



# Journal of Applied Sciences

ISSN 1812-5654

**science**  
alert

**ANSI***net*  
an open access publisher  
<http://ansinet.com>

## Survey Mediation Role of Perceived Insider Position and the Controlling Role of Supervisors' Traditionality

Fakhraddin Maroofi

Department of Business Administration, University of Kurdistan, Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran

---

**Abstract:** The present study recognize the dimensions of active socialization behavior among Iranian employees and develops a model investigating the intermediating effects of perceived insider position and the controlling effects of supervisors' traditionality on the relationships between active socialization behavior and outsiders' socialization effects. Results from 560 outsiders supervisor supported the hypotheses that active socialization behavior was positively related with task performance and social integration through perceived insider position. In addition, supervisors' traditionality significantly mitigates the effects of outsiders' active socialization behavior on their perceived insider position, task performance and social integration. Specifically, the effects of active socialization behavior on outsiders' effects become weaker as supervisors' traditionality increases. These results suggest that supervisors' traditionality can be a potential constraint for active Iranian outsiders from gaining insider position and appropriate socialization effects.

**Key words:** Active socialization behavior, traditionality, perceived insider position

---

### INTRODUCTION

Outsiders face to an uncertainty environment during the organization entry period (Miller and Jablin, 1991). To reduce this uncertainty, outsiders may commit in active socialization behavior such as seeking information about organizational policies and creating relationships with officeholders (Bauer and Green, 1998; Wanberg and Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000). To extant management literature, active socialization behavior has been related with good effects for both outsiders and organizations, such as job satisfaction, organizational loyalty and job performance (Ashforth *et al.*, 2007; Wanberg and Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000). Therefore, at least several important questions are not discussed. The first important issue that activity research needs to examine is distinguishing the dimensions of active socialization behavior outside Western societies. Because of differences in cultural values, cross-cultural researchers have found that some working behaviors are similar across countries whereas others are different across countries. For example, Sanoubar and Moghadam (2013) found that only five dimensions of Iranian organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) are similar to the major OCB dimensions in Western literature and at least one dimension is unique to Iran. Likewise, the dimensionality of active socialization behavior can be different in one country and certain behaviors not considered active in one national culture may be regarded as active. Thus, one goal of this research was to recognize the

dimensions of active socialization behavior in Iran. Second, the existing literature has paid little attention to investigating the consequences of active socialization behavior outside the U.S. Even though factors of active socialization behavior are effective in one national culture, they may lead to different effects in another country. Therefore, how active socialization behavior affects employee influence in other nations is important in making Western-developed management theories appropriate to managing nationally different work forces more effectively (Tsui, 2004). Thus, this investigate directed to examine the effects of active socialization behavior among Iranian employees. Due to the frequently use of socialization effects for outsiders we focused on task performance and social integration effects (Bauer *et al.*, 2007). Third, few research has focused on the mechanisms through active socialization behavior uses its influence. Investigating how active socialization behavior transforms into socialization effects in the development of the activity literature which has showed the linkage between active socialization behavior and socialization effects (Fang *et al.*, 2011). We suggest that perceived insider position is a key to realizing the linkage between active socialization behavior and socialization effects. Bauer and Erdogan (2011), state that socialization "is a process which new employees move from being organizational outsiders to becoming organizational insiders". When outsiders actively commit in active socialization behavior, they feel like insiders (Masterson and Stamper, 2003). The feel of being an

insider in turn the outsiders increases and can contribute to the organization and further mix with others (Stamper and Masterson, 2002). In addition, investigating perceived insider position as one of the mechanisms linking active socialization behaviors to task performance and social integration is important in the context of Iranian society. Finally, although past research has shown significant positive relationships between active socialization behavior and employee effects, the size of the effects has been heterogeneous, suggesting that the relationships may not be uniform across different conditions (Bateman and Crant, 1993; Erdogan and Bauer, 2005; Jounnaqi *et al.*, 2010). Saks *et al.* (2011) have argued that “the success of outsiders” active behavior depends on the behavior itself and on the responses to others”. Therefore, we developed these arguments in this research, directing to the suggestion that supervisors’ traditionality, high rating of hierarchical orientations in human relationships and an emphasis on submission to authority (Farh *et al.*, 1997), has an effect on the effects of active socialization behavior on outsiders effects. According to Morrison *et al.* (2004) finding, estimating whether any culture-related variable moderates the relationships between active socialization behavior and employee effects in Iran. To summarize, distinguishing the dimensions of active socialization behavior in a different cultural context as well as investigating the basic mechanism and the boundary conditions for the effects of active socialization behavior on outsiders effects are important. Using Iranian employees, we recognized the dimensions of active socialization behavior and tested the intermediating effect of perceived insider position and the controlling effects of supervisors’ traditionality on the relationships between active socialization behavior and outsiders effects.

## **THEORY DEVELOPMENT AND HYPOTHESES**

### **Active socialization behavior in the Iranian context:**

According to Ashford and Black (1996) finding and using a different samples recognized a variety of active socialization behaviors that outsiders may commit in as part of their attempts to fit into a new job and organization: Sense making, relationship creating and job-change negotiation. Ashford and Black (1996) also recognized positive framework as a dimension of activity but it is likely to be a cognitive process rather than a kind of behavior. These dimensions are widely accepted in Western literature (Ashforth *et al.*, 2007; Saks *et al.*, 2011). However, the dimensions of active socialization behavior in Iran may be different from those recognized in North American studies for several reasons. As

Ashford and Black (1996) measure some dimensions may be locally unique views of active socialization behavior in Western societies and thus might not be acceptable to Iranian employees. Although power distance varies from small to moderate in the Western societies, power distance in Iranian society is larger than that in most of Western societies (Hofstede, 2001). Individuals in large power-distance societies greatly accept and expect power differences between themselves and their superiors (Hofstede, 2001). As a result, individual differences within the country exist (Peterson and Wood, 2008), Iranian subordinates who realize to value power distance through cultural socialization tend to feel a large emotional distance between themselves and their supervisors and hence hesitate to interact with their supervisors (Morrison *et al.*, 2004). Therefore job-change negotiation which is recognized by Ashford and Black (1996) may not be regarded as active socialization behavior in Iran. In addition, there may be some locally unique dimensions of active socialization behavior in Iran that have not been recognized in the Western literature. For example, in a collective culture such as Iran, “in-group” membership plays an important role in workplace interpersonal relationships (Hofstede, 2001). Colleague may not be colleagues defined by work roles but may be considered as friends (Farh *et al.*, 2004). As a result, gaining in-group membership can be an important task for most Iranian outsiders. Iranian outsiders may commit in relationship creating behavior at a personal level even outside work (e.g., spending leisure time with colleague after work) to gain in-group membership. Therefore, activities related to gaining in-group membership can be considered as active socialization behavior among Iranian employees. In short, cultural values and power distance, may influence an outsiders behaviors and can be recognized as active among Iranian employees. Thus, before testing the hypothesized model, we investigated the following research question.

**Research question:** What types of outsiders behaviors are recognized as active socialization behavior among Iranian employees.

Active socialization behavior and socialization consequences active socialization behavior allows outsiders to access the information needed directly and to interact frequently with other organizational members, directing to positive socialization effects. In particular, outsiders active socialization behavior can positively influence task performance. For example, when outsiders get information about their work setting and feedback on their performance and activities, they can obtain job skills and knowledge (Ashforth *et al.*, 2007). In

addition, when outsiders create good relationships with office holders, they are more likely to create a situational personality and to create friendships that can help them get guidance and role behavior instruction related to core job responsibilities (Nelson and Quick, 1991; Reichers, 1987). Outsiders active socialization behavior can positively influence their social integration as well. Social integration refers to the outsiders experience cooperative social interaction with their group members, satisfaction with other group members and attraction to the group (O'Reilly *et al.*, 1989). Outsiders actively seeking information about their work environments and feedback on their activities allow colleagues to form a positive impression of them (Ashford and Northcraft, 1992; Ashford and Tsui, 1991). In turn this positive impression can help outsiders experience cooperative social interaction with colleagues (Goffman, 1959). Additionally, creating relationships with others allows outsiders to interact with their colleague, thereby helping them obtain and practice suitable interpersonal skills to cooperate with others (Wanberg and Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000). The preceding logic behind the effects of active socialization behavior on its effects may be confirmed in Iran. For example, because of their high tolerance for ambiguity, Iranian organizations may not have clear rules, laws, or regulations that define employees' roles and working procedures (Hofstede, 2001). Thus, outsiders' active socialization behavior along the learning path toward their tasks and integrating with others is a very important step. Altogether, outsiders' active socialization behavior is positively related to task performance and social integration among new Iranian employees. Therefore, we assume that perceived insider position mediates the influence of active socialization behavior on socialization effects. As Stamper and Masterson (2002) suggested, outsiders to the organization, employees' feelings regarding their relationship with their employer are extremely flexible and may be affected by such socialization factors as active tactics. By getting more information, outsiders understand clearly the boundaries of differentiate organizational insiders from outsiders, increasing their perceived insider position (Masterson and Stamper, 2003). Moreover, actively engaging in relationship creating allows outsiders to interact frequently with other organizational members which creates a situational identity that can also help outsiders clarify suitable role expectations (Nelson and Quick, 1991), directing to a sense of comprehensiveness to their organizations (Lapalme *et al.*, 2009). Higher perceived insider position can in turn lead to better task performance and social integration because of the




Fig. 1: Hypothesized model (Kim *et al.*, 2009)

motivational implications of organizational membership (Sanoubar and Moghadam, 2013). According to Jounaqi *et al.* (2010) organization insiders members, employees are more likely to accept their responsibilities as employees of an organization and as members of a social network at work. The acceptance of these responsibilities as organizational insiders motivates new employees to better accomplish allocated tasks and integrate with other organizational members. Ersoy *et al.* (2011) found that perceived insider position has a positive linkage with task performance. Therefore, we suggest the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1:** Active socialization behavior is positively related to (a) Task performance and (b) Social integration and these relationships are partially mediated by perceived insider position (Fig. 1).

**Controlling role of supervisors' traditionality:** An emphasis on hierarchical differences, supervisors with high traditionality keeps information secret, expect followers to be told what to do and avoid interacting with subordinates in an open manner (Spreitzer *et al.*, 2005). On the other hand, individuals with low traditionality are directed toward self-reliance and openness (Hui *et al.*, 2004). Supervisors' traditionality is expected to influence the effects of active socialization behavior on outsiders' perceived insider position. Supervisors with low traditionality who are willing to interact with subordinates in an open manner (Spreitzer *et al.*, 2005) can regard outsiders' active socialization behavior as positive. Thus, when outsiders actively seek information about their jobs, supervisors with low traditionality are disclose a wide range of information that can help outsiders clarify their role expectations. According to their roles, outsiders can easily adopt their organizations, directing to a sense of comprehensiveness to their organizations (Stamper and

Masterson, 2002). According to social learning theory (Bandura, 1997), individuals copy a particular behavior that captures their attention through interaction with others. Such cases happen in Iran and as a result, people's behaviors are likely to be affected by others around them. Therefore, the supervisor is often perceived as a figure within a workgroup, employees are to learn about how to treat others from observation and interaction with their supervisors (Shamir *et al.*, 1993). Therefore, other colleagues may respond positively to active socialization behavior when working with supervisors with low traditionalism. The feeling of being responded to by other colleagues as well as supervisors has a positive effect on outsiders' feelings about how included they are in the organizations (Lapalme *et al.*, 2009). On the other hand, supervisors with high traditionalism who want to sustain their differential position prefer outsiders who strictly follow their guidance to those who take self-initiated actions without acquiring their confirmation (Spreitzer *et al.*, 2005). Additionally, supervisors with high traditionalism emphasize top-down communication and hesitate to interact with subordinates in an open manner (Sanoubar and Moghadam, 2013), so, active outsiders may have difficulty in acquiring positive support from them. The less positive support from their supervisors with high traditionalism makes the active outsiders perceive less comprehensiveness (Lapalme *et al.*, 2009), because employees evaluate their position in a group on the basis of how authority figures treat them (Tyler and Lind, 1992). To summarize, supervisors with high traditionalism create a less supportive environment for active outsiders and make them feel less included. Thus, we suggest the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 2:** Supervisors' traditionalism influences the relationship between active socialization behavior and perceived insider position such that active socialization behaviors are more positively related to perceived insider position when supervisors' traditionalism is high than when it is low.

As mentioned before, a first-stage such that the mediating effects of perceived insider position on the relationships between active socialization behavior and socialization effects are moderated by supervisors' traditionalism. Formally, we predict the following.

**Hypothesis 3a:** The indirect relationship between task performance and active socialization behavior via perceived insider position is moderated by supervisors' traditionalism.

**Hypothesis 3b:** The indirect relationship between social integration and active socialization behavior via perceived insider position is moderated by supervisors' traditionalism.

We managed two studies to examine which was discussed earlier. Investigate 1 aims to recognize the dimensions of active socialization behavior among Iranian employees. Investigate 2 examines the mediating effects of perceived insider position and the moderating effects of supervisors' traditionalism on active socialization behavior among Iranian employees.

**Investigate 1:** We managed a multiphase investigate to recognize and verify the dimensions of active socialization behavior among Iranian new employees. In Phase 1, we created a combined active socialization behavior from a group of employees who we asked to provide examples of various forms of active socialization behavior. In Phase 2, a focus group consisting of experts in management research reviewed and estimated this combined. In Phase 3, we purified the scale for the locally unique dimension of Iranian active socialization behavior.

**Phase 1:** We obtained 182 part-time graduate students at two universities in Iran. All of the respondents had full-time jobs and 65% were women. They had an average age of 25.2 years (SD = 3.8) and had worked for an average of four years (SD = 3.1). We provided these respondents with the following description: "When outsiders join a company, they face uncertainty, frustration, anxiety and stress. In such circumstances, people may take certain independently started and future-oriented actions directed to effect themselves and/or their environment". We then asked them to provide specific examples of these behaviors. This process resulted in the documentation of 558 behaviors.

**Phase 2:** We asked eight experts to view and categorize the 558 items using initial and confirmatory processes (Anderson and Wilson, 1997; Farh *et al.*, 2004). First, each item was categorized and then all items were gathered together to discuss the differences. All items were classified on the basis of three criteria: (i) Whether the item had clear meaning in the Iranian language; (ii) Whether the item referred to employee behavior and (iii) Whether the item was consistent with the meaning of the allocated variable name and did not overlap with other variable names. We considered 88 items (15.8%) were not usable" and thus we eliminated them, resulting in 470 usable items. Therefore, after discussion we agreed on a six-category system that

could classify all 470 usable items into mutually exclusive categories. These categories were (1) Information seeking, (2) Feedback seeking, (3) General socializing, (4) Networking, (5) Relationship creating with a supervisor and (6) Establishing an informal interpersonal relationship characterized by an unlimited exchange of favors between two individuals (Alston, 1989). Thus, were cognized six dimensions of active socialization behavior-five dimensions commonly used in the Western literature and one dimension locally unique to Iran (i.e., establishing an informal interpersonal relationship characterized by an unlimited exchange of favors between two individuals (Alston, 1989). Therefore, regarding to the five common dimensions which were similar to the Ashford and Black (1996) items, we adopt to test the research hypotheses and maintain consistency across studies, allowing for comparison with Western literature.

For the developing dimension of No. 6 (establishing an informal interpersonal relationship characterized by an unlimited exchange of favors between two individuals (Alston, 1989), we extracted six items from the item combine: "Developed friendship with colleagues who may be beneficial to you in the future"; "Maintained an intimate relationship with colleagues who may help you in the future"; "Bought meals or gave some presents to colleagues who may benefit you in the future"; "Joined an informal group in the company whose members may be helpful to you"; "Spent time with colleagues who may be beneficial to you during holidays or after office hours"; and "Shared your personal thoughts, problems, needs and feelings with colleagues who may help you in the future".

### Phase 3

**Instrument refinement:** Accordingly, we tested the reliability and validity of these six items by using another sample. We recruited a total of 262 recent university graduates employed in a different organizations. The average age of these participants was 25.7 years (SD = 1.5) and their average years of work experience were 2.2 (SD = 1.2). Of the respondents, 40% were female. We asked the respondents to indicate which out of the six items match the general practices developing dimension of No. 6 on a 5-point Likert-type scale (from 1 = to no extent to 5 = to a great extent). The results showed good reliability ( $\alpha = 0.87$ ) and the exploratory factor analysis using component analysis and varimax rotation showed that the six items were loaded in a single component. As a result, we measured all the six items.

**Investigate 2:** Investigate 2 examines how perceived insider position mediates the effects of active socialization

behavior on socialization effects and how supervisors' traditionality moderates these relationships.

**Organizational context:** We managed the present investigation in three manufacturing organizations in west of Iran: A private enterprise and a plastic equipment sector and another enterprise in the telecommunications sector. All these organizations use a sophisticated technology. First author acquired the participation of these three organizations on the basis of her personal network and contacted the top management in each organization. All agreed to participate in the investigation under the condition that they receive copies of the results. Their main tasks include materials handling, machine operation and equipment maintenance.

**Sample and procedures:** To follow Morrison *et al.* (2004) and Wanberg and Kammeyer-Mueller (2000). Research on active socialization behavior which recruited period of employees was less than one year. We collected the data from 576 Iranian subordinates and 102 Iranian supervisors working in three organizations (91% response rate, ranging from 84 to 95% by organization). Among the questionnaires sixteen were incomplete and we eliminate that, therefore, leaving 560 sets for further analyses. At each organization, we asked the human resources manager to distribute the questionnaires among the employees who had worked in the organization for less than one year. The respondents directly returned completed questionnaires to the human resource manager of each organization. The supervisors reported their own level of traditionality as well as their subordinates' task performance and social integration. Outsiders reported their active socialization behavior and perceived insider position.

### Measures

**Active socialization behavior:** To measure active socialization behavior, we adopted (Ashford and Black, 1996) four dimensions of activity: Information seeking and general socializing, networking and relationship creating with boss. We also added the six-item scale developed in investigation 1 to estimate Iranian outsiders' developing dimension of No. 6 (establishing an informal interpersonal relationship characterized by an unlimited exchange of favors between two individuals (Alston, 1989). We asked the outsiders since joined the company to show the extent to which they had performed the various active socialization behavior (from 1 = no extent, 5 = great extent). As the correlations among the sub-dimensions of active socialization behavior ranged from 0.55 and 0.72, we ran a

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with the five dimensions as lower level hidden variables by using AMOS 8.0 (Arbuckle, 2005). The second order CFA results showed that dimensions of active socialization behavior tap into the same basic construct ( $\chi^2 = 636.75$ ,  $df = 261$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ; RMSEA = 0.06; CFI = 0.92; TLI = 0.91). The results suggest that active socialization behavior can be tested at either the dimensional level or the construct level. According to our hypotheses following previous research (Ashforth *et al.*, 2007) we combined all dimensions to form a composite.

**Perceived insider position:** We used a 5-item scale validated by Stamper and Masterson (2002), to measure Perceived insider position. We asked them to rate how important each value was for them as a guiding principle in their lives (from 1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree).

**Task performance:** We used a 5-item scale validated by Aryee *et al.* (2004), to measure Task performance. We asked them to rate how important each value was for them as a guiding principle in their lives (from 1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree).

**Social integration:** We used (Kim *et al.*, 2009) 2-item scale to measure outsiders' social integration. We asked supervisors to evaluate their subordinates on a 5-point Likert-type scale (from 1 = needs much improvement to 5 = excellent).

**Supervisors' traditionality:** We used a 4-item scale validated by Farh *et al.* (1997) to measure supervisors' traditionality. We asked supervisors to estimate their own levels of traditionality. Specifically, we asked them to rate how important each value was for them as a guiding principle in their lives (from 1 = very unimportant to 5 = very important).

**Control variables:** The analyses controlled for outsiders' genders, matching between supervisor and subordinate because these could explain for variances in performance ratings (Turban and Jones, 1988). We controlled outsiders' age and education levels because these could reflect life experiences related to the socialization process (Allen, 2006; Bauer and Green, 1998). We also controlled their organizational period because this could influence socialization effects (Klein *et al.*, 2006).

**Analyses:** According to the multilevel data with subordinates placed within supervisors, we managed Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) analyses by using

the software HLM 6.09 (Raudenbush *et al.*, 2004) to test the controlling effects of supervisors' traditionality on the relationship between active socialization behavior and perceived insider position. We analyzed supervisors' traditionality at the supervisor level of analysis (level 2) and active socialization behavior and perceived insider position at the individual level of analysis (level 1). In addition, we applied a coefficients test (MacKinnon *et al.*, 2002) and used the bootstrap sampling method (bootstrap sample size = 5000) (MacKinnon *et al.*, 2004). Finally, we applied Edwards and Lambert (2007) procedure to test how supervisors' traditionality moderates the indirect relationships that active socialization behavior has with task performance and social integration via perceived insider position.

## RESULTS

We managed CFAs to estimate the discriminant validity of the measures. According to items in our model, we arrange three items for supervisors' traditionality, task performance and perceived insider position by averaging the highest and lowest loadings sequentially (Anonymous, 2011; Jounaqa *et al.*, 2010). Therefore, this reduce the number of parameters for accurate estimation. As a good model requires the values of CFI and TLI to be greater than 0.90 (Hu and Bentler, 1999). The value of RMSEA has to be lower than 0.07 (Browne and Cudeck, 1993). The CFA results showed that the supposed four factor measurement model fits the data comparatively well ( $\chi^2 = 340.02$ ,  $df = 131$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ; RMSEA = 0.07; CFI = 0.92; TLI = 0.93) and better than a four factor model combining perceived insider position and social integration ( $\chi^2 = 450.21$ ,  $df = 135$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ; RMSEA = 0.08; CFI = 0.90; TLI = 0.91), a two factor model combining constructs reported by outsiders and those reported by their supervisors, respectively ( $\chi^2 = 1621.332$ ,  $df = 144$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ; RMSEA = 0.19; CFI = 0.66; TLI = 0.61) and the one-factor model ( $\chi^2 = 2122.18$ ,  $df = 1141$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ; RMSEA = 0.26; CFI = 0.51; TLI = 0.43), supporting the discriminant validity for the measured variables. We report the descriptive statistics, reliability estimates and correlations for all measures in Table 1. All reliability estimates go beyond 0.72. As expected, active socialization behavior was significantly correlated with perceived insider position, task performance and social integration (i.e.,  $r = 0.40$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ;  $r = 0.39$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ;  $r = 0.55$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , respectively), suggesting that outsiders who committed in active socialization behavior were perform better in their jobs and social relationships as well as feel more included. Hypothesis 1 suggested that the effects of active socialization behavior on (1) Task

**Table 1: Means, correlations and coefficients for study variables**

Variables	Means	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Gender	0.55											
Gender match	0.26	0.38**										
Age	26.48	0.18*										
Education	0.72	0.03	-0.09									
Education	0.18	0.09	0.11	0.04**								
Period	8.60	0.16**	-0.09	0.29**	0.16*							
Organization1	0.28	-0.59**	0.11	-0.38**	0.33**	-0.18*						
Organization2	0.09	0.08	0.08	-0.06**	-0.33**	0.58**	-0.06					
Organization3	0.45	0.54**	0.17*	0.29**	0.23**	0.14	0.48**	-0.46**				
Active socialization behavior	6.49	-0.04**	0.00	0.09	-0.09	0.01	-0.09	-0.11	0.01			
Supervisors' traditionality	6.07	-0.27**	0.16*	-0.17*	0.13	0.011	0.09	0.36**	0.15*	-0.06		
Perceived insider position	6.69	0.06	0.03	0.06	0.16*	0.16*	0.15*	28.00**	0.15*	0.39**	0.36**	
Task performance	6.27	0.07	0.01	0.08	0.07	0.14*	0.16*	-0.03	0.01	0.18**	0.36**	
Social integration	6.68	0.00	-0.10	0.09	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.16*	0.55**	-0.19**

Employee n = 560; supervisor n = 102 \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05 (two-tailed)

**Table 2: Results of HLM analyses for perceived insider position**

Variables	Perceived insider position		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Intercept	2.46**	3.30*	4.66*
Gender	-20.17	-30.19	-0.16
Gender match	0.08	0.24	0.19
Age	0.03	0.01	0.00
Education 1	-0.08	-0.09	-0.25
Education 2	-0.33	-0.33	-0.45
Period	-0.06	-0.04	-0.04
Organization 1	3.26*	3.52*	266.00*
Organization 2	2.05*	2.34*	3.36*
Organization 3	264.00*	2.78*	2.86*
Active socialization behavior	0.50*	0.50*	0.47*
Supervisors' traditionality		-0.24*	-0.22*
Active socialization behavior X Supervisors' traditionality			-0.13*
ΔR <sup>2</sup> within <sup>a</sup>	35.23	6.23	5.81
ΔR <sup>2</sup> between	50.26	80.23	97.73
Deviance	842.27	843.51	812.68

<sup>a</sup>These are R-square differences compared with those of the previous model. Model 1 was compared with the null model. \*p<0.01

**Table 3: Effects of active socialization behavior and perceived insider positions on task performance and social integration**

Variables	Task performance			Social integration		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Intercept	1.15*	0.96	0.41	1.64**	1.12**	1.13*
Gender	-0.08	0.06	0.06	-0.29	-0.22	-0.21
Gender match	-0.08	-0.09	-0.08	-0.39	-0.44**	-0.40**
Age	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Education 1	0.23	0.23	0.22	-0.13	-0.08	-0.16
Education 2	0.53	0.79*	0.74*	-0.16	0.14	-0.03
Period	0.03	0.04	0.04	-0.05	-0.06	-0.06
Organization 1	0.52	-0.42	-0.19	0.71*	-0.32	0.13
Organization 2	0.03	-1.33**	-1.03*	0.85**	-0.65*	-0.16
Organization 3	0.59*	-0.49*	-0.27	0.97**	-0.17	0.25
Active socialization behavior	0.47**	0.23**	0.63**	0.39**		
Perceived insider position		0.59**	0.49**	0.67**	0.48**	

\*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05

performance and (2) Socialintegration would be mediated by perceived insider position. The result of Model 1 in Table 2 shows that active socialization behavior was significantly related to perceived insider position ( $\gamma = 0.55$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Moreover, perceived insider position was significantly related to task performance and social integration ( $\gamma = 0.58$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ;  $\gamma = 0.65$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , respectively,

Model 2 in Table 3). The bootstrapping test confirmed that the indirect effects of active socialization behavior on task performance and social integration via perceived insider position were significant. These results support Hypothesis 1. As well as, organization variables were positively related with perceived insider position (Table 2) and social integration (Model 1 in Table 3).






Fig. 2: Simple slopes of active socialization behavior on perceived insider position at levels of supervisors' traditionality




Fig. 3: Indirect effects of active socialization behavior on socialization outcomes via perceived insider position at levels of supervisors' traditionality

These results suggest that outsiders from state-owned enterprises perceived a higher level of insider position and obtained a higher social integration than outsiders from private enterprises. It is possible that in Iran, where people prefer state-owned enterprises to private enterprises because of higher salaries and better paths, outsiders have more information about these two types of organizations before they enter and thus better adjust to these organizations after they enter (Riordan *et al.*, 2001). When the relationship becomes weaker as supervisors' traditionality increases, supervisors' traditionality moderates the relationship between active socialization behavior and perceived insider position (Hypothesis 2). The results of Model 3 in Table 2 show that the interaction condition between active socialization behavior and supervisors' traditionality significantly affected perceived insider position ( $y = -0.12, p < 0.01$ ). When supervisors' traditionality was low (simple slope = 0.68,  $p < 0.01$ ), the tests of simple slopes indicated that the positive relationship between active socialization behavior and perceived insider position was statistically significant but weaker when supervisors' traditionality was high (simple slope = 0.35,  $p < 0.01$ ) (Fig. 2). Thus, Hypothesis 2 is supported. When the relationships become weaker as supervisors' traditionality increases, the active socialization behavior has with task performance and social integration via perceived insider position, hypotheses 3a and 3b stated the supervisors' traditionality moderates the indirect relationships. The moderated path analytic procedures showed that the path linking active socialization behavior and perceived insider position and then task performance and social integration, varied significantly as a function of supervisor's traditionality (Edwards and Lambert, 2007). When supervisor's traditionality is low (simple slope = 0.50,  $p < 0.01$ ), the simple slope of the indirect effect of active

socialization behavior on task performance via perceived insider position is significant but became weaker when supervisor's traditionality was high (simple slope = 0.38,  $p < 0.01$ ). In addition, when supervisor's traditionality is low (simple slope = 0.68,  $p < 0.01$ ), the simple slope of the indirect effect of active socialization behavior on social integration via perceived insider position is significant but became weaker when supervisor's traditionality was high (simple slope = 0.56,  $p < 0.01$ ). Therefore, these results support the Hypotheses 3a and 3b (Fig. 3). As a supplementary analysis, we tested the significance of developing dimension of No. 6 (establishing an informal interpersonal relationship characterized by an unlimited exchange of favors between two individuals (Alston, 1989), in explaining the variance in socialization effects beyond other dimensions of active socialization behavior. As an additional analysis, we tested the significance of developing dimension of No. 6 in explaining the variance in socialization effects beyond other dimensions of active socialization behavior. Entering developing dimension of No. 6 as a separate step following to the entry of the other dimensions of active socialization behavior and the control variables did not significantly improve R-square for social integration but for task performance ( $\Delta R^2 = 0.04, p < 0.01$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.00$ , respectively).

## DISCUSSION

This research recognizes the dimensions of active socialization behavior among Iranian employees and improves a model investigating the intermediating effects of perceived insider position and the controlling effects of supervisors' traditionality on the relationships between active socialization behavior and outsiders' socialization effects (i.e., task performance and social integration).

These results suggest theoretical implications for active socialization behavior research and as well as suggest several opportunities. One of the result of this investigation are universal and can be generalized across different cultures. But some dimensions are may not be applied to other cultures. On the other hand, we found developing dimension of No. 6 (establishing an informal interpersonal relationship characterized by an unlimited exchange of favors between two individuals (Alston, 1989), as a locally unique activity dimension among Iranian employees. Although developing dimension of No. 6 focus on interpersonal relationships, also targets someone who can be helpful to the focal person, whereas relationship creating targets a broad scope of people (e.g., department members) which is different from Fig. 3. The indirect effects of active socialization behavior on socialization effects via perceived insider position at levels of supervisors' traditionality relationship creating activities usually restricted to the workplace, developing dimension of No. 6 (establishing an informal interpersonal relationship characterized by an unlimited exchange of favors between two individuals; (Alston, 1989), developing includes after-work activities (Sanoubar and Moghadam, 2013; Jounaqui *et al.*, 2010). According to the scarcity of research which active socialization behavior influences socialization effects, it should be confirm the intermediating effects of perceived insider position on the relationships between active socialization behavior and socialization effects. Our results can increase our understanding about how outsiders with high active socialization behavior contribute to their organizations and better perform than those with low active socialization behavior and thus expanding the homological network of active socialization behavior. In addition, supervisors' traditionality significantly mitigates the effects of outsiders active socialization behavior on their perceived insider position, task performance and social integration. Moreover, as supervisors' traditionality increases, the effects of active socialization behavior on outsiders' effects become weaker. These results suggest that supervisors' traditionality can be constraint for active Iranian outsiders from gaining insider position and appropriate socialization effects. These findings extend current activity research (Elanain, 2007; Ersoy *et al.*, 2011) by showing the role of situational factors in the effects of active socialization behavior on outsiders' socialization effects. In addition, the differences in the indirect effects of active socialization behavior on task performance and social integration via perceived insider position across the levels of supervisors' traditionality were minor. The results of the investigation have practical implications for organizations and supervisors.

**Limitations and future research:** The limitations of this research as follow: First, we collected the data in investigation 2 at a single time, raising questions about the direction of causality. Although the predictions were based on the active socialization behavior and perceived insider position affect socialization effects, we cannot eliminate that employees who perform their tasks well or integrate well and to commit in active socialization behavior. Future research need to develop a better and more responsive theory to shed light on how active socialization behavior leads to socialization effects. For example, future research needs to investigate other contextual variables that can improve the effects of active socialization behavior on employee effects. Such research attempt the understanding of the role of traditionality in organizations beyond its effects on employees' reactions toward superiors (Farh *et al.*, 1997, 2004; Hui *et al.*, 2004). It will also be interesting to link or compare traditionality to other measures related to personal values of people in Iran in investigating their roles in the effect of active socialization behavior. Finally, future research may benefit from investigating locally unique dimensions of active socialization behavior in other countries. However, the current investigation research hypotheses include complex moderated mediation relationships between supervisors' traditionality and supervisory or estimated outsiders effects rather than linear relationships; thus, the potential response bias may not be a serious concern. Future research needs to supplement supervisory assessment of employee effects with other methods such as objective data or peer rating.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, D.G., 2006. Do organizational socialization tactics influence newcomer embeddedness and turnover? *J. Manage.*, 32: 237-256.
- Alston, J.P., 1989. Wa, Guanxi and Inhwa: Managerial principles in Japan, China and Korea. *Bus. Horizons*, 32: 26-31.
- Anderson, L. and S. Wilson, 1997. Critical Incident Technique. In: *Applied Measurement methods in Industrial Psychology*, Whetzel, D.L. and G.R. Wheaton (Eds.). Davies-Black Publishing, Palo Alto, CA., pp: 89-111.
- Anonymous, 2011. Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in school: Retesting and changing a tested model in industry. *Q. J. Public Admin.*, 3: 63-80.
- Arbuckle, J.L., 2005. *Amos? 6.0 User's Guide*. Amos Development Corporation, Chicago, USA.

- Aryee, S., Z.X. Chen and P.S. Budhwar, 2004. Exchange fairness and employee performance: An examination of the relationship between organizational politics and procedural justice. *Org. Behav. Human Decis. Processes*, 94: 1-14.
- Ashford, S.J. and A.S. Tsui, 1991. Self-regulation for managerial effectiveness: The role of active feedback seeking. *Acad. Manage. J.*, 34: 251-280.
- Ashford, S.J. and G.B. Northcraft, 1992. Conveying more (or less) than we realize: The role of impression-management in feedback-seeking. *Org. Behav. Human Decis. Processes*, 53: 310-334.
- Ashford, S.J. and J.S. Black, 1996. Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 81: 199-214.
- Ashforth, B.E., D.M. Sluss and A.M. Saks, 2007. Socialization tactics, proactive behavior and newcomer learning: Integrating socialization models. *J. Vocation. Behav.*, 70: 447-462.
- Bandura, A., 1997. *Social Learning Theory*. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Bateman, T.S. and J.M. Crant, 1993. The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *J. Org. Behav.*, 14: 103-118.
- Bauer, T.N. and S.G. Green, 1998. Testing the combined effects of newcomer information seeking and manager behavior on socialization. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 83: 72-83.
- Bauer, T.N., T. Bodner, B. Erdogan, D.M. Truxillo and J.S. Tucker, 2007. Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: a meta-analytic review of antecedents, outcomes and methods. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 92: 707-721.
- Bauer, T.N. and B. Erdogan, 2011. Organizational socialization: The effective onboarding of new employees. In: *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Zedeck, S., (Ed.). Vol. 3, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC., pp: 51-64.
- Browne, M.W. and R. Cudeck, 1993. Alternative Ways of Assessing Model Fit. In: *Testing Structural Equation Models*, Bollen, K.A. and J.S. Long (Eds.). SAGE Publication, Newbury Park, USA., pp: 136-162.
- Edwards, J. R. and L.S. Lambert, 2007. Methods for integrating moderation and mediation: A general analytical framework using moderated path analysis. *Psychol. Methods*, 12: 1-22.
- Elanain, H.A., 2007. Relationship between personality and organizational citizenship behavior: Does personality influence employee citizenship? *Int. Rev. Bus. Res. Pap.*, 3: 31-43.
- Erdogan, B. and T.N. Bauer, 2005. Enhancing career benefits of employee proactive personality: The role of fit with jobs and organizations. *Personnel Psychol.*, 58: 859-891.
- Ersoy, C.N., M.Ph. Born, E. Derous and H.T. Van der Molen, 2011. Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior among blue-and white-collar workers in Turkey. *Int. J. Intercultural Relat.*, 35: 356-367.
- Fang, R., M.K. Duffy and J.D. Shaw, 2011. The organizational socialization process: Review and development of a social capital model. *J. Manage.*, 37: 127-152.
- Farh, J.L., P.C. Earley, S. Lin, 1997. Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Sci. Q.*, 42: 421-444.
- Farh, J.L., C.B. Zhong and D.W. Organ, 2004. Organizational citizenship behavior in the people's republic of china. *Org. Sci.*, 15: 241-253.
- Goffman, E., 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. 1st Edn., Anchor, Penguin, Harmonds worth, UK., ISBN-13: 978-0385094023, Pages: 259.
- Hofstede, G.H., 2001. *Culture's consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. 2nd Edn., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA., ISBN-13: 9780803973244, Pages: 256.
- Hu, L.T. and P.M. Bentler, 1999. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct. Equation Model.*, 6: 1-55.
- Hui, C., C. Lee and D.M. Rousseau, 2004. Employment relationships in China: Do workers relate to the organization or to people. *Org. Sci.*, 15: 232-240.
- Jounnaqi, A.F., G. Reza, A.S. Mehdi and M.Z. Hassan, 2010. A Comprehensive Model for identify factors influence on develop of organizational citizenship behavior (Case study: People in staff of Iranian national oil Firm). *Q. J. Public Admin.*, 3: 55-72.
- Kim, T.Y., D.M. Cable, S.P. Kim and J. Wang, 2009. Emotional competence and work performance: The mediating effect of proactivity and the moderating effect of job autonomy. *J. Org. Behav.*, 90: 983-1000.
- Klein, H.J., J. Fan and K.J. Preacher, 2006. The effects of early socialization experiences on content mastery and outcomes: A mediational approach. *J. Vocation. Behav.*, 68 : 96-115.
- Lapalme, M.E., C.L. Stamper, G. Simard and M. Tremblay, 2009. Bringing the outside in: Can "external" workers experience insider status? *J. Org. Behav.*, 30: 919-940.

- MacKinnon, D.P., C.M. Lockwood, J.M. Hoffman, S.G. West and V. Sheets, 2002. A comparison of methods to test mediation and other intervening variable effects. *Psychol. Methods*, 7: 83-104.
- MacKinnon, D.P., C.M. Lockwood and J. Williams, 2004. Confidence limits for the indirect effect: Distribution of the product and resampling methods. *Multivariate Behav. Res.*, 39: 99-128.
- Masterson, S.S. and C.L. Stamper, 2003. Perceived organizational membership: An aggregate framework representing the employee-organization relationship. *J. Org. Behav.*, 24: 473-490.
- Miller, V.D. and F.M. Jablin, 1991. Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics and a model of the process. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 16: 92-120.
- Morrison, E.W., Y.R. Chen and S.R. Salgado, 2004. Cultural differences in newcomer feedback seeking: A comparison of the United States and Hong Kong. *Applied Psychol. Int. Rev.*, 53: 1-22.
- Nelson, D.L. and J.C. Quick, 1991. Social support and newcomer adjustment in organizations: Attachment theory at work. *J. Org. Behav.*, 12: 542-554.
- O'Reilly, C.A., D.R. Caldwell and W.P. Barnett, 1989. Work group demography, social integration and turnover. *Administrative Sci. Quarterly*, 34: 21-37.
- Peterson, M.F. and R.E. Wood, 2008. Cognitive Structures and Processes in Cross Cultural Management. In: *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Management Research*, Smith, P.B., M.F. Peterson and D.C. Thomas (Eds.). Sage Press, Thousand Oaks, CA., pp: 15-33.
- Raudenbush, S.W., A. Bryk, Y.F. Cheong, R. Congdon and M. du Toit, 2004. *HLM 6: Hierarchical Linear and Nonlinear Modeling*. Scientific Software International, Lincolnwood, IL., USA., ISBN-13: 9780894980541, Pages: 297.
- Reichers, A.E., 1987. An interactionist perspective on newcomer socialization rates. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 12: 278-287.
- Riordan, C.M., E.W. Weatherly, R.J. Vandenberg and R.M. Self, 2001. The effects of pre-entry experiences and socialization tactics on newcomer attitudes and turnover. *J. Manage. Issues*, 13: 159-176.
- Saks, A.M. J.A. Gruman and H. Cooper-Thomas, 2011. The neglected role of proactive behavior and outcomes in newcomer socialization. *J. Vocation. Behav.*, 79: 36-46.
- Sanoubar, N. and S.A. Moghadam, 2013. Investigating the effects of religiosity on organizational citizenship behavior. *J. Public Administr.*, 4: 35-52.
- Shamir, B., R.J. House and M.B. Arthur, 1993. The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory *Organiz. Sci.*, 4: 577-594.
- Spreitzer, G.M., K.H. Perttula and K. Xin, 2005. Traditionality matters: An examination of the effectiveness of transformational leadership in the United States and Taiwan. *J. Org. Behav.*, 26: 205-227.
- Stamper, C.L. and S.S. Masterson, 2002. Insider or outsider? How employee perceptions of insider status affect their work behavior. *J. Org. Behav.*, 23: 875-894.
- Tsui, A.S., 2004. Contributing to global management knowledge: A case for high quality indigenous research. *Asia Pacific J. Manage.*, 21: 491-513.
- Turban, D.A. and A.P. Jones, 1988. Supervisor-subordinate similarity: Types, effects and mechanisms. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 73: 228-234.
- Tyler, T.R. and E.A.Lind, 1992. A Relational Model of Authority in Groups. In: *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Zanna, M.P. (Ed.). Vol. 25, Academic, San Diego, CA., USA., pp: 115-191..
- Wanberg, C.R. and J.D. Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000. Predictors and outcomes of proactivity in the socialization process. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 85: 373-385.