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ABSTRACT
Motivated by the growing literature on organizational socialization (OS), this study aims to provide a review of the domain of organizational socialization in the workplace, highlighting the applicability of OS, the most used measures, the mechanisms of OS, commonly used theories, and future directions. Using a systematic literature review, the search was conducted using Web of Science and covering the years 1991 to 2021. After removing qualitative and unrelated studies, we reached 24 articles published in the Financial Times research rank.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Organizational socialization is concerned with the process by which an employee will be able to adjust to the organization to fulfill a predetermined role. This adjustment is not only associated with the required tasks but also with personal behaviors and values (Taormina, 2004). Therefore, OS aims to achieve fit and congruence between employees and their organizations. Organizational socialization (OS) has been defined as the process by which employees gain important skills to perform specific organizational functions and the ability of the employees to act in a suitable manner to that organization (Taormina, 2004). Furthermore, it is about the effectiveness of employees due to sharing the same norms and values (Yanik & Yildiz, 2019).

OS is an important strategy that organizations have used to face different situations such as organizational changes, new recruitment, and job promotions. Most of the literature on OS strictly focuses on the socialization, specifically on newcomers using specific antecedents, outcomes, mediations, and moderations (Bauer et al., 2007), limiting their work in a short period of time (Saks, & Ashforth, 1997), and using specific perspectives or theory underlying their review (Griffin et al., 2000), which limits the gathered information. Therefore, future advancement of the OS domain needs a review of previous empirical studies, highlighting the applicability of OS, the most used measures of OS, the associated variables, and the philosophical lens that can extend the OS researches directions.

To fill these gaps, this paper aims to systematically review the literature on OS and addresses the following questions:
- To whom can OS strategies be applied?
- What are the most used measures of OS?
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What antecedents, mediators, moderators, and outcomes determine OS?
What theories have been linked to OS?
What directions can extend future research in OS?

By answering the previous questions, this paper will have two main contributions. First, we collected a wide range of empirical studies in one paper that will offer a deep understanding of the OS domain. Second, we highlighted the direction of future research based on the review of an extended period of previous work that includes different perspectives and theories.

This paper is organized as follows. The first section discusses the applicability of OS, the second section discusses the most used measures of OS, the third section introduces the associated variables with OS, and finally, the fourth section discusses the philosophical lens that extends the OS research direction.

The Applicability of OS

Organization Socialization as a Continuous Process

Researchers have been focusing on OS, specifically on newcomers and their outcomes of this process, which are work-related adjustments. In reviewing the OS literature, we can recognize that OS has been applied as a process specifically to newcomers in many earlier studies (e.g., Bigliardi et al., 2005). Some current studies also apply it to newcomers (e.g., Awan & Fatima, 2018; Reissner et al., 2019). The reason behind applying organizational socialization specifically to newcomers is that many scholars believe that when a newcomer takes a position in an organization, even though they have some prior knowledge regarding the required tasks, this prior knowledge will change after they go through the socialization process (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

Taormina (1997) illustrated that organizational socialization is a long-term process. When an employee moves from one position to another, they need to learn more about the position’s tasks. Furthermore, Taormina (2009) highlighted that each employee has different personal needs. The organizational culture may not match some of these needs, affecting their satisfaction. Therefore, organizational socialization can be used not only for newcomers but also for other employees with different job tenures as long as they are employed in the same organization (Taormina, 2004). Moreover, Spagnoli (2020) examined job tenure, the difference between newcomers and career growth, and found no significant differences. Thus, organizational socialization is expected to have an effect on employees with their different job tenures by using other outcomes. Likewise, Cranmer et al. (2019) mentioned that future research should investigate the impact of socialization not only on newcomers but also on other workers with longer experience in the organization.

To whom Can OS Strategies be Applied?

As mentioned previously, newcomers were the main focus of the research in OS. In the field of organizational management, OS can be applied to different individuals with their different work phases; for example, executives (Nishanthi & Kailasapathy, 2018), experts (Spagnoli, 2020), expatriates (Fu et al., 2017), and volunteers (Hidalgo, & Moreno, 2009).

Nishanthi and Kailasapathy (2018) emphasized that talented employees such as executives and experts are a crucial source of competitive advantage for their organizations, which illustrates the importance of socializing them to increase commitment and their intention to stay. Likewise,
Fu et al. (2017) highlighted that expatriates are usually talented employees hired to fill a critical need in organizations in host countries. Fu et al. also mentioned that those expatriates usually experience high levels of uncertainty that prevent them from being socially integrated. Furthermore, Hidalgo and Moreno (2009) illustrated that the nature of relationships inside the organization, the provided support, and the supported co-workers can affect the volunteers’ desire to stay in the organization. Additionally, Hayashi (2013) conducted a study on senior staff, assistant managers, and managers. Their sample had ten years of average experience, and the researcher found that OS and self-esteem are higher for employees with longer work experiences than for employees with short work experiences (Hayashi, 2013).

All in all, OS can be applied to all employees as long as they go through either career-related changes or personal-related changes, or both (Chao et al., 1994). Ongoing socialization will result in facilitating the fit between employees and their organizations, which will contribute to the desired outcomes for both the organization and the employees.

**Measurements of OS**

Previous literature has classified OS as stages and processes. Different stages have been illustrated in detail by Wanous et al. (1984). Most of the current research focuses on OS as a continuous process that mostly focuses on the content of employees’ socialization. (e.g., Alessandri et al., 2020; Cepale et al., 2021; Spagnoli, 2020).

On the other hand, the measurement of OS has been focused on tactics and content. OS content refers to the aspect an employee must learn or knowledge that should be gained in order to function effectively within the organization (Ashforth et al., 2007). OS tactics refers to "the ways in which the experiences of an individual in transition from one role to another are structured for him by others in the organization" (Van Maanen, 1978). Table 1 highlights OS measurers and their classification and dimensions.

Those measures of OS were either developed from the conceptual works such as the measure developed by Jones (1986) or developed based on the previous measures, such as the measure developed by Ogawa (2006), which was based on the work of Jones (1986) and Chao et al. (1994) (Ishii et al., 2021); or based on provided critiques of other scholars such as the measure developed by Haueter et al. (2003), which was developed as results of the limitations of Chao et al. (1994) measure that was noticed by Bauer et al. (1998); or based on the recognition of unnoticed aspects such as the measure developed by Taormina (1994), which highlights an important subscale, future prospect, that has never been a focus of the OS measurements; or finally, based on integrating items form different measures such as Cooper-Thomas et al. (2020) measure. Likewise, some studies have shortened some of the already developed measures (e.g., Cable & Parsons, 2001; Fu et al., 2017; Nasr et al., 2019).

**Table 1. Organizational Socialization Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>OS as</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones (1986)</td>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>Collective vs. Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal vs. Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sequential vs. Random</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed vs. Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investiture vs. Divestiture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Serial vs. Disjunctive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ostroff and Kozlowski (1992)</td>
<td>Task, Role, Group, and Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao et al. (1994)</td>
<td>History, Language, Politics, People, Organizational Goals and Values, and Performance Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taormina (1994)</td>
<td>Training, Understanding, Co-worker Support, and Future Prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas and Anderson (1998)</td>
<td>Social, Role, Interpersonal Support, and Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks and Hunt (1998)</td>
<td>Organization and Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haueter et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Organization, Group, and Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livi et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Identification, Competence, and Acceptance by Co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper-Thomas et al. (2020)</td>
<td>Role, Relationships, Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is at the same level of importance to point out the other measures that are related to OS. Several measures measure different aspects of socialization from different points of view. Table 2 highlights these measures.

Those measures are usually used independently of the OS process. By independently, we mean that these measures are not measures of the tactics or content of socialization or the socialization outcomes. They are mostly used as mechanisms of the OS process. For example, proactive socialization has been used as a mediator in the socialization process (Beenen & Pichler, 2014; Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2013). Likewise, Dufour et al. (2021) have used the measure of divestiture socialization as a mediator in the socialization process.

**Table 2. Measures of socialization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan (1974)</td>
<td>Socialization experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon et al. (1980)</td>
<td>Socialization influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton (1993)</td>
<td>Socialization-related learning experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford and Black (1996)</td>
<td>Proactive socialization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OS Antecedents, Mediators, Moderators, and Outcomes

Methodology

This section highlights the approach by which we conducted the systematic literature review (SLR). In order to establish a rigorous study, we follow the recommendations of Tranfield et al. (2003) to avoid any bias and make our study applicable for replication by independent scholars. Tranfield et al.’s (2003) recommendations are widely used in conducting systematic literature reviews (e.g., Baker et al., 2020; Mio et al., 2020; Nadkarni & Prügl, 2021).

The Review Process

After pointing to the need to conduct this study, we follow the second stage of Tranfield et al.’s (2003) recommendations, specifically the third and fourth phases, which is illustrated in detail in Figure 1.

In this stage, we conduct the initial search using only two keywords, regardless of the dimensions of OS. We did not focus on the dimensions because other unrelated articles would appear if we did. By unrelated, we mean, for example, if we search using “training,” which is a dimension of Taormina’s scale, other measures of training that are not actually related to the domain of OS will appear. Those two keywords are organizational socialization and organization socialization.
Figure 1. Details of systematic Review Steps

The search includes searching journals’ titles, abstracts, and keywords. We insist on being accurate in our search criteria in order to achieve the benefit of doing SLR rather than a narrative review, which will lead us to avoid bias and reach a comprehensive search (Tranfield et al., 2003).

Regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria, we first limit our search in the Web of Science (WOS) database. The focus on WOS is because we also focus on the Financial Times top 50 journals (FT50) which include the most influential business journals in business and management schools around the world (Vidgen et al., 2019). Zhang (2021) conducted his study focusing on the FT50 journals, and he used Clarivate to reiterate the required journals. Therefore, we use the WOS database to locate the FT50 journals. Likewise, we limit our search for journals because they are widely used to report empirical research details and findings (Podsakoff et al., 2005). Furthermore, we specified the date to locate journal articles published between 1991 and 2021. After removing unrelated articles—by unrelated articles, we mean the conceptual and qualitative articles or the articles that discuss OS but were not related to the focus of the study—we reached 109 articles. The last step was with the aim of achieving precision; we removed any article that did not include any measure of OS. As a result, we reached 24 articles applicable to our study.
The Quality Assessment and Data Extraction

By conducting the study based on FT50, we based our quality assessment on the rating of the quality of these journals. This limitation is also highlighted by Tranfield et al. (2003) due to the hardness of quality assessment in management research.

For the data extraction process, we deductively documented in a worksheet that includes the article title, authors’ names, journal names, year of publication, the number of citations in Google Scholar (GS) and WOS, sample information, the used measure of OS, the theory the study based on, mechanisms, and references.

The articles included in this study have at least one measure of OS. Also, citations on GS and WOS might change from the time this article was written. Figure 2 highlights the publications in the domain of OS between 1991 and 2021. The data extraction stage was made by one reviewer and revised by another reviewer.

Figure 2: Number of Articles Published in OS Per Year

Data Synthesis

Following the bibliometric methods of review, we specifically employ citation analysis. According to Zupic and Čater (2015), citation analysis is a review conducted on studies based on their influence. As mentioned previously, we selected the FT50 journals because they are the most influential business journals in the field. Furthermore, the synthesis of the extracted data leads us to reach four themes on OS mechanisms, and some of these themes have two categories.

The main themes are antecedents, mediators, moderators, and outcomes. These four themes are consistent with our research question and previous frameworks (e.g., Shahbaz & Parker, 2021). Indeed, Shahbaz and Parker (2021) did not specify a period of time in their selection criteria, while our study contributes by providing a comprehensive and accurate review by specifying the period of time and only conducting the review based on articles that are directly related to OS domain, using at least one measure of OS. Table 3 indicates the FT50 journals that are included in our review.
Table 3. Number of OS Publications in FT50 Journals and Their Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Number of OS Articles</th>
<th>Number of Citations on GS</th>
<th>Number of Citations on WOS</th>
<th>Total Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
<td>JAP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>5076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Management Journal</td>
<td>AMJ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6157</td>
<td>2237</td>
<td>8394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Business Ethics</td>
<td>JBE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</td>
<td>OBHDP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management Information Systems</td>
<td>JMIS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Science</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be clearly seen from Table 3 that while JAP has the highest number of OS articles publications, the AMJ has the highest number of citations in both Google Scholar (GS) and WOS. It is expected to have article repetition in total citations from both GS and WOS; as a result, we encourage researchers to focus on each database independently.

In the following three sections, we will discuss the findings of our review, answering the study questions.

The Most Used Measures of OS

While we provided a detailed introduction to the OS measures, after conducting the SLR, we found that the most used measure of OS is the one developed by Jones (1986), followed by Chao et al. (1994). Figure 3 highlights the used measures of OS with the percentage of using them in the studies under this review.
Most interestingly, the studies using Chao et al.’s (1994) measure have used the measure to measure other constructs rather than OS. Examples of these constructs are task mastery (Ellis et al., 2017; Jiang et al., 2021), social integration (Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2013; Jiang et al., 2021), and social adjustment (Ellis et al., 2017; Nifadkar et al., 2012). This is also emphasized by Bauer et al. (2007), that even though Chao et al.’s (1994) measure has been utilized frequently, it is seldom utilized as a whole to measure OS.

**The Applicability of OS Measures**

As we previously mentioned, based on our review, we conclude that OS is applicable to all employees in the organization regardless of their status in the organization. Figure 4 highlights the employment status of the samples in the reviewed articles.

Figure 4 clearly shows that even though 67% of the reviewed articles were conducted based on newcomers as samples, there is a significant portion of studies (21%) based on all employees in the organization. Also, other studies were conducted based on interns, professionals, and a mix of all other types of employees.
The Mechanisms of OS

In this section, we introduce the results of our SLR that relate to the third research question: What antecedents, mediators, moderators, and outcomes determine OS? Figure 5 highlights our comprehensive answer to this question. The antecedent theme refers to the action that leads to the outcome behaviors. The mediator theme refers to the conditions that might occur before the outcome or might not. The moderator theme refers to the factors that may lead to strengthen or weaken the relationship between the antecedents and the outcomes or it might reverse the relationship. The outcome theme refers to the resulted behaviors or attitudes because of the preceded antecedents. We also have two categories under those themes: (1) organizational factors that include any variables related to the organization and the job and (2) individual factors related to individuals’ self-perceptions.

Antecedents of OS

The discussion here will focus on factors that provoke OS. Our SLR led us to find two categories under the antecedents of OS. Those two categories are organizational and individual factors. According to Nicholson (1984), not only organizational factors can affect the OS outcomes, but also the job and individual factors can play the same role. That is exactly what we found in our review. A variety of factors were used as antecedents, and they are a mix of organizational and individual factors.

Of the organizational factors, most are related to the supervisors’ and co-workers’ behaviors, besides the work nature and the characteristics and requirements of the job. On the other hand, the individual factors are related to the employee’s perception of self, work, colleagues, and organization. It also includes the employee’s personality, behaviors, and attitudes.

Mediators of OS

As seen in Figure 5, the mediators also have organizational and individual factors, but it is also clear that several individual factors are used as mediators compared with the organizational factors. That might lead us to conclude that the individual factors may facilitate the OS more than...
the organizational factors. One reason for this focus of facilitating OS through the mediation of individual factors is that the organizational factors are associated with costs that have already occurred due to the socialization activities. Therefore, encouraging individual initiatives is better for organizations, leading to decreased costs in this stage. According to Campbell (2000), personal initiatives are a consequence of highly involved and committed employees, resulting in expanding the employee role and increasing their feeling of being responsible. That is part of the goals of OS, which organizations aim to achieve with their employees. Furthermore, most of the mediating variables are called proximal outcomes of socialization, which means they are the immediate consequences of socialization, such as role clarity (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003).

Moderators of OS

Again, the number of individual factors used as moderators is more than the organizational factors. The organizational factor was the bureaucratic orientation, which is characteristic of the organization’s culture, and the extent to which the employees accept this culture. The individual factors are related to personal attitudes and behaviors.

Outcomes of OS

Outcomes have been tested fundamentally in terms of either increasing employees’ desirable attitudes and behaviors such as organizational commitment or decreasing their undesirable attitudes and behaviors such as work withdrawal.

Previous research called those attitudes and behaviors distal socialization outcomes (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003) or socialization outcomes adjustments (Ashforth et al., 1998). By distal outcomes, researchers mean the long-term consequences such as job satisfaction (e.g., Wesson & Gogus, 2005) and turnover (e.g., Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). Likewise, by the adjustment outcomes, researchers mean the acquired knowledge regarding task and being socially accepted (Fisher, 1986).
Theories On Which OS are Based

Our review found that OS has been associated with different theories, such as uncertainty management theory (Berger, 1979; Miller & Jabin, 1991), social network perspective (Ibarra, 1993; Lincoln & Miller, 1979), belongingness theory (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), the theory of planned behaviors (Ajzen, 1991), socialization theory (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977), affective events theory (Weiss & Davis, 1996), broaden and build theory (Fredrickson, 2001), self-determination theory (Gagné & Deci, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2000), creativity theory (Amabile et al., 1997), regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1996), emotion as feedback system theory (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), job rotation (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), Social identity theory (Hogg & Terry, 2000), conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), job demands-resources model (Demerouti et al., 2001), field theory (Lewin, 1951), turnover theory (Mitchell et al., 2001), symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969), expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), and the theory of work role transitions (Nicholson, 1984).

Future Directions

Reviewing a significant number of articles to reach an evidence-informed conclusion is the aim of our study. In this section, we discuss the future directions of OS research concerning the used methods, the research contexts, and the used variables. In terms of the used methods, most OS research is quantitative in nature. That does not mean that the domain of OS has no studies that use qualitative nature. However, it means that the qualitative research is limited, increasing the need for more qualitative research or even mixed-methods research. In addition, many quantitative studies use the longitudinal approach in studying OS (e.g., Adkins, 1995; Fu et al., 2017), which gives the study more accurate and robust results. On the other hand, we recommend using this approach qualitatively, which will contribute to the richness and development of the OS domain. Another important part of research in OS is to consider measures development. As organizations operate in highly-changed environments, they must respond to these changes by implementing the most appropriate methods that can lead them to be successful. One of these methods, without doubt, is the OS. Therefore, the OS requirements will be changed due to other internal or external environment changes, which will increase the need for new and convenient measures of OS. Finally, and most importantly, in order to achieve knowledge accumulation, every study should connect their findings with previous studies, providing the basis for future research to build their studies on and fill any recognized gaps. Furthermore, there is a constant need to conduct systematic reviews and meta-analysis studies in the OS domain, which will contribute to enhancing the quality of future studies.

Figure 5. Mechanisms of OS
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In terms of the research contexts, there is a need to conduct studies that highlight the difference between organizational characteristics, for example, industry type, size, and used technologies, and the appropriate OS strategies based on the specific organization. This will not only benefit future research in terms of building and connecting their studies based on these studies but will also benefit practitioners in facilitating their planned OS and lowering the associated costs. Moreover, it is noteworthy to conduct studies that focus on comparisons between organizations with their different characteristics and their strategies of OS. Another important stream of research worth conducting is comparing countries regarding their OS strategies and the outcomes of these strategies, highlighting the cultural differences that consider a critical issue in the current nature of the international workplace.

In terms of the used variables, most of the previous research focused on individual, organizational or job-related factors that might impact OS, while little attention has been paid to the managerial level variables. As shown in Figure 5, some antecedents are related to supervisors, but most of them are the explicit impact of supervisors in OS. At the same time, more attention needs to be paid to the implicit impact of supervisors on OS. According to Greenwald et al. (2009), implicit attitudes proved to influence different behaviors and judgments. Therefore, studying OS should include those implicit variables because the nature of organizations and employees’ interactions is highly sensitive, making the impact of implicit variables higher than the explicit variables (Greenwald et al., 2009).

Additionally, most of the variables are either individual or organizational variables; future studies should consider the external variables such as the Covid-19 pandemic, technology, and family support. Likewise, considering pandemics such as Covid-19 will shift the researcher’s attention to important subjects that need to be discussed. For example, the socialization of employees within this pandemic and the socialization of the virtual employees who remotely work. Research on these subjects is currently limited, and they are either conceptional (e.g., Saks & Gruman, 2021) or qualitative (e.g., Yarberry & Sims, 2021; Woodrow & Guest, 2020). Therefore, more research needs to be conducted using different research methods. Furthermore, it is also important to uncover the dark side of OS and highlight the influence of OS not only on the desired outcomes but also the undesirable outcomes such as workplace ostracism and workplace deviance. Another benefit to research is the richness of OS measures by comparing them with each other (e.g., Taormina, 2004). That will provide future researchers with a great insight into these measures and the appropriateness of their usage because the selection of the appropriate measure to conduct a study is a critical situation that needs careful consideration for different aspects because the dimensions of these measures, even though their general similarity, have a great difference in their purposes.

Appendix A: The Articles Included in the Literature Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Article Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dufour et al. (2021)</td>
<td>(How) Will I Socialize You? The Impact of Supervisor Initial Evaluations and Subsequent Support on the Socialization of Temporary Newcomers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peltokorpi et al. (2021)</td>
<td>The interactive effects of socialization tactics and work locus of control on newcomer work adjustment, job embeddedness, and voluntary turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan et al. (2020)</td>
<td>Making the right friends: A social network perspective on newcomer socialization in teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ellis et al. (2017) Newcomer Adjustment: Examining the Role of Managers’ Perception of Newcomer Proactive Behavior During Organizational Socialization

Nifadkar and Bauer (2016) Breach of Belongingness: Newcomer Relationship Conflict, Information, and Task-Related Outcomes During Organizational Socialization

Beenen and Pichler (2014) Do I Really Want To Work Here? Testing A Model Of Job Pursuit For Mba Interns

Kammeyer-Mueller et al. (2013) Support, Undermining, And Newcomer Socialization: Fitting In During The First 90 Days

Ke et al. (2012) Inducing Intrinsic Motivation to Explore the Enterprise System: The Supremacy of Organizational Levers


Sluss and Thompson (2012) Socializing the newcomer: The mediating role of leader-member exchange


Thomas and Lankau (2009) Preventing Burnout: The Effects Of Lmx And Mentoring On Socialization, Role Stress, And Burnout

Vitell and Singhapakdi (2008) The role of ethics institutionalization in influencing organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and esprit de corps

Allen (2006) Do organizational socialization tactics influence newcomer embeddedness and turnover?


Wesson and Gogus (2005) Shaking hands with a computer: An examination of two methods of organizational newcomer orientation

Kim et al. (2005) Socialization tactics, employee proactivity, and person-organization fit

Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg (2003) Unwrapping the organizational entry process: Disentangling multiple antecedents and their pathways to adjustment

Morrison (2002) Newcomers' relationships: The role of social network ties during socialization

Lance et al. (2000) Latent growth models of individual change: The case of newcomer adjustment

Ashforth et al. (1998) Socialization and newcomer adjustment: The role of organizational context

Ashforth and Saks (1996) Socialization tactics: Longitudinal effects on newcomer adjustment

Black and Ashford (1995) Fitting In Or Making Jobs Fit - Factors Affecting Mode Of Adjustment For New Hires

Chao et al. (1994) Organizational Socialization - Its Content And Consequences
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