small sample size of new tellers. In one sense, this is encouraging, because significance was found for many important effects, despite low power. On the other hand, the small sample prevented the use of more complicated analyses which would have shed some light on questions raised by the results of the presented analyses. An example of this problem is the issue of how newcomer-workgroup perceptual congruency precisely relates to job attitudes. Efforts are currently being made to increase the sample size.
A second limitation is that this research did not provide an objective measure of social information ambiguity. This would have required observing the interactions between new tellers and their work groups. If an objective measure were present, then the three indices, uncertainty, disagreement, and frequency of interaction, could be evaluated against this measure. As it is, none of these indices moderated expectation and social information effects in the predicted manner. This may be because the indices are not good indicators of ambiguity. However, it is also possible that these variables do indicate ambiguity, but ambiguity does not moderate expectation and socialization effects on perceptions. This issue deserves further attention under more controlled conditions.

Finally, this study was a longitudinal, correlational, field study. The longitudinal aspect is an asset because the socialization literature has suffered from a lack of longitudinal research (Fisher, 1986; VanMaanen, 1976; Wanous & Colella, 1989). Also, in order to truly examine the organizational socialization process, research should be conducted using real newcomers entering real jobs. However, control is lost using this type of design. There are several issues raised in this study and discussed above which lend themselves to study under more controlled conditions. A future line of research should experimentally manipulate pre-entry expectations, as is done in RJP research, and then look at expectation effects on subsequent perceptions.

In conclusion, this research has several important implications. First, it was shown that pre-entry expectations can influence subsequent perceptions and that these perceptions have a direct effect on job
attitudes. The expectation effect was only present for task perceptions, indicating that this effect is moderated by the content of perceptions. Wansow (1989) has recently proposed ten tough choices to consider when using RJP's. This research suggests an eleventh: For which aspects of the job will lowered expectations result in more negative perceptions, and consequently, more negative attitudes?

This study also provided much needed field support for the SIP hypothesis concerning the influence of social information on job perceptions. The present research expanded upon this body of literature by indicating that social cue effects may be even stronger for extrinsic job factors than for task characteristics.

Theoretically, this research advanced the job perceptions literature and the organizational socialization literature by empirically demonstrating that individual characteristics (expectations) influence how newcomers come to perceive their job. This is a step away from the typically situationist perspective adopted in these literatures (Jones, 1983; Schneider, 1983). This research also provided empirical results supporting an interactionist model of the formation of early job perceptions.

Finally, this study was the first empirical piece, to the author's knowledge, to examine the effect of congruence between newcomer and work group perceptions on newcomer attitudes and performance. The results suggest that larger discrepancies lead to more positive attitudes, particularly satisfaction and commitment. The implication is that we need to examine whether it is beneficial to engage in intense socialization practices designed to cause newcomers to come to perceive the
environment in a manner congruent with insiders. More work is needed, as outlined above, on this issue. One question raised by these findings is whether successful socialization should be defined in terms of how closely the individual comes to fit in with coworkers or simply in terms of what the final outcome is with respect to newcomer attitudes and behaviors. Feldman's (1976, 1981) model of newcomer socialization considers both to be outcomes of socialization. However, since newcomer-group congruence and newcomer reactions to the job can be inversely related, current conceptualizations of the socialization process and its desired outcomes may have to be reconsidered or expanded.
Notes

1. Return rates have been adjusted to account for turnover. Approximately 4% of the new tellers left during training, between Time 1 and Time 2 questionnaires. Another 26% left during their first month on the job, prior to questionnaire 3. At the present time, 21 of the original 140 have not or have just recently been sent questionnaire 3. The 55.8% return rate reported for Time 3 does not include these subjects.

2. Teller trainers conducted the introductory sessions at one bank which was out of town. They used the author's notes.

3. New tellers are also being surveyed after they have been working for three months. Only eighteen tellers have so far responded to the fourth questionnaire. The majority of the new teller sample has not been on the job for three months. Therefore, this data will not be presented in this dissertation.
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APPENDIX A

Research Proposal to Management
Research Proposal

A great deal of research has demonstrated that the early organizational experiences of newcomers to the organization influence their subsequent attitudes toward their job, their commitment, whether they remain on the job, and their performance. Three important influences on the entry process are: 1) the recruiting source used to attract newcomers to the organization; 2) the accuracy of newcomers' pre-entry expectations about the job; and 3) the manner in which newcomers are socialized into their particular work group as well as the organization. It has been demonstrated across several organizational studies that newcomers who are recruited by informal recruiting sources (e.g., recommended by a friend) have lower turnover rates than those who are recruited through formal sources (e.g., newspaper advertisements). Many studies have also demonstrated that turnover can be reduced and satisfaction can be increased by programs which provide newcomers with realistic expectations about their new jobs. Finally, it has been suggested that newcomers' commitment, satisfaction, and performance can be enhanced when there is a great deal of social interaction between newcomers and the existing work group.

The proposed doctoral dissertation study is designed to examine the effects of recruiting source, newcomers' pre-entry expectations about the job, and socialization methods on newcomers' perceptions of their jobs, their satisfaction and commitment to their jobs, their performance, and turnover during their first months on the job. The end result of this study would be a great deal of diagnostic information about work climates and the factors which affect new employee turnover, satisfaction, commitment and performance.
RESEARCH DESIGN

Sample: We will need to survey approximately 200 new recruits several times during their first three to four months in the host organization. The first questionnaire will be administered before they begin training. It is not necessary that all newcomers come from the same organization and/or job. We will also need to survey the newcomer's on-the-job work group and supervisor. Therefore, newcomers who serve as subjects in this study should be entering positions for which there is an easily identifiable work group. For example, if the newcomer is a bank teller, then the other tellers at his or her branch bank will comprise the work group.

Time Frame for Study: The duration of the study depends on the hiring rate of new employees. If it takes one year to obtain a sufficiently large sample of newcomers, then the entire study will last one year and three months because newcomers will be surveyed for three months after entering the organization.

Method: Most data will be collected by questionnaires administered to both newcomers and their immediate work groups. Turnover and performance information will be collected from supervisors. Each newcomer will be surveyed prior to training, after training, one month after working on the job, and three months after working on the job. Work groups will be surveyed once at the beginning of the study. Below is a schedule for questionnaire administration.
## Employees to be Surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Newcomers</th>
<th>Work Group Questionnaire</th>
<th>Supervisor Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to Newcomer's Training</td>
<td>Pre-Training Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Newcomer Completes Training</td>
<td>Post-Training Questionnaire</td>
<td>Work Group Questionnaire</td>
<td>Supervisor Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately One Month After Newcomer Has Been On the Job</td>
<td>On-the-Job Questionnaire 1</td>
<td>Performance Ratings for the Newcomer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Months After Newcomer Has Been On the Job</td>
<td>On-the-Job Questionnaire 2</td>
<td>Performance Ratings for the Newcomer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questionnaire Contents:** Below is a list of the general information which will be collected on the questionnaires listed on the above schedule. Sample questionnaires are included in the appendix.

### Newcomer Pre-Entry Questionnaire
* Demographic Information (age, race, sex, education, etc.)
* Pre-Entry Expectations: A pilot study will be conducted to determine which characteristics of the job environment are most important. Important expectation areas may be: relationships with coworkers, relationship with supervisors, characteristics of the task (e.g., feedback, boredom, importance), organizational policy, relationships with customers.
* Expected Satisfaction, Commitment, and Other Attitudes toward the Job
* Recruiting Source

### Newcomer Post-Training Questionnaire
* Pre-Entry Expectations: Same as those used on the Newcomer Pre-Entry Questionnaire.
* Expected Satisfaction, Commitment, and Other Attitudes toward the Job

### On-the-Job Newcomer Questionnaires 1 and 2
Both questionnaires will be the same.
* Perceptions of the Job Environment: These questions will be essentially the same as the expectation questions, however, newcomers will be asked to
describe what their work environment is like rather than what they expect it to be like.
* Certainty of Perceptions
* General Job Satisfaction, Commitment, and other Attitudes toward the Job
* Checklist of Socialization Methods: These will include methods by which newcomers learn about their jobs, e.g., receiving specific on-the-job instruction and socializing with coworkers.
* Frequency of Interaction with Work Group

**Work Group and Supervisor Questionnaires**
The work group and supervisors will fill out the same questionnaire before the arrival of newcomers.
* Demographics
* Tenure on the Job, with the Work Group, and with the Organization
* Perceptions of the Job Environment
* Certainty of Perceptions
* Job Satisfaction, Commitment, and other Attitudes toward the Job
* Checklist of Socialization Methods used on Newcomers
* Amount of Interaction with Newcomers

**On-the-Job Supervisor Questionnaires**
Supervisors will fill out short questionnaires concerning each newcomer under their supervision.
* General Performance Ratings
* Objective Performance Measures (e.g., average number of errors or whatever other records are available)
* Turnover Information

**HOST ORGANIZATION'S RESPONSIBILITIES**
Because questionnaires will be distributed in different locations and at different time intervals, it is most feasible for the organization to distribute questionnaires. Completed questionnaires will be mailed to the researchers. The researchers will work with those responsible for data collection by reminding them when to administer the surveys and by providing the questionnaires. The host organization would also be responsible for material costs which include copying questionnaires and postage. The researchers will develop the questionnaires with the organization and dissertation committee's approval. The researchers will also analyze the data and provide feedback to the organization.
In return for access to the host organization's employees and help with the data collection process, the researchers will provide the organization with diagnostic information which may be beneficial to training needs analysis, programs aimed at improving turnover rates and improving work group climate, and recruiting decisions. The following diagnostic information will be provided:

* The accuracy of newcomer expectations
* Work group climate perceptions
* Satisfaction and commitment data
* On-the-job socialization data
* More frequent performance information than would normally be obtained
* Differences in recruiting source effectiveness
* How newcomers' pre-entry job expectations, recruiting sources, perceptions of the job, and socialization methods influence newcomers' on-the-job perceptions of the work environment, turnover, satisfaction, commitment, and performance.

This information could serve as the basis for programs designed to improve climate, new training or socialization programs for newcomers, and realistic job preview practices. These data could also be used to determine the effectiveness of different recruiting sources. In general, this study will provide the organization with knowledge of the factors which influence how new employees perceive their new job and their subsequent satisfaction, commitment, performance, and willingness to remain with the organization.
APPENDIX B

Demographic Information
### Demographic Information for Insiders and Newcomers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insiders n = 295</th>
<th>Newcomers n = 127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN AGE</strong></td>
<td>30.31</td>
<td>25.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-yr College Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-yr College Degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARITAL STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, Widowed, or Divorced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILDREN AT HOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART OR FULL TIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teller</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN TENURE IN BRANCH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.87 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN TENURE IN POSITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.41 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Introductory Memo to Tellers

Work Group Questionnaire
To: Tellers and Head Tellers

From: Adrienne Colella, Ohio State University Researcher

Re: Participation in a survey

has allowed me to ask their tellers to participate in a study I am conducting for my dissertation at Ohio State University. Dr. John Wanous from the business school is supervising the project.

The purpose of this study is to examine the expectations that new tellers have about their jobs and how they feel about their jobs once they've been working. I am also interested in how new tellers learn the ropes of their new job. As experienced tellers, your responses are important to this study because you can tell me what people who have been on the job for a while think. The enclosed questionnaire asks about your perceptions and feelings about your job. I also need to have your name on the questionnaire so that I can find out if you leave your job within the next few months.

No one from the Bank will see your answers. You will mail your questionnaires directly to me. In other words, your responses are confidential. The Bank will only receive information which is averaged across all respondents and will not be able to trace any individual or branch responses. Your answers will not have any influence on decisions which are made concerning you. Your participation is voluntary. You may fill out your questionnaire in your free time. It should take about 20 minutes. No one from the Bank will know whether or not you participated.

I strongly encourage you to participate in this study. This research will provide you with an opportunity to let management know how you (as a group) feel about different aspects of your job. It is important that everyone answer so that we get a realistic picture. Also, the information gained in this study may allow the organization to develop programs which will make it easier for new tellers to become adjusted and more satisfied with their jobs. Finally, people who study organizational behavior, like myself, are very concerned about how newcomers come to learn about their jobs. Your participation in this study will help us learn about this process.

Thank you for your time. Your participation will be greatly appreciated.
TELLER QUESTIONNAIRE

* This questionnaire asks about your feelings and perceptions about your job and your interactions with new tellers. It is important to this study that I find out what experienced tellers think about their jobs and how often they interact with new tellers. Your responses on this questionnaire are the only way I can get this information.

* Remember that your participation is voluntary and that your responses are confidential. Only the researchers at Ohio State will be aware of your responses. This study is for research purposes to help us better understand the experiences and feelings of tellers. Your responses will not have any impact on your job.

* After filling out this questionnaire, simply mail it back in the postage paid envelope which has been provided. This will be sent to my office at the Ohio State University. PLEASE RETURN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE WITHIN 2 DAYS.

* Your cooperation and participation is greatly needed and appreciated. It is very important that I hear from everyone so that I can get a realistic picture.

* If you have any questions, please call or write to me, Adrienne Colella, at the numbers and address below. I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Adrienne Colella, M.A.
404-C West 17th Avenue
Psychology
Columbus, Ohio 43210
ph. (614)457-6297 (h) or 292-8175 (o)

* Thank you for your participation. Your cooperation in this study will help us understand the experiences of bank tellers and how new tellers come to learn about their jobs. Without your participation, research of this type would be impossible.
PART I

Directions: Please answer the following questions about yourself.

1. Name: ____________________________

2. You: Branch: _______________________

3. Sex: ___ Female ___ Male

4. Race: ___ Caucasian ___ Black ___ Hispanic ___ Asian ___ Other (indicate) ____________________

5. Age: ____ years

6. Check the highest level of education that you have completed.
   ___ Elementary School ___ Some College ___ 4-Year College Degree
   ___ High School ___ 2-Year College ___ Graduate School Degree

7. Marital Status: ___ Single, Divorced, or Widowed ___ Married ___ Other

8. Do you have children living at home? ___ yes ___ no

9. Are you a part-time, or full-time employee?
   ___ Part-Time ___ Full-Time

10. What is your current position? ____________________________

11. How long have you been at this position? ________ months

12. How long have you worked at your branch? ________ months

13. What other positions have you held with this bank (if any)? ________________________________
**PART II**

DIRECTIONS: Items 14 through 34 represent attitudes or feelings towards your job. For each question you are to give two responses:

1. Based on your feelings about your job, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate number. Use the following scale:

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

2. Indicate how certain you are about your rating for each statement. If you are certain about your response, circle C. If you are uncertain about your rating circle UC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>CERTAIN</th>
<th>UNCERTAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. I really care about the fate of this Bank.
31. For me, this Bank is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.
32. I am extremely glad that I chose this Bank to work for, over others I was considering.
33. My opinion of myself goes up when I do my teller job well.
34. I live eat, and breathe my job.

PART III

DIRECTIONS: Items 35 through 64 are statements which may describe your teller job. For each statement you are to give two responses.

(1) For each statement, indicate how much you agree or disagree that the statement describes your job and experiences as a teller in this bank. Use the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Indicate how certain you are about the rating for each statement. If you are certain about your response, circle C. If you are uncertain about your rating circle UC.

35. My supervisors encourage me to take classes or do other things which help my professional development.
36. I have gotten to know many of the customers.
37. My supervisors do not ask me to do anything they wouldn't do.
38. There is pressure on me to work fast.
39. I am paid well.
40. My supervisors go out of their way to get me the materials or help I need to get my job done.
41. I have to deal with unfriendly or angry customers.
42. I have a great deal of personal responsibility for the money I handle.
43. Other tellers help me get my work done when I am very busy.
44. I am expected to be a public relations representative for the Bank.
45. My supervisors are understanding when I have personal problems.
46. I will get pay raises or bonuses for good performance.
47. Tellers must work together as a team so everyone can get his or her job done.  
48. Being a teller is a good way to get into management.  
49. My supervisors are knowledgeable about policy and products which helps me with my job.  
50. My work schedule is flexible.  
51. I am afraid or worried about being robbed.  
52. My supervisors are tactful when pointing out my mistakes.  
53. The customers ask for my advice about investment decisions.  
54. It is difficult to balance my cash drawer at the end of the day.  
55. I have to educate customers about different products.  
56. Other tellers have helped me learn about this job.  
57. I get recognition from the Bank for good performance.  
58. Getting along with customers is an important part of my job.  
59. My supervisors support me if I have confrontations with customers.  
60. I know what I have to do to get promoted.  
61. I have to follow strict security precautions.  
62. I have to work overtime and/or miss breaks.  
63. My supervisors understand the teller job because they were once tellers.  
64. I am satisfied with my pay.
65. How much variety is there in your job?  
66. How much are you left on your own to do your own work?  
67. How often do you see projects or jobs through to completion?  
68. To what extent do you find out how well you are doing on this job as you are working?  
69. How much opportunity is there to meet individuals with whom you would like to develop friendships?  
70. To what extent do you receive information from your supervisors on your job performance?  
71. To what extent do you have the opportunity to talk informally with other tellers while at work?  
72. How similar are the tasks that you perform in a typical working day?  
73. To what extent are you able to do your job independently of others?  

PART V.  

DIRECTIONS: Items 74 through 87 are possible characteristics of jobs. For each item you are to give two responses.  

(1) First, use the scale below to indicate how much of each characteristic there is in your job. For each question, circle the appropriate number.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>UC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>VERY LITTLE</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td>MODERATE AMOUNT</td>
<td>MUCH</td>
<td>VERY MUCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Indicate how certain you are about the rating for each statement. If you are certain about your response, circle C. If you are uncertain about your rating circle UC.  

74. Feedback from my supervisors on how well I'm doing  
75. Friendship from other tellers  
76. The opportunity to talk with other tellers on the job  
77. The opportunity to do a number of different things  
78. The freedom to do pretty much what I want on my job  
79. The opportunity to find out how well I'm doing on my job  
80. The opportunity in my job to get to know other employees  
81. The amount of variety in my job  

1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC
PART VI

DIRECTIONS: Items 88 through 113 deal with your interactions with new tellers. Some of the items represent different topics of conversation which may take place between coworkers and some represent more general interactions. Consider how often, on the average, you would have each type of interaction or discussion with a new teller. Use the scale below to indicate how often you would have each type of interaction with a new teller in your branch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER OR RARELY</td>
<td>ONCE A MONTH</td>
<td>A FEW TIMES A MONTH</td>
<td>ONCE A WEEK</td>
<td>A FEW TIMES A WEEK</td>
<td>EVERY DAY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88. You and the new teller discuss your pay.
89. The newcomer and you discuss stressful events which have happened to you on this job.
90. The new teller and you talk about your interactions with the head teller.
91. You talk informally with the new teller.
92. You tell the newcomer how you feel about the teller job.
93. You and the new teller discuss whether or not you need many different skills to do the teller job.
94. You and the new teller talk about promotion opportunities or lack of opportunities.
95. You discuss whether your behavior influences the customers.
96. The new teller is unable to find out important information about his or her job.
97. You tell the newcomer about different ways of getting information about how he or she is doing on this job.
98. You and the new teller discuss whether or not you have good supervisors and head tellers.
99. You discuss with the new teller how much or how little control you have over how you get this job done.
100. You and the new teller discuss how tellers can get raises or bonuses.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
101. You and the new teller discuss whether all tellers at your branch work as a team.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
102. You talk with the new teller about whether it is important to be able to get along with the customers.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
103. You talk to the newcomer about whether or not tellers and other employees are friendly on the job.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
104. You talk to the newcomer about whether or not this job is stressful.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
105. You and the new teller discuss the degree of freedom that you have in choosing your work schedules.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
106. You discuss with the newcomer whether or not you are informed of how well you are performing on the job.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
107. You and the new teller talk about whether this job is repetitious or whether it requires a lot of different skills.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
108. You talk to the newcomer about how important tellers are to the organization.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
109. You tell the newcomer how tellers get promoted.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
110. You and the newcomer discuss whether there is enough opportunity to get to know other tellers and employees.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
111. The new teller and you talk about your interactions with customers.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
112. You talk with the newcomer about different aspects of the job.  
1 2 3 4 5 6
113. You discuss with the new teller how you feel about working for this organization.  
1 2 3 4 5 6

PART VII.

DIRECTIONS: Below is a list of activities that may help new employees "learn the ropes" of their job. Indicate with a check which activities are available to new tellers in your branch.

☐ Formal Orientation Program
☐ Formal Training Program conducted before they start their job
☐ Formal On-The-Job Training
☐ Associating with other New Tellers
☐ A "Buddy" Relationship with a more Experienced Teller who acts as a Mentor
☐ Help from the Supervisor
☐ Help from Secretaries or other Support Staff
☐ Daily Interactions with Other Tellers while working
☐ Social/Recreational Activities with people from work
APPENDIX D

New Teller Questionnaire #1
New Teller Questionnaire #3
Supervisory Rating Form
* Remember that your participation is voluntary and that your responses are confidential. Only the researchers at Ohio State will be aware of your responses. This study is for research purposes to help us better understand the experiences and feelings of tellers. Your responses will not have any impact on your job.

* After filling out this questionnaire, simply mail it back in the postage paid envelope which has been provided. These questionnaires are being sent to my office at the Ohio State University. PLEASE RETURN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE WITHIN 2 DAYS.

* Your cooperation and participation is greatly needed and appreciated. It is very important that we hear from everyone so that we can get a realistic picture of what new tellers expect about their jobs.

* If you find that you are having difficulty in filling out this questionnaire, there are extra instructions on the last page of your questionnaire. Please refer to these if you need help. If you have any questions, please call or write to me, Adrienne Colella, at the numbers and address below. I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Adrienne Colella, M.A.
404-C West 17th Avenue
Psychology
Columbus, Ohio 43210
ph. (614)457-6297 (h) or 292-8175 (o)

* Thank you for your participation!
NEW TELLER QUESTIONNAIRE #1

PART I

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions about yourself.

1. Name: __________________________________________

2. Your Branch where you will be working (if you know): ___________________________
   If you'll be a floater, write this down.

3. Sex: ____ Female ____ Male

4. Race: ____ Caucasian ____ Black ____ Hispanic
   ____ Asian ____ Other (indicate) ______________________

5. Age: ____ years

6. Check the highest level of education that you have completed.

   ____ Elementary School ____ 2-Year College Degree
   ____ High School ____ 4-Year College Degree
   ____ Some College ____ Post Graduate Work

7. Marital Status: ____ Single, Divorced, or Widowed ____ Married ____ Other

8. Do you have children living at home? ____ yes ____ no

9. What position will you be entering? ______________________________________

10. Will you be part-time or full-time employee?
    ____ Part-Time ____ Full-Time

11. Have you worked for this Bank before? ____ yes ____ no
    
    If yes, how many months? _______ months
    
    If yes, what other position did you occupy? ______________________________________

12. Have you been a teller before at a different Bank? ____ yes ____ no
    
    If yes, how many months did you work as a teller? _______ months

13. What was your most recent job? _____________________________________________
PART II

DIRECTIONS: Items 14 through 34 represent attitudes or feelings toward your new job. For each statement, you are to assign a number from 0 to 10 to each answer category (e.g., disagree strongly, agree strongly). The numbers you assign for each statement must add up to 10. These numbers represent the chances out of 10 that you would expect to disagree strongly, agree strongly, etc. with each statement once you are on the job. For example, if you are totally sure you will agree with the statement, you would assign a 10 to the agree answer. Or, if you are equally sure that you might either disagree or disagree strongly with this statement once you are on the job, you would assign a 5 to each category. Below is an example of how someone may answer:

EXAMPLE 1: I will like the teller job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>LIGHLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This answer indicates that the person thinks there is a 3 out of 10 chance that she will agree slightly with the statement and a 7 out of 10 chance that she will agree with the statement. This means that she thinks she will probably agree but there is a slight chance she may only agree slightly with the statement once she is on the job.

EXAMPLE 2: I will like the teller job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>LIGHLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This response indicates that the person is sure (a 10 out of 10 chance) that he will disagree slightly with this statement once he is on the job.

NOTICE THAT FOR EACH ANSWER, THE RESPONSES ADD UP TO 10. LEAVING A SPACE BLANK MEANS THAT YOU THINK THAT THERE IS A 0 OUT OF 10 CHANCE THAT YOU WOULD GIVE THIS RESPONSE ONCE YOU WERE ON THE JOB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. I will be generally satisfied with the kind of work that tellers do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I will find that my values and the Bank's values are very similar.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Most tellers are very satisfied with their jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I will feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The most important things that happen to me will involve my work as a teller.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Tellers often think of quitting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. I will be willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the Bank be successful.  

21. I will talk up this Bank to my friends as a great place to work.  

22. Generally speaking, I will be very satisfied with the teller job.  

23. I will frequently think of quitting this job.  

24. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this Bank.  

25. I will be proud to tell others that I am a part of this Bank.  

26. I will probably look for a new job in the next year.  

27. I will feel bad or unhappy if I discover that I have performed poorly as a teller.  

28. This Bank will really inspire the very best in me in the way of job performance.  

29. I will be very much personally involved in my teller job.  

30. I will really care about the fate of this Bank.  

31. For me, this Bank will be the best of all possible organizations for which to work.  

32. I will be extremely glad that I chose this Bank to work for, over others I was considering.  

33. My opinion of myself will go up when I do the teller job well.  

34. I will live, eat, and breathe my job.  

PART III  

DIRECTIONS: Items 35 through 64 are statements which may describe your new teller job. For each statement, you are to assign a number from 0 to 10 to each response category (e.g., disagree strongly, agree strongly, etc.). The numbers you assign for each statement must add up to 10. As in Part II, these numbers represent the chances out of 10, that you EXPECT to disagree strongly, agree strongly, etc. with each statement once you are on the job. Below is an example of how someone may answer:  

EXAMPLE: My branch office will be a nice place to work.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This answer indicates that the person thinks that there is a 2 out of 10 chance that she will disagree slightly with the statement and a 8 out of 10 chance that she will agree slightly with the statement. This means the person is pretty sure she will agree slightly but there is a small chance she will disagree slightly.

35. My supervisors will encourage me to take classes or do other things which will help my professional development.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

36. I will get to know many of the customers.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

37. My supervisors will not ask me to do anything they wouldn't do.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

38. There will be pressure on me to work fast.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

39. I will be paid well.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

40. My supervisors will go out of their way to get me the materials or help I need to get my job done.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

41. I will have to deal with unfriendly or angry customers.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

42. I will have a great deal of personal responsibility for the money I handle.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

43. Other tellers will help me get my work done when I am very busy.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

44. I will be expected to be a public relations representative for the bank.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

45. My supervisors will be understanding when I have personal problems.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

46. I will get pay raises or bonuses for good performance.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

47. Tellers must work together as a team so everyone can get his or her job done.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

48. Being a teller is a good way to get into management.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

49. My supervisors will be knowledgeable about policy and products so that they can help me with my job.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]

50. My work schedule will be flexible.
   \[ \text{Disagree Strongly} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \]
51. I will be afraid or worried about being robbed. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

52. My supervisors will be tactful when pointing out my mistakes. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

53. The customers will ask for my advice about investment decisions. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

54. It will be difficult to balance at the end of the day. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

55. I will have to educate customers about different products. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

56. Other tellers will help me learn about this job. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

57. I will get recognition from the bank for good performance. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

58. Getting along with customers will be an important part of my job. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

59. My supervisors will support me if I have confrontations with customers. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

60. I will know what I have to do to get promoted. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

61. I will have to follow strict security precautions. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

62. I will have to work overtime and/or use breaks. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

63. My supervisors will understand the teller job because they were once tellers. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

64. I will be satisfied with my pay. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PART IV.**

**DIRECTIONS:** Items 65 through 73 concern possible characteristics of your new job. The responses indicate how much of each characteristic your new job may contain. For each item, you are to respond as you did to the items in Parts II & III. That is, for each response category (e.g., very much, very little), you are to give a number from 0 to 10 indicating the chances out of 10 that you think your new job will contain each amount of the characteristic.

Remember: Your answers for each item should add up to 10.

**EXAMPLE:** How much supervision will you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>MUCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This response indicates that the respondent thinks that there is an 8 out of 10 chance that there will be a moderate amount of supervision, a 1 out of 10 chance that there will be much supervision, and a 1 out of 10 chance that there will be very much supervision. This means that she is almost sure that there will be a moderate amount of supervision but there is a slight chance that there could be much supervision or very much supervision.

| 65. How much variety will there be in your job? | None | Very Little | Little | Moderate Amount | Much | Very Much |
| 66. How much will you be left on your own to do your own work? | | | | | | |
| 67. How often will you see projects or jobs through to completion? | | | | | | |
| 68. To what extent will you find out how well you are doing on this job as you are working? | | | | | | |
| 69. How much opportunity will there be to meet individuals with you would like to develop friendships? | | | | | | |
| 70. To what extent will you receive information from your supervisors on your job performance? | | | | | | |
| 71. To what extent will you have the opportunity to talk informally with other tellers while at work? | | | | | | |
| 72. How similar will the tasks be that you perform in a typical working day? | | | | | | |
| 73. To what extent will you be able to do your job independently of others? | | | | | | |

PART V.

DIRECTIONS: Items 74 through 87 concern possible characteristics of your new job. The responses indicate how much of each characteristic your new job may contain. For each item, you are to respond as you did to the items in PART IV. That is, for each response category (e.g., very much, very little), you are to give a number from 0 to 10 indicating the chances out of 10 that you think your new job will contain each amount of the characteristic.

Remember: Your answers for each item should add up to 10.

Use this scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART VI.

**DIRECTIONS:** Below is a list of possible recruiting sources or methods by which people hear about job openings. Please check off the method by which you learned of this job opening.

- [ ] Employee Referral
- [ ] Newspaper Ad
- [ ] School Recruiting/Placement Office
- [ ] TV or Radio Ad
- [ ] Direct Application at the Bank
- [ ] Friend or Relative (who is not an employee)
NEW TELLER QUESTIONNAIRE #3

* Now that you've been working as a teller for about one month, it is time to fill out another questionnaire. Rather than telling me what you expect to find on the job, you will be asked to tell me what your job is actually like and how you feel about it. This is the third out of four questionnaires. You will be asked to fill out one more in about two months. If you filled out the first two, THANK YOU! If not, please fill out the others. Your participation is very important to the success of this study.

* Remember that your participation is voluntary and that your responses are confidential. Only the researchers at Ohio State will be aware of your responses. This study is for research purposes to help us better understand the experiences and feelings of tellers. Your responses will not have any impact on your job.

* After filling out this questionnaire, simply mail it back in the postage paid envelope which has been provided. These questionnaires are being sent to my office at the Ohio State University. PLEASE RETURN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE WITHIN 2 DAYS.

* Your cooperation and participation is greatly needed and appreciated. It is very important that I hear from everyone so that I can get a realistic picture of what new tellers expect about their jobs.

* These questions are very similar to the others. It is important that you tell me how you think and feel now that you're on-the-job. If you have any questions, please call or write to me, Adrienne Colella, at the numbers and address below. I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Adrienne Colella, M.A.
404-C West 17th Avenue
Psychology
Columbus, Ohio 43210
ph. (614)457-6297 (h) or 292-8175 (o)

* Thank you for your participation!
NEW TELLER QUESTIONNAIRE #3

Name: ____________________________________________

Your Branch: ______________________________________

PART I

DIRECTIONS: Items 1 through 21 represent attitudes or feelings towards your job. For each question you are to give two responses:

(1) Based on your feelings about your job, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate number. Use the following scale:

Disagree  Disagree  Disagree  Agree  Agree  Agree
Strongly  Slightly  Slightly  Strongly

(2) Indicate how certain you are about your rating for each statement. If you are certain about your response, circle C. If you are uncertain about your rating circle UC.

1. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do on this job. 
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC

2. I find that my values and the Bank's are very similar.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC

3. Most tellers are very satisfied with their jobs.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC

4. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC

5. The most important things that happen to me involve my work as a teller.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC

6. Tellers often think of quitting.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC

7. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the Bank be successful.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC

8. I talk up this Bank to my friends as a great place to work.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC

9. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with the teller job.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC

10. I frequently think of quitting this job.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC

11. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this Bank.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 C UC
12. I am proud to tell others that I am a part of this Bank.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

13. I will probably look for a new job in the next year.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

14. I feel bad or unhappy if I discover that I have performed poorly as a teller.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

15. This Bank inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

16. I am very much personally involved in my teller job.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

17. I really care about the fate of this Bank.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

18. For me, this Bank is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

19. I am extremely glad that I chose this Bank to work for, over others I was considering.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

20. My opinion of myself goes up when I do my teller job well.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

PART II

DIRECTIONS: Items 22 through 51 are statements which may describe your teller job. For each statement you are to give two responses.

(1) For each statement, indicate how much you agree or disagree that the statement describes your job and experiences as a teller in this bank. Use the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Indicate how certain you are about the rating for each statement. If you are certain about your response, circle C. If you are uncertain about your rating circle UC.

22. My supervisors encourage me to take classes or do other things which help my professional development.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

23. I have gotten to know many of the customers.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

24. My supervisors do not ask me to do anything they wouldn't do.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

25. There is pressure on me to work fast.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

26. I am paid well.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

27. My supervisors go out of their way to get me the materials or help I need to get my job done.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC

28. I have to deal with unfriendly or angry customers.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6  C UC
29. I have a great deal of personal responsibility for the money I handle.  
30. Other tellers help me get my work done when I am very busy.  
31. I am expected to be a public relations representative for the bank.  
32. My supervisors are understanding when I have personal problems.  
33. I will get pay raises or bonuses for good performance.  
34. Tellers must work together as a team so everyone can get his or her job done.  
35. Being a teller is a good way to get into management.  
36. My supervisors are knowledgeable about policy and products which helps me with my job.  
37. My work schedule is flexible.  
38. I am afraid or worried about being robbed.  
39. My supervisors are tactful when pointing out my mistakes.  
40. The customers ask for my advice about investment decisions.  
41. It is difficult to balance my cash drawer at the end of the day.  
42. I have to educate customers about different products.  
43. Other tellers have helped me learn about this job.  
44. I get recognition from the Bank for good performance.  
45. Getting along with customers is an important part of my job.  
46. My supervisors support me if I have confrontations with customers.  
47. I know what I have to do to get promoted.  
48. I have to follow strict security precautions.  
49. I have to work overtime and/or miss breaks.  
50. My supervisors understand the teller job because they were once tellers.  
51. I am satisfied with my pay.
PART III.

DIRECTIONS: Items 52 through 60 are possible characteristics of jobs. For each item you are to give two responses.

(1) First, use the scale below to indicate how much of each characteristic there is in your job. For each question, circle the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY MUCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Indicate how certain you are about the rating for each statement. If you are certain about your rating, circle 5. If you are uncertain about your rating circle UC.

52. How much variety is there in your job?  
53. How much are you left on your own to do your own work?  
54. How often do you see projects or jobs through to completion?  
55. To what extent do you find out how well you are doing on this job as you are working?  
56. How much opportunity is there to meet individuals with whom you would like to develop friendships?  
57. To what extent do you receive information from your supervisor on your job performance?  
58. To what extent do you have the opportunity to talk informally with other tellers while at work?  
59. How similar are the tasks that you perform in a typical working day?  
60. To what extent are you able to do your job independently of others?

PART IV.

DIRECTIONS: Items 61 through 74 are possible characteristics of jobs. For each item you are to give two responses.

(1) First, use the scale below to indicate how much of each characteristic there is in your job. For each question, circle the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY MUCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Indicate how certain you are about the rating for each statement. If you are certain about your response, circle 5. If you are uncertain about your rating, circle UC.
61. Feedback from my supervisors on how well I'm doing
62. Friendship from other tellers
63. The opportunity to talk with other tellers on the job
64. The opportunity to do a number of different things
65. The freedom to do pretty much what I want on my job
66. The opportunity to find out how well I'm doing on my job
67. The opportunity in my job to get to know other employees
68. The amount of variety in my job
69. The opportunity for independent thought and action
70. The opportunity to complete the work I start
71. The feeling that I know whether I am performing my job well or poorly
72. The opportunity to develop close friendships on my job
73. The control I have over the pace of my work
74. The opportunity to do a job from the beginning to end (i.e., the chance to do a whole job)

**PART V**

**DIRECTIONS:** Items 75 through 100 deal with your interactions with coworkers. Some of the items represent different topics of conversation which may take place between coworkers and some represent more general interactions. Consider how often, on the average, you would have each type of interaction or discussion with other tellers. Use the scale below to indicate how often you would have each type of interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER OR RARELY</td>
<td>ONCE A MONTH</td>
<td>A FEW TIMES A MONTH</td>
<td>ONCE A WEEK</td>
<td>A FEW TIMES A WEEK</td>
<td>EVERY DAY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75. Your coworkers and you discuss your pay.
76. Other tellers and you discuss stressful events which have happened to you on this job.
77. Other tellers and you talk about your interactions with the head teller.
78. You talk informally with the other tellers,
79. Other coworkers tell you how they feel about the teller job.

80. You and other tellers discuss whether or not you need many different skills to do the teller job.

81. You and other tellers talk about promotion opportunities or lack of opportunities.

82. You and your coworkers discuss whether your behavior influences the customers.

83. You are unable to find out important information about your job.

84. Other coworkers tell you about different ways of getting information about how you are doing on this job.

85. You and other tellers discuss whether or not you have good supervisors and head tellers.

86. You discuss with other tellers how much or how little control you have over how you get this job done.

87. You and other coworkers discuss how tellers can get raises or bonuses.

88. You and your coworkers discuss whether all tellers at your branch work as a team.

89. You talk with other tellers about whether it is important to be able to get along with the customers.

90. You talk to coworkers about whether or not tellers and other employees are friendly on the job.

91. You talk to other tellers about whether or not this job is stressful.

92. You and other tellers discuss the degree of freedom that you have in choosing your work schedules.

93. You discuss with coworkers whether or not you are informed of how well you are performing on the job.

94. You and the other tellers talk about whether this job is repetitive or whether it requires a lot of different skills.

95. You talk to other tellers about how important tellers are to the organization.

96. Coworkers tell you how tellers get promoted.

97. You and other tellers discuss whether there is enough opportunity to get to know other tellers and employees.

98. The other tellers and you talk about your interactions with customers.

99. You talk with the other tellers about different aspects of the job.

100. You discuss with other tellers how you feel about working for this organization.
PART VI.

DIRECTIONS: Below is a list of activities that may help new employees "learn the ropes" of their job. Indicate with a check which activities were available to you.

____ Formal Orientation Program
____ Formal Training Program conducted before they start their job
____ Formal On-The-Job Training
____ Associating with other New Tellers
____ A "Buddy" Relationship with a more Experienced Teller who acts as a Mentor
____ Help from the Supervisor
____ Help from Secretaries or other Support Staff
____ Daily Interactions with Other Tellers while working
____ Social/Recreational Activities with people from work
SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE #1

This questionnaire is part of the study being done on new tellers. Performance information on the new tellers is needed as part of the study. This rating form is being used because this study is being conducted in several banks. Having all supervisors use the same forms will allow performance information to be averaged across different banks.

The questions below refer to your general assessment of the new teller’s performance. These ratings are confidential. Only the researchers at OSU will know your responses. These performance ratings will not be used to make any decisions about this teller. Only information which is averaged across all tellers will be presented to the bank.

New Teller’s Name: ____________________________________________

What is your position? ___________________________________________

1. Circle the response which best describes this teller’s general job performance.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Very Poor Poor Satisfactory Good Excellent

2. Using the scale below, indicate how this teller’s performance compares to the average performance of a new teller with the same amount of experience.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Much Worse Worse Same as Better Much Better

3. Using the scale below, indicate how this teller’s performance compares to the average performance of a teller with 6 months of experience.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Much Worse Worse Same as Better Much Better

4. Consider the performance of previous new tellers which you have supervised. Using the scale below, estimate the percentage of new tellers which would perform better than this teller.

For example, if you feel that about 75% of new tellers would perform better than this teller you would circle 4. If you feel that only about 10% of new tellers would perform better than this teller, then you would circle 1.

   1  2  3  4  5
   0%–20% 21%–40% 41%–60% 61%–80% 81%–100%

THANKS FOR YOUR COOPERATION! YOUR HELP WITH THIS PROJECT IS
VERY MUCH APPRECIATED.
APPENDIX E

Item Inventory
ITEM INVENTORY

DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Name

2. Sex
   ___ Male  ___ Female

3. Race
   ___ Caucasian
   ___ Black
   ___ Hispanic
   ___ Asian
   ___ Other (please indicate) ____________________________

4. Check the highest level of education that you have completed.
   ___ Elementary School
   ___ High School
   ___ Some College
   ___ 2 year College Degree/ Associate's Degree
   ___ 4 year College Degree/ Bachelor's Degree
   ___ Post Graduate Work

5. What is your age in years?
   ___ years

6. What is your marital status?
   ___ single
   ___ married
   ___ other

7. Do you have children living at home?  ___ yes  ___ no

WORK EXPERIENCE (newcomers)

1. What position will you be entering?
   ______________________

2. Will you be a part-time or a full-time employee?
   ___ part-time  ___ full-time

3. Have you worked for this organization before?
   ___ yes  ___ no

   If yes, how many months have you worked for this organization?
   ___ months

   If yes, what positions did you previously occupy in this organization?
   ____________________________
4. Have you had a job similar to this one, but in a different organization? (or Have you worked as a teller for another bank before?)
   **yes**  **no**
   If yes, how long did you work in this position?
   ___________ months

5. What was your last job?
   ____________________________________________________________________

**WORK EXPERIENCE** (work group)

1. How many months have you worked for this organization?
   ___________ months

2. What is your current position?
   ____________________________________________________________________

3. How long have you been in this position?
   ___________ months

4. Are you a part time or full time employee?
   ____part time  ____full time

5. How long have you worked at this branch?
   ___________ months

6. What other positions have you held in this organization (if any)?
   ____________________________________________________________________

**EXPECTATIONS/PERCEPTIONS**
(these are in perception form)

* Task Characteristics

* from the Job Characteristics Inventory (Sims et al., 1976), with the following changes:
  1. Delete dealing with others scale (items 6,11,30 on original scale).
  2. Delete friendship opportunities item 27.
  3. Delete skill variety item 7.
  4. Delete autonomy item 8.
  5. Delete task identity item 19.

* Items which are followed by "**" were dropped from the scale because they substantially reduced the internal reliability of the scale.

* Rating Scale:
  1 = None  4 = Moderate Amount
  2 = Very Little  5 = Much
  3 = Little  6 = Very Much
* All items except the following comprise the Task Characteristics Scale: 5, 7, 11, 12, 16, 21. These items are on the Social aspects scale.

1. How much variety is there in your job?
2. How much are you left on your own to do your own work?
3. How often do you see projects or jobs through to completion?
4. To what extent do you find out how well you are doing on the job as you are working?
5. How much opportunity is there to meet individuals whom you would like to develop friendships with?
6. To what extent do you receive information from your supervisors on your job performance?
7. To what extent do you have the opportunity to talk informally with other tellers while at work?
8. How similar are the tasks that you perform in a typical working day? **
9. To what extent are you able to do your job independently of others?

For items ** through **, use the scale below to describe how much of each characteristic you have in this job.

10. The feedback from my supervisors on how well I'm doing
11. Friendship from other tellers
12. The opportunity to talk with other tellers on my job
13. The opportunity to do a number of different things
14. The freedom to do pretty much what I want on my job
15. The opportunity to find out how well I'm doing on my job
16. The opportunity in my job to get to know other people
17. The amount of variety in my job
18. The opportunity for independent thought and action
19. The opportunity to complete work I start
20. The feeling that I know whether I am performing my job well or poorly
21. The opportunity to develop close friendships in my job
22. The control I have over the pace of my work
23. The opportunity to do a job from the beginning to end (i.e., the chance to do a whole job)

Job Specific Expectation/Perception Items

* These were derived from a pilot study in which 12 tellers and 7 supervisors were interviewed. Teller experience ranged from 3 months to 24 years in the teller/head teller position. Subjects came from different branches of two of the sample banks. Tellers were chosen by the organizations.

* Items which are followed by "**" were dropped from the scale because they substantially reduced the internal reliability of the scale.

* Rating Scale:
  1 = Disagree Strongly
  2 = Disagree
  3 = Disagree Slightly
  4 = Agree Slightly
  5 = Agree
  6 = Agree Strongly

Customer Relations
1. I have gotten to know many of the customers.
2. The customers ask for my advice about investment decisions.
3. I have to educate customers about different products.
4. I have to deal with unfriendly or angry customers. **
5. I am expected to be a public relations representative for the bank.
6. Getting along with customers is an important part of my job.

Supervisory Support/Social
1. My supervisors support me if I have confrontations with customers.
2. My supervisors go out of their way to get me the materials or help I need to get my job done.
3. My supervisors understand the teller job because they were once tellers.
4. My supervisors are understanding when I have personal problems.
5. My supervisor is knowledgeable about policy and products which helps me with my job.
6. My supervisors are tactful when pointing out my mistakes.
7. My supervisors do not ask me to do anything that they wouldn't do.
8. My supervisors encourage me to take classes or do other things which help my professional development.

Stress on the Job
1. There is pressure on me to work fast.
2. It is difficult to balance my cash drawer at the end of the day. **
3. I have a great deal of responsibility for the money I handle.
4. I have to follow strict security precautions.
5. I am afraid or worried about being robbed.

Hours
1. I have to work overtime and/or miss breaks. **
2. My work schedule will be flexible. **

Working with Coworkers/Social
1. Other tellers help me get my job done when I am very busy.
2. Other tellers have helped me learn about the job.
3. Tellers must work together as a team so that everyone can get his or her job done. **

Promotions/Reward
1. Being a teller is a good way to get into management.
2. I get recognition from the Bank for good performance.
3. I know what I have to do to get promoted.

Pay/Reward
1. I am paid well.
2. I am get pay raises or bonuses for good performance.
3. I am satisfied with my pay.

CERTAINTY OF PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

* For each perception question, tellers were asked to indicate whether they are certain (C) or uncertain (UC) of their response by circling a "C" or "UC".
**SATISFACTION**
*Items from JDS (Hackman & Oldham, 1975)*

**Rating Scale:**
1 = None
2 = Very Little
3 = Little
4 = Moderate Amount
5 = Much
6 = Very Much

1. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with the teller job.
2. I frequently think of quitting this job. (R)
3. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do on this job.
4. Most tellers are very satisfied with the job.
5. Tellers often think of quitting. (R)

**COMMITMENT**
*Items from OCQ (Porter & Smith, 1970)*
*Short form, i.e. reverse items omitted*

**Agree/Disagree rating scale**

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.
2. I talk up this Bank to my friends as a great organization to work for.
3. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this Bank.
4. I find that my values and the Bank's values are very similar.
5. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this Bank.
6. This Bank really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
7. I am extremely glad that I chose this Bank to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined.
8. I really care about the fate of this Bank.
9. For me this Bank is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.

**INTENTION TO TURNOVER**
*Items from MOAQ (Seashore et al., 1982)*

*One item is removed because it uses a different response format.*

**Agree/Disagree rating scale**

1. I often think about quitting.
2. I will probably look for a new job in the next year.

**INTERNAL WORK MOTIVATION**
*Items from JDS (Hackman & Oldham, 1975)*

**Agree/Disagree rating scale**

1. My opinion of myself goes up when I do my teller well.
2. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.
3. I feel bad and unhappy when I discover that I have performed poorly as a teller.

**JOB INVOLVEMENT**
*Items from MOAQ (Seashore et al., 1982)*

**Agree/Disagree rating scale**
1. I am very much personally involved in my teller job.
2. I live, eat, and breathe my job.
3. The most important things which happen to me involve my work as a teller.

SOCIALIZATION METHODS
(Adapted from Louis et al., 1983)

Below is a list of activities that may help new employees "learn the ropes" of their job. Indicate with a check which activities have been available to you.

___ Formal Orientation Program
___ Formal Training Program conducted before you start your job
___ Formal On the Job Training
___ Associating with other New Teller
___ A "Buddy" relationship with a more Experienced Teller who acts as a Mentor
___ Help from your Supervisor
___ Help from Secretaries or other Support Staff
___ Daily Interactions with other Tellers while working
___ Social/Recreational Activities with People from Work

FREQUENCY OF INTERACTION

* items sorted according to expectation/perception domain
* these are worded for newcomer subjects

* Rating Scale:
  1 = Never or Rarely 4 = Once a Week
  2 = Once a Month 5 = A Few Times a Week
  3 = A Few Times a Month 6 = Every Day

* Directions:

Items xx through xx deal with your interactions with your supervisor and your work group. Some of the items represent different topics of conversation which may take place between coworkers and some represent more general interactions. Use the scale below (above) to indicate how often you have each type of interaction with your coworkers.

General Interactions

1. You talk informally with other tellers.
2. You talk with other tellers about different aspects of the job.
3. You are unable to find out important information about your job. **
(task variety) 1. You and other tellers discuss whether or not you need many different skills to do this job.

(task variety) 2. You and other tellers talk about whether or not this job is repetitious and boring.

(autonomy) 3. You and other tellers discuss how much or how little control you have over how you get your job done.

(autonomy) 4. You and other tellers discuss the degree of freedom that you have in choosing your work schedules.

(task identity) 5. You talk to other tellers about how important this job is to the organization.

(task identity) 6. You and your coworkers discuss whether your job performance influences the customers.

(feedback) 7. You discuss with coworkers whether or not you are informed of how well you are performing on the job.

(feedback) 8. Other coworkers tell you about different ways of getting information which tells you how you are doing on your job.

(friendship opportunities) 9. You talk to coworkers about whether or not tellers and other employees are friendly on the job.

(friendship opportunities) 10. You and other tellers discuss whether there is enough opportunity to get to know other tellers and employees.

Specific Aspects of the Teller Job

(supervisory support) 1. Other tellers and you talk about your interactions with the head teller.

(supervisory support) 2. You and other tellers discuss whether you have good head tellers and supervisors.
(pay) 3. Your coworkers and you discuss your pay.

(pay) 4. You and other coworkers discuss how tellers can get pay raises and bonuses.

(stress) 5. Other tellers and you discuss stressful events which have happened to you on the job.

(stress) 6. You talk to other tellers about whether or not this job is stressful.

(promotion) 7. You and other tellers talk about promotion opportunities or lack of opportunities.

(promotion) 8. Coworkers tell you how tellers get promoted.

(working with coworkers) 9. You and your coworkers discuss whether all tellers at your branch work as a team.

(customer relations) 10. You talk with other tellers about whether it is important to be able to get along with customers.

(customer relations) 11. The other tellers and you talk about your interactions with customers.

**Attitudes**

(General) 1. Other coworkers tell you how they feel about the teller job.

(General) 2. You discuss with other tellers how you feel about working for this organization.

**RECRUITING SOURCE**

* This information is not directly relevant to the dissertation but is included because the host organization will find it useful and because it pertains to other research interests of the investigator.
Below is a list of possible recruiting sources or methods by which people hear about job openings. Please check off the method by which you learned of this job opening.

- Employee Referral
- Newspaper Ad
- School Recruiting Office or Placement Office
- TV or Radio Ad
- Advertisement in a Professional Journal or other publication
- Direct Application to the Organization
- Friend or Relative