2003

Predictors of networking behavior

Campbell Jung
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Jung, Campbell, "Predictors of networking behavior" (2003). *Master's Theses*. 2446.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.3vyp-ng95>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2446

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

PREDICTORS OF NETWORKING BEHAVIOR

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Psychology Department

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Campbell Jung

August 2003

UMI Number: 1417482

Copyright 2003 by
Jung, Campbell

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1417482

Copyright 2004 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2003

Campbell Jung

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Dr. Nancy Da Silva

Dr. Megumi Hosoda

Dr. Harriet Pila

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

PREDICTORS OF NETWORKING BEHAVIOR

by Campbell Jung

Research indicates that involvement in networking behavior is related to career outcomes such as career advancement and managerial effectiveness. Professionals are finding networking to be advantageous in managing their career. Recent literature found that the personality variables of self-esteem and extraversion are significant predictors of involvement in networking behaviors. The significant relationships of these two personality variables to involvement in networking behaviors suggest that other personality variables may also be related to involvement in networking. This study, using 107 graduate level students working at least part-time, examined the relationship of three personality variables: locus of control, self-efficacy toward networking, and self-monitoring, to involvement in networking behaviors. Results suggested the significance of self-efficacy toward networking as directly relating to networking behavior and indirectly through desire to be successful. The implications for training and selection of managerial and professional level employees are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to gratefully acknowledge Nancy Da Silva, for all her guidance and support through each step in completing my thesis. I would also like to thank Megumi Hosoda and Harriet Pila for all their valuable feedback and help in completing my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
NETWORKING AND CAREER OUTCOMES.....	4
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN NETWORKING AND CAREER OUTCOMES.....	9
PREDICTORS OF NETWORKING.....	12
NETWORKING AND PERCEIVED CONTROL.....	16
METHOD.....	21
Procedure.....	21
Participants.....	22
Measures.....	23
Control Variables.....	29
RESULTS.....	31
TEST OF HYPOTHESES.....	33
DISCUSSION.....	37
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH.....	40
IMPLICATIONS.....	41
CONCLUSION.....	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Factor Loadings of Networking Items.....	48
2. Factor Loadings of Motivation Items.....	49
3. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations.....	50
4. Personality as a Predictor of Career Planning.....	51
5. Career Planning as a Predictor of Networking.....	52
6. Personality as a Predictor of Networking.....	53
7. Personality as a Predictor of Networking, Controlling for Mediator.....	54

Introduction

Social networking occurs at all levels in our society (Sonnenberg, 1990; McDermott, 1992; Forret & Dougherty, 2001; Solberg et. al., 1994). Through networking with others, a new college graduate may develop leads or referrals to possible job opportunities. On a personal level, networking provides a means of establishing lasting relationships with friends, family, colleagues, or simply maintaining a network of acquaintances. When examined more closely, networking also has its advantages for the working professional. Networking behaviors have been shown to be related to career advancement and managerial effectiveness (Burt, 1992; Gould & Penley, 1984; Michael & Yukl, 1993; Luthans, Rosenkrantz, & Hennessy, 1985).

Thus, past research has examined various predictors of involvement in networking behaviors (Forret & Dougherty, 2001; Michael & Yukl, 1993), yet the literature on this topic is scarce. The proposed study will examine the relationship between three personal characteristics of working professionals (managers and non-managers) - locus of control, self-efficacy toward networking, self-monitoring, and how they relate to networking behaviors. Although the literature has generally focused on managerial networking and how it relates to career outcomes (Kaplan, 1984; Kotter, 1982; Gould & Penley, 1984; Luthans et. al, 1985; Michael & Yukl, 1993), the research has also included the benefits of networking among non-managerial professionals (Sonnenberg, 1990; McDermott, 1992; Turban & Dougherty, 1994; Wanberg, Kanfer, & Banas, 2000; Forret & Dougherty, 2001). Thus, it is necessary to study networking behaviors among professionals with managerial as well as non-managerial roles.

Understanding the factors that predict involvement in networking behaviors holds practical and theoretical implications. In organizations where effective networking is crucial for the success of the individual and the company, organizations can benefit from selection and training processes. For example, individuals can be screened on factors relating to their ability to network effectively for tasks that require networking skills (Forret & Dougherty, 2001). For the individual, effective networking can help maintain existing relationships, which may aid the individual in gaining resources to perform his or her job effectively (Sonnenberg, 1990). Managers who secure such relationships benefit the organization through maintaining customer and client business contracts (Kaplan, 1984; Mueller, 1986). Organizations may even consider the benefits of training managers on effective networking skills as part of a management development initiative. Managers would benefit from being able to identify important members in their networks who have the resources they need, as well as understanding various networking approaches available in establishing valuable contacts with others (Michael & Yukl, 1993). Even though networking skills may be trained, it is important to consider the impact of personality traits and how they affect one's networking behaviors. Understanding what personality characteristics predict networking behaviors can help in the assignment of managers to work tasks that require an ability to network with business partners in order to gain access to vital resources. Organizations can determine which individuals are more suitable for these networking assignments with the help of personality characteristics. Seibert and Kraimer (2001) examined the relationship between personality and career success. Their results showed that extraversion was

positively related to salary level, promotions, and career success. While this study found a positive relationship between personality and career success, it did not examine networking behaviors directly. It was Forret and Dougherty's (2001) study that examined the personality variables - extraversion, and self-esteem, and their relationship to networking behaviors. Support for their findings suggests the importance of personality in predicting networking behaviors. From a theoretical standpoint, the present study will provide additional knowledge of factors influencing networking behaviors, contributing to a more accurate model or framework of networking behaviors. Furthermore, understanding the factors that predict networking behaviors would enhance the social capital model proposed by Seibert, Kraimer, and Liden (2001). Their model focuses on the relationship between social resources and career success, but fails to examine the factors that lead to the use of these social resources. Predictors of career success are important components of the networking literature (Wayne, Liden, Kraimer, & Graf, 1999), and must be included to provide a more integrated model.

In a work environment where employees work closely with others in a team or in a functional unit, professional employees and managers will have regular contact with their peers and colleagues, their subordinates, and their superiors. However, it is often the case that managers or professionals do not possess all the resources they need to do their job (Michael & Yukl, 1993). They will often need to collaborate with other members of their workgroup in order to accomplish a task. Other times, managers will need to rely on individuals outside their immediate workgroup in order to get their job done (Kaplan, 1984). What follows is a series of attempts to develop relationships with

these individuals as a means of acquiring these necessary resources to get the job done (Kaplan, 1984; Sonnenberg, 1990). The engagement in these activities can be categorized as networking behaviors.

Networking behaviors can be defined as the activities that managers and professionals engage in “to develop and maintain relationships with others who have the potential to assist them in their work or career” (Forret & Dougherty, 2001, p.284). Most of the literature has focused specifically on networking among managers and professionals. With networking comes the expectation that building such relationships will assist managers to accomplish job-related tasks or to perform their jobs better (Kaplan, 1984; Mueller, 1990). There is a wide array of activities that can be considered networking behaviors, including (a) socializing before and after meetings, (b) attending social events such as parties and lunches, (c) providing mentoring and advice, (d) taking an active role in community projects, (e) doing favors, (f) joining industry and professional associations, (g) forming alliances and cliques, (h) engaging in informal conversations about non-work topics, exchange of information, benefits, and influence, and (i) passing on gossip and information (Kaplan, 1984; Kotter, 1982; Michael & Yukl, 1993; Sonnenberg, 1990; McDermott, 1992; Liden & Mitchell, 1988).

Networking and Career Outcomes

To understand networking behaviors in a fuller context, it is important to discuss it within the theoretical framework of social capital. Social capital is defined as “the structure of individuals’ contact networks – the pattern of interconnection among the various people with whom each person is tied” (Raider & Burt, 1996, p. 187). Social

capital theory suggests that individuals achieve different levels of career success as a result of differences in their social networks, or social ties with others. Individuals possessing advantageous social networks may attain higher levels of career success, while less advantageous social networks may result in lower levels of career success (Raider & Burt, 1996). Social networks are advantageous when they provide opportunities to connect with a diverse group of individuals who possess various resources and information (Raider & Burt, 1996). It is advantageous because it provides a competitive advantage over individuals who lack such social networks. Differences in social networks stem from the types of relationships individuals develop and maintain. These relationships are the building blocks of social networks. Individuals engaging in such relationships gain access to valuable information and resources. Differences in career outcomes can result from the amount of social capital individuals obtain through such relationships (Forret & Dougherty, 2001). Three different theoretical approaches to social capital involve weak tie theory, structural hole theory, and social resource theory (Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001).

According to Granovetter's weak tie theory (1973), strong ties refer to information possessed by any member within a social group that is likely to be shared or obtained quickly by other members in the group. Weak ties are those that extend outside of the social clique. Granovetter (1973) argues that weak ties offer a unique source of information and resources. These weak ties provide individuals with valuable information that other members in the social group are not aware of. While weak tie theory focuses on the characteristics of the individual's direct ties, Burt's (1992)

structural hole theory focuses on the patterns or relations among the individual's social contacts. This theory attributes structural holes to the separation between non-redundant contacts. Redundant contacts refer to individuals already within one's network, thus providing the same information or resources. According to Burt's theory, individuals benefit from networks with many structural holes by gaining access to information, bargaining power, and referral (Burt, 1992). A network with many structural holes means there are many non-redundant contacts. The abundance of non-redundant contacts provides individuals with more opportunities to acquire unique sources of information and resources. These unique sources of information give individuals their competitive advantage. Lastly, the third major theoretical approach to social capital is social resources theory. This theory focuses on the social resources that are embedded in networks to provide individuals with benefits such as access to information, resources, or sponsorship within a social system (Seibert et al., 2001). For example, a college friend who has information about a job opening serves as a social resource for an individual who is seeking a job, but does not serve as a social resource for another individual who is currently employed. Thus, a career counselor will be considered a social resource to an individual seeking career development and advice, while another individual may not reap the same benefits from this resource.

Rather than viewing these three theories separately, Seibert et al. (2001) proposed a model to integrate these theories, arguing that they are not mutually exclusive.

According to their integration, they view social capital as "both the different network structures that facilitate (or impede) access to social resources and the nature of the social

resources embedded in the network” (Seibert et. al., 2001, p.221). In other words, it is important to consider what the social resources are, and how an individual acquires the resources. Thus, the emphasis is on both the structure and the nature of the social resources. Taking this theoretical integration one step further, these researchers used structural equation modeling to test their model, providing empirical findings to support their conceptual integration. The results of their findings showed that network structure was related to social resources. Furthermore, they found the relationship between social resources and career success to be fully mediated by three network variables: access to information, access to resources, and career sponsorship (Seibert et al., 2001). This theoretical model provides the background for understanding the important role of networking as it relates to career success. While this model provides a framework for understanding the relationship between social resources and career success, it leaves out the factors that predict whether individuals are able to utilize these social resources. Seibert et al.’s (2001) theoretical model is missing the component that precedes networking, that is, the factors that predict networking (see Figure 1). The importance of networking toward career success has been documented by many researchers (e.g., Forret & Dougherty, 2001; Kaplan, 1984; Michael & Yukl, 1993), yet the literature on predictors of networking is scarce.

Seibert et al.’s (2001) framework provides an opportunity to examine three personality variables that may predict involvement in networking behaviors: locus of control, self-efficacy toward networking, and self-monitoring. Where networking and access to social resources is seen as beneficial to one’s career, these three personality

variables seem to explain whether an individual engages in networking (Turban & Dougherty, 1994; Kilduff & Day, 1994). However, the relationship is not a direct one. Individuals must see the rationale behind the benefits of networking in order for them to engage in these behaviors. That is, individuals must be driven by a need to succeed in their careers to see networking as valuable. This involves a motivational component, in which motivation to succeed will mediate the relationship between the personality variables and networking behaviors. Within this theoretical framework of social capital theory, we now examine the empirical findings of networking and its relationship to career outcomes.

Figure 1

Hypothesized Model of Social Capital Effects on Career Success

Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001

Relationships Between Networking and Career Outcomes

Networking plays an important role in providing career opportunities for managers and working professionals. Networking serves to provide individuals with information and access to resources and personnel (Sonnenberg, 1990). According to Sonnenberg, networking also creates opportunities for individuals to position themselves strategically within certain groups of an organization; it serves to strengthen existing client relationships; and it can provide a source of new business leads or job opportunities. Of significant importance in the networking literature is that involvement in networking has been related to career outcomes such as income and promotions (Burt, 1992; Gould & Penley, 1984; Luthans, Hodgetts, & Rosenkrantz, 1988; Luthans et al., 1985; Michael & Yukl, 1993).

In the study conducted by Luthans et al. (1985), the researchers used observational techniques to examine the activities performed by successful managers. They measured manager success by using a promotion index of manager level over tenure and by considering the top managers of each organization to be successful. The manager's level in the organization is determined on a scale of 1 to 5 to represent the levels in the organization, where a higher number reflects a higher level in the organization. This is divided by tenure, which is the time in years the manager has spent with the organization. This promotion index was borrowed from Hall (1976), linking a manager's age to their rank in the organization. According to Hall's (1976) index, the higher an individual's rank and the younger his or her age, the more successful the individual is within the organization. The results of the study indicated that two out of a

total of 12 activities, i.e., interaction with outsiders and socializing/politicking, were significantly and positively related to the success of the managers (Luthans et al, 1985). These networking activities involved chitchatting about topics not related to work, doing public relations work, interacting with outsiders, attending external meetings, making informal jokes, discussing rumors, and engaging in politics and gamesmanship (Luthans et al., 1985). The researchers found support for the notion that one needs political/social skills to get ahead in an organization, thus providing support that networking behaviors can help managers succeed in their workplace and do their job more effectively.

In Michael and Yukl's (1993) study, the authors examined networking behaviors among managers in various industries, distinguishing internal networking (interactions with members within the organization) from external networking (interactions with people outside the organization). The researchers found external networking behaviors to be affected by a manager's level and function within the organization, but internal networking was only affected by a manager's level. That is, higher-level managers engaged in more internal and external networking. However, the manager's function affected whether they engaged in more internal or external networking. In addition, they examined the relationship between internal and external networking and the rate of advancement by a manager in the organization. Michael and Yukl (1993) measured rate of advancement using two promotion indexes. The first index was computed by dividing the number of promotions a manager received by their age. The second index was computed by dividing the number of promotions a manager received by the time they had been with the organization. The researchers concluded that both internal and external

networking behaviors were related to rate of advancement in the organization. Based on a hierarchical regression analysis, internal networking demonstrated a significant increase in the amount of variance explained in rate of advancement based on the manager's age and their time in the organization (Michael & Yukl, 1993). External networking only contributed a significant amount of variance in rate of advancement based on the manager's age, but not on their time in the organization. It was not clear to the researchers why time in the organization did not play a role in accounting for rate of advancement. These results confirmed the findings of the Luthans et al. (1985) study that networking is related to rate of advancement in an organization.

A study conducted by Gould and Penley (1984) examined the utilization of seven career strategies among employees of a large municipal bureaucracy. One of these strategies consisted of networking. Participants, which included clerical, professional, and managerial employees, responded to a two-item networking scale. These two items asked respondents the extent to which they engaged in building a network of contacts to obtain information, and to assist in their career progression. The authors found that for managers, the career strategy of networking was positively related to the rate of salary progression. The career strategy of networking for non-managers was not related to the rate of salary progression.

According to Burt's (1992) structural hole theory, effective networking requires that an individual consider who the contacts are, to avoid wasting time and effort on redundant contacts. A manager seeking to acquire important information through networking needs to consider whether an existing contact will be able to provide him or

her with the necessary information to perform his or her job. Burt (1992) found that managers who had networks consisting of many structural holes were promoted faster. An abundance of structural holes in one's contacts provides a larger pool of information from which a manager can utilize to his or her advantage. Non-redundant contacts are found in a network with many structural holes. As a result, structural holes provide unique sources of information that others in the network do not possess. This gives managers a competitive advantage by having additional information and resources to help them in their work functions. The findings from this study further support the notion that networking is related to career advancement.

Predictors of Networking

The studies on networking provide evidence that networking behaviors are related to career outcomes such as career advancement (e.g., Burt, 1992; Gould & Penley, 1984; Luthans et. al., 1985; Michael & Yukl, 1993). Results from Seibert et al.'s (2001) study provide further evidence that theoretical models can be tested empirically. Their findings that access to information, access to resources, and career sponsorship fully mediate the relationship between social resources and career success provide a more integrated model for understanding the social networking literature. However, few researchers have examined the factors that influence whether professional or managerial employees engage in networking behaviors. For example, Michael and Yukl (1993) examined the determinants of networking behavior in organizations. These researchers hypothesized that managerial level and function would determine whether managers engaged more or less in networking behaviors. Managerial level was measured using two criteria. The

first criterion was a questionnaire item asking respondents to indicate their managerial level by choosing one of five response categories. The other criterion involved examining the information regarding the respondent's position title, the number of managerial levels in the organization, and the number of levels in the chain of command between the respondent and the president. This information was used to recode respondents into lower-level or upper-level management.

Michael and Yukl (1993) measured managerial function using a questionnaire item with seven functional categories to choose from. The categories were then recoded into marketing, finance, and production managers. Although Michael and Yukl found support for their measures of internal and external networking, they found external networking to be related to managerial function and level, but found internal networking to only be related to managerial level. They further concluded that dependencies partially mediated the effects of managerial function and level on networking behaviors. Michael and Yukl (1993) defined dependencies as "the extent to which cooperation and support from a person are needed to carry out a manager's job responsibilities effectively and achieve a desired rate of career advancement" (p.330). Dependencies were either internal (involving individuals within the organization) or external (involving individuals outside the organization).

Forret and Dougherty (2001) conducted a study to examine the relationship of personal and job characteristics to involvement in networking. For personal characteristics, these researchers examined demographic characteristics, including gender and socioeconomic background. Furthermore, they examined personality and attitudinal

characteristics, including self-esteem, extraversion, and attitudes toward workplace politics, and how they related to involvement in networking behavior. Self-esteem refers to a person's overall self-evaluation or sense of self-worth (Myers, 1999). It was hypothesized that individuals with higher self-esteem would show more attempts at engaging in networking behaviors due to their greater confidence in themselves. Extraverted individuals can be described as outgoing, sociable, active, lively, and talkative (Goldberg, 1993; McCrae & Costa, 1987). Extraverted individuals tend to socialize more and initiate more contacts with others, thus are hypothesized to show more involvement in networking behavior. Results from their study found support that the personality characteristics of self-esteem and extraversion were positively related to involvement in networking behaviors. They also found support that favorable attitudes toward workplace politics are related to involvement in networking behaviors. In addition, they found support that organization level (individual's level within the organization) was a significant predictor of three of their five networking behaviors in their measures. These three behaviors included: Maintaining Contacts, Engaging in Professional Activities, and Increasing Internal Visibility. These results confirm the findings of Michael and Yukl's (1993) study that organization level is related to networking.

The significance of personality variables in predicting involvement in networking suggests the possibility that there are other personal characteristics that also predict involvement in networking. Sullivan (1999) conducted a review on the changing nature of careers, indicating the importance of networking in managing one's career. He went

on to suggest the importance of future research on personality characteristics that may contribute to a broader understanding of networking models. Forret and Dougherty (2001) concluded in their study the importance of personality variables in understanding networking behaviors. Self-esteem and extraversion are personality variables that emphasize the individual's self-confidence and their own inclinations toward seeking out social situations. Three other personality variables that might show potential in predicting involvement in networking behaviors are: locus of control, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring. These three variables have a common theme of perceived control over one's environment. Perceived control, as it relates to career success, determines whether individuals will take action to attain their career goals. Individuals who feel in control of their lives allow them to "set challenging goals and persist when facing difficulties" (Myers, 1999, p.51). As these individuals feel in control, they will strive to reach their desired career goals. As networking predicts career success, these individuals may utilize the benefits associated with networking in order to advance their careers. Perceived control can be better understood by examining the literature on its main components of locus of control, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring.

Tremblay and Roger (1993) examined whether locus of control was related to career plateau, rather than career advancement, among managers. They found external locus of control to be positively related to a subjective measure of having reached a dead end. As networking is related to career advancement (Gould & Penley, 1984), it would be important to examine whether there is a relationship between locus of control and networking behavior. Solberg et al. (1994) examined career development and self-

efficacy theory in terms of the Career Search Efficacy Scale. The items in this scale were factor analyzed, with one factor focusing exclusively on networking efficacy. This factor of networking efficacy suggests the importance of examining whether self-efficacy toward networking predicts whether an individual will engage in networking behaviors. Kilduff and Day (1994) found self-monitoring to be significantly related to cross-company promotions. Their findings showed that high self-monitors obtained more promotions than low self-monitors. As networking is related to career outcomes such as promotions (Burt, 1992; Gould & Penley, 1984), the relationship between self-monitoring and networking is worth investigating. The findings of previous research that personality variables may predict career outcomes (Kilduff & Day, 1994; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1982) provide a theoretical reasoning for examining the possible relationships between locus of control, self-efficacy, self-monitoring, and involvement in networking behaviors.

Networking and Perceived Control

Locus of control refers to “the extent to which people perceive outcomes as either internally controllable by their own efforts or actions, or externally controlled by chance, fate or outside forces” (Myer, 1999, p. 51). Individuals with an external locus of control tend to view their own reinforcements resulting from external factors that are beyond the individual’s own control. On the other hand, individuals with an internal locus of control view reinforcements resulting from their own actions and efforts. These individuals are more likely to explain setbacks in a positive manner, believing that their own efforts and self-discipline can help them achieve long-term goals (Rotter, 1966). A study conducted

by Luzzo and Ward (1996) examined whether locus of control was related to career aspirations of college undergraduates who were employed part-time. Their findings suggested that locus of control was a significant predictor of career aspirations as it was related to their current occupation. The findings showed that individuals with an internal locus of control were more likely than individuals with an external locus of control to seek out part-time jobs that were related to their career interests. As a result of being able to control their own destiny, individuals with an internal locus of control see their own actions as a determining factor of how they carry out long-term plans. A study conducted by Turban and Dougherty (1994) examined relationships between protégés' personality characteristics, mentoring, and career success among managers and professionals. Their results suggested that the personality characteristics of locus of control indirectly related to career attainment through initiating mentoring and mentoring received. Since involvement in networking behaviors will tend to rely on taking initiative to create contacts, individuals with an internal locus of control will be positively related to networking behavior.

Personality characteristics alone will not directly predict whether an individual engages in networking behaviors in order to attain his or her career goals. Similar to how access to information and resources mediates the relationship between social resources and career success, such mediators may also exist for the relationship between locus of control and networking behavior. In a study conducted by Wayne, Liden, Kraimer, and Graf (1999), they examined factors that predicted career success. They hypothesized that motivational variables such as desire for upward mobility and career planning would

positively predict career success. Their results indicated partial support for their hypotheses. The researchers found desire for mobility to be related to salary progression but not for career planning. Career planning was related to career satisfaction, but not for desire for upward mobility (Wayne et al., 1999).

Wayne et al.'s (1999) study is important in providing reason to examine the work motivation theories and how they relate to career success. According to various work motivation theories, individuals are motivated to put effort into their work if they expect their efforts to lead to rewards or good performance (Wayne et al., 1999; Greenberg, 2002). Motivation theory may help to explain whether an individual will utilize the social resources of networking to attain their career goals. This desire to be successful may mediate the relationship between internal locus of control and involvement in networking behaviors. It is expected that individuals will network more if they believe their efforts will be successful, thus the use of internal locus of control (Spector, 1982). This will be a partial rather than a complete mediation. The absence of motivation for an individual should not entirely eliminate the innate characteristics of personality to affect their behavior to engage in some amount of networking. This leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Internal locus of control will be directly related to networking behavior and indirectly through desire to be successful.

Self-efficacy refers to the sense that one is competent and effective (Bandura, 1982). Individuals with a strong sense of self-efficacy are “more persistent, less anxious, and less depressed” (Myers, 1999). Individuals with a strong sense of self-efficacy tend to set challenging goals and persist even when faced with difficulties or other obstacles. These individuals strive to attain their goals. According to Myers (1999), a combination of striving and persistence results in accomplishment; this accomplishment then leads to a greater self-confidence. Orpen (1995) examined self-efficacy beliefs and job performance among African-American managers in a manufacturing company in South Africa. Results of the study found a positive relationship between self-efficacy beliefs of the managers and their salary growth since joining the firm.

As self-efficacy is viewed as context-specific (Cianni, 1994; Solberg et al., 1994), it is necessary to examine self-efficacy in terms of context. This study proposes to examine self-efficacy toward networking, as it relates to involvement in networking behaviors. Individuals who feel competent that they can network will engage in more networking than individuals who feel less competent in networking. An assumption is that these individuals perceive networking as a means of obtaining valuable resources to perform their job effectively (Kaplan, 1984). Similar to self-esteem, self-efficacy grows with hard won achievement. In order for successful networking behaviors to take place, individuals must feel confident in their own abilities to initiate contact with others. These individuals are not deterred by the limitations in available resources within their work environment. They will take the challenge to acquire such resources if it requires

attaining them through outside contacts. With this in mind, individuals with a strong sense of self-efficacy toward networking should engage in more networking behaviors. Incorporating motivation theory as a mediator in the relationship between self-efficacy toward networking and involvement in networking behaviors leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: Self-efficacy toward networking will be directly related to networking behavior and indirectly through desire to be successful.

Self-monitoring refers to individuals who adjust their behavior or performance in response to external situations in order to create the desired impressions (Snyder, 1987; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986; Myers, 1999). Individuals high in self-monitoring tend to modify their self-presentation according to what the desired behavior is, in any given situation. Often compared to a social chameleon, these individuals' attitudes serve as a social adjustment function, helping them adapt to new jobs, roles, and relationships (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). On the other hand, individuals low in self-monitoring tend to care less about how they wish to be perceived in social situations. They worry less about what is the appropriate behavior when with others. Thus, they are "more internally guided and more likely to talk and act as they feel and believe (McCann & Hancock, 1983). As individuals high in self-monitoring will actively construct their own public image to attain social ends (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000), self-monitoring theory has also been linked to certain job outcomes. Kilduff and Day (1994) examined the effects of

self-monitoring on managerial careers. Their study found that self-monitoring was related to career mobility. The sample of MBA graduates in the study who were high in self-monitoring were more likely to change employers, re-locate, and achieve cross-company promotions (Kilduff & Day, 1994). The ability to seek other employment opportunities or move work locations requires a greater network of contacts to assist the individual in a career change (Wanberg et al, 2000). Wanberg et al. examined predictors and outcomes of network intensity among unemployed job seekers. Because self-monitoring relates to career mobility, which includes those individuals who are currently unemployed and seeking a job, individuals high in self-monitoring should engage more in networking behaviors than individuals low in self-monitoring. Incorporating motivation theory as a mediator in the relationship between self-monitoring and networking behaviors leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Self-monitoring will be directly related to networking behavior and indirectly through desire to be successful.

Method

Procedure

The sample consisted of 107 business and psychology graduate students from San Jose State University. Professors of the graduate courses were contacted to arrange for the study to be conducted during their class. Participants were asked to complete a survey questionnaire during their class time. Participants were informed that the purpose

of the study was to examine whether personality variables predicted networking behaviors. The participants were provided with a consent form to sign if they chose to participate. Participation was entirely voluntary. Participants were assured that returned questionnaires would be strictly confidential.

Participants

Of the 107 respondents, 53 (49.5%) were male, and 54 (50.5%) were female. Approximately 30% of the participants were 26 years of age or younger, 36% were between 27-30 years old, and 34% were over 30 years old. When asked what their highest degree obtained was, 59% responded that they currently held a Bachelors degree, while 41% indicated that they had an advanced degree. Respondents were not asked to provide the type of advanced degree they received. The participants were employed at least either part-time or full-time, working on average 38 hours per week at the time of data collection. Approximately 53% of the participants were Asian/Pacific Islander, 41% Caucasian/Euro-American, and 6% other ethnicities. Of the participants, 71% were in non-managerial positions, and 23% in managerial positions, while the remaining 6% did not provide their job level. Responses indicated that 97% of the participants had been employed at their current company on average of 3.1 years, while the remaining 3% did not provide this information. Only 30% of participants provided information on their job functions. The resulting data did not provide a clear indication of the types of industries the participants worked in.

Measures

Networking behaviors. Networking behaviors refer to the activities that managers and professionals engage in “to develop and maintain relationships with others who have the potential to assist them in their work or career” (Forret & Dougherty, 2001, p.284). To capture the wide range of networking behaviors discussed in previous research, items were taken from the Networking Behavior Scale, developed by Forret and Dougherty (2001). These researchers developed their scale by incorporating the literature detailed in practitioner and scholarly articles (e.g., Michael & Yukl, 1993; Sonnenberg, 1990). The scale consisted of 17 items.

Participants were asked to respond to each item along a 6-point Likert type scale (1 = *never*, 2 = *seldom/only once or twice per year*, 3 = *occasionally/several times a year*, 4 = *moderately often/every few weeks*, 5 = *often/almost every week*, 6 = *very often/almost every day*). The stem for the networking scale began with “Within the last year, how often have you...?”. Sample items included: Within the last year, how often have you...given business contacts a phone call to keep in touch?; attended social functions of your organization?; gone to lunch with persons outside your company? Alpha for the four components of the Networking Behaviors Scale were: Maintaining Contacts (alpha = .79), Socializing (alpha = .77), Engaging in Professional Activities (alpha = .73), and Increasing Internal Visibility (alpha = .65) (Forret, & Dougherty, 2001). Items from a fifth component, Participating in Church and Community, were not included due to the inappropriateness of the items for the present study. Additional items from the scale

were not included as they did not seem to be networking activities this particular sample would typically engage in.

Reliability and validity of the networking measure. The networking behavior questionnaire was factor analyzed to identify whether the underlying categories of networking behavior matched the underlying factors proposed by Michael and Yukl (2001). The principal components method of factor analysis was used with varimax rotation of factors because it provides an empirical summary of the data by taking into account all the variance without losing any information. Varimax rotation is a procedure to maximize variance. The goal was to maximize the variance of factor loadings by making high loadings higher, and low loadings lower. The following criteria were used in determining which items should be retained for interpreting the factors: a loading of at least .30 on the expected factor, and a low loading on the other factors (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2001). Items were forced to four factors to compare the factor loadings with Michael and Yukl's (2001) four networking factors. The rotated matrix produced three main groups of item loadings on the first three factors. Several of the items had multiple loadings of .30 or higher. The goal was to maximize item loadings on a single factor while reducing multiple factor loadings. Examination of the scree plot and the eigenvalue-greater-than-one criteria suggested that three factors be retained. A second factor analysis was computed in which three factors were forced. Table 1 presents the results of this second analysis. This factor analysis reduced the number of multiple item loadings to five of the items. For each of the items with multiple loadings, the higher loading was retained and the lower loading removed. Items 4, 3, 7, 17, and 2 loaded onto

factor 1. Of these five items, items 4 and 17 were items from the “Engaging in Professional Activities” scale. Items 3 and 7 were from the “Increasing Internal Visibility” scale, while item 2 was from the “Socializing” scale. Items in Factor 1 were not consistent with any of the factors from Michael & Yukl’s (2001) research. While these items pertain to different networking behaviors, all of these items do reflect behaviors that involve increasing one’s visibility. As a result, Factor 1 was labeled Increasing One’s Visibility. The coefficient alpha for Factor 1 was .76.

The second factor consisted of items 12, 13, 8, 9, 1, and 5. Four of these six items (items 12, 13, 1, 5) were from the “Maintaining Contacts” scale. Items 8 and 9 were from the “Engaging in Professional Activities” scale. This group of items was most similar in terms of overlap with Michael & Yukl’s “Maintaining Contacts” scale (2001). Item 8 (attended professional seminars or workshops) and item 9 (attended meetings of business-related organizations) related to engagement in professional activities. These two behaviors can also be seen as a means of maintaining contacts with other professionals. As a result, this second factor was labeled Maintaining Contacts. The coefficient alpha for this factor was .74.

A third factor consisted of items 6, 11, 14, 10, 16, and 15. Items 6, 11, and 15 were from the “Socializing” scale developed by Michael and Yukl (2001). Items 10 and 16 were from the “Increasing Internal Visibility” scale. Item 14 was from the “Maintaining Contacts” scale. All of these items can be interpreted as socializing behaviors. As a result, this factor was labeled Socializing. The coefficient alpha for this factor was .73. As a result of this factor analysis, networking as the criterion variable,

consisted of three scales: Increasing One's Visibility, Maintaining Contacts, and Socializing.

Locus of control. Locus of control refers to "the extent to which people perceive outcomes as either internally controllable by their own efforts or actions, or externally controlled by chance, fate or outside forces" (Myer, 1999, p.51). Items from the Work Locus of Control, developed by Spector (1988), were used to measure the construct of locus of control. This scale was more appropriate to use than the general Locus of Control scale as it generalized expectancies about control of reinforcements specifically within a work environment (Spector, 1992; Spector, 1988). Items were measured on a 6-point scale (1 = *Disagree very much*, 2 = *Disagree moderately*, 3 = *Disagree slightly*, 4 = *Agree slightly*, 5 = *Agree moderately*, 6 = *Agree very much*). Sample items reflecting an internal locus of control included: A job is what you make of it; Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort. Although items reflecting an external locus of control were included in the survey, only items reflecting internal locus of control were included in the data analyses. Orpen (1992) validated the Work Locus of Control Scale and found coefficient alpha = .82 within the alpha range of .75 to .85 that Spector's (1988) validation results indicated. The scale consisted of 16 items. Only the eight items reflecting internal locus of control were used in determining the coefficient alpha for this scale. The internal locus of control scale for this study produced a coefficient alpha of .63.

Self-Efficacy. Self-efficacy toward networking refers to the sense that one is competent and effective (Bandura, 1982) in their ability to network. Items from the

Networking dimension in the Career Search Efficacy Scale (Solberg et. al., 1994) were used to measure this construct. Items from this scale were suitable for adapting to this study as the items specifically measured networking efficacy as it related to career development. Items began with the phrase: "How confident are you in your ability to:" and were rated on a 10-point scale from 0 (very little) to 9 (very much). Sample items included: Meet new people in careers of interest; Utilize your social networks to gain employment. The scale consisted of eight items. Solberg et. al. (1994) reported an alpha of .92 for the networking efficacy scale.

Self-Monitoring. Self-monitoring refers to individuals who adjust their behavior or performance in response to external situations in order to create the desired impressions (Snyder, 1987; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986; Myers, 1999). Items from the revised 18-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986) were used, as it was more reliable than the original Self-Monitoring Scale with 25 items. The items were true/false format, with sample items including: I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people; At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like; I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain others. Coefficient alpha for this scale was .70 (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). This study utilized 14 items from this scale. Four items not included were removed due to low factor loading, or were deemed irrelevant or inappropriate to ask the intended participants. Two items in the scale were modified to be appropriate to the nature of the sample.

Motivation. Desire to be successful involves work motivation theories where individuals are motivated to put effort into their work if they expect their efforts to lead to

rewards or good performance (Wayne et al., 1999; Greenberg, 2002). Two scales were used to measure this variable. The first scale measured desire for mobility. This scale consisted of six items on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Disagree slightly*, 4 = *Neither*, 5 = *Agree slightly*, 6 = *Agree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*). Sample items included: I would be satisfied remaining at my current level at (company name) for a long time; I am not interested in moving from my present job to a higher-level position (reverse scored) (Wayne et al., 1999; Landau & Hammer, 1986). Wayne et al. (1999) reported a coefficient alpha of .89 for this scale.

The second scale measured career planning. According to Gould's (1979) career planning model, "planning career goals leads to implementation of career goals which, in turn, leads to attainment of career goals." This 6-item scale was borrowed from Gould (1979). Items were on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Sample items included: I have a strategy for achieving my career goals; I have a plan for my career; I know what I need to do to reach my career goals. Wayne et al. (1999) reported a coefficient alpha of .80 for this scale. Because both motivation scales deal with attaining one's career goals, the scales were combined into a single motivation scale.

Reliability and validity of motivation measure. Wayne et al. (1999) treated motivation as two separate measures consisting of Desire for Mobility and Career Planning. It was argued that these two measures could be combined as one scale as they both deal with attaining one's career goals. The 12 items were factor analyzed to examine whether the items loaded well on one or two factors. The principal components

method of factor analysis was used with varimax rotation, with items forced to two factors. The two factors accounted for 53% of the total variance. Table 2 shows the factor loadings for all the items. Items 1-6 were originally from the Desire for Mobility scale, while items 7-12 were originally from the Career Planning scale. All six items from the Career Planning scale loaded onto the first factor. Item 3, originally from the Desire for Mobility scale, also loaded onto the first factor. A reliability analysis was conducted with the items loading on the first factor. The reliability analysis indicated low inter-item correlations between item 3 and the other items. The data indicated an increase in the coefficient alpha by deleting this item. Conceptually, item 3 concerns promotion and desire for mobility. It does not pertain to the concept of career planning. Based on empirical and theoretical reasoning, item 3 was removed from the first factor. The remaining items produced a coefficient alpha of .87. The higher the score, the stronger the internal consistency of the scale.

Five of the six original items from the Desire for Mobility scale loaded onto the second factor. The alpha coefficient for these five items was .72. Based on the results of the factor analysis, the two motivation scales: Desire for Mobility and Career Planning, were used as the mediator variables.

Control Variables

The following variables were included in the present study to control for possible confounding relationships: Degree, work experience, and hours worked per week. Similar control variables have been used in previous studies on the careers of professionals and managers (Forret & Dougherty, 2001; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Turban &

Dougherty, 1994; Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1991). Forret and Dougherty (2001) classified these variables as human capital variables.

Degree. Individuals with advanced degrees may have more networking opportunities as a result of additional contacts with other students. Professionals who return to school for an MBA or a Masters in Psychology may also have more chances to network with others, thus it was necessary to control for degree. Respondents indicated their highest degree obtained. Responses were coded 1 for bachelor's degree and 2 for advanced degree.

Work experience. Individuals with more work experience may have developed more contacts and networks than individuals just starting out their career. Thus, it was important to control for work experience. Respondents indicated the number of years of full-time work experience they had (including positions other than their current one).

Hours worked per week. Individuals in upper management may work longer hours than a lower-level general manager. Additional hours at work may lead to more opportunities for the manager to network with others, thus it was important to control for work experience. Respondents indicated the average number of hours they worked per week.

Analyses. Hypotheses 1 through 3 were each analyzed separately, using the following steps. To test each hypothesis, the first step was to show that the personality variable was correlated with the mediator variable. The mediator variable was used as the criterion variable in a regression equation and the personality variable as the predictor. Second, the mediator variable had to be shown to affect the networking

variable. The networking variable was then used as the criterion variable in a regression equation and the mediator entered as the predictor. Third, the personality variable had to be shown to affect the networking variable. The networking behavior variable was used as the criterion variable in a regression equation and personality as the predictor variable. If these three conditions held, then a fourth step was involved to establish any mediation effect. In the fourth step, both the personality and mediator variables were entered in as predictors. The mediator was entered in step 1, and the personality variable was entered in step 2. This regression analysis controlled for the mediator variable. Testing for partial mediation, the effect of personality on networking, controlling for the mediator, should not be zero (zero value indicates complete mediation). The three control variables were not correlated to the networking variable, thus, they were not included in the regression analyses.

Results

The results are divided into two sections: (a) correlations, means, and standard deviations of study variables, and (b) regression analyses.

Correlations, means, and standard deviations of study variables. Correlations for the study variables are shown in Table 3, along with the corresponding means, standard deviations, and alpha coefficients for scale items. Among the three control variables, total years of work experience was significantly correlated to degree ($r = .22, p < .05$) and to the number of hours worked per week ($r = .29, p < .05$). The control variables were not significantly correlated to any of the three measures of networking. Degree was not correlated to Increasing One's Visibility, Maintaining Contacts, or Socializing ($r = .15$,

n.s.; $r = .08$, n.s.; $r = .08$, n.s., respectively). Hours worked per week was not correlated to the networking variables ($r = .18$, n.s.; $r = .00$, n.s.; $r = .16$, n.s., respectively). Total years of work experience was not correlated to the networking variables ($r = -.01$, n.s.; $r = -.01$, n.s.; $r = -.16$, n.s., respectively). As a result, the control variables were not included in the regression analyses.

Among the predictor variables, internal locus of control was positively correlated to self-efficacy toward networking ($r = .34$, $p < .05$). Self-efficacy toward networking was negatively correlated to self-monitoring ($r = -.35$, $p < .05$). This was an unexpected finding because both personality variables were expected to positively relate to networking behavior. The negative correlation between these two personality traits suggest that low self-monitors rather than high self-monitors are more likely to network. Internal locus of control was not related to self-monitoring ($r = -.10$, n.s). This suggests that there is no correlation between individuals who have feel in control of their own actions and those that are highly adaptive to different social settings.

A closer look at the relationships between the predictor variables and the criterion variables reveals that internal locus of control was positively correlated to Increasing One's Visibility ($r = .22$, $p < .05$), but not to Maintaining Contacts or Socializing ($r = -.02$, n.s.; $r = .17$, n.s., respectively). Self-efficacy toward networking was positively correlated to all three networking variables: Increasing One's Visibility ($r = .46$, $p < .05$), Maintaining Contacts ($r = .42$, $p < .05$), and Socializing ($r = .44$, $p < .05$). These results suggest that individuals with an internal locus of control are more likely to network to increase their own visibility, but not necessarily to maintain their contacts or

to socialize with others. Self-monitoring was significantly negatively correlated to all three dependent variables of networking, with correlations ranging from -.21 to -.31. These results indicate that low self-monitors are more likely to engage in all three types of networking behaviors.

The mediator variables were Career Planning and Desire for Mobility. Career Planning was positively related to two of the predictor variables: locus of control ($r = .25$, $p < .05$) and self-efficacy toward networking ($r = .45$, $p < .05$), suggesting that individuals with these two personality traits are likely to be motivated to achieve their career goals. Desire for Mobility was not related to any of the predictor variables. The correlations for Desire for Mobility and locus of control, self-efficacy toward networking, and self-monitoring are $r = .06$, n.s.; $r = .10$, n.s.; $r = -.08$, n.s., respectively. An examination of the relationship between the mediator variables and the criterion variables of networking, reveals that Career Planning was positively correlated to all of the three networking variables, with correlations ranging from .42 to .46, $p < .05$. Desire for Mobility was not correlated to any of the networking variables. As Desire for Mobility was not correlated to the predictor variables or the criterion variables, therefore, this variable was not included in the regression analyses. Finally, the three networking variables: Increasing One's Visibility, Maintaining Contacts, and Socializing, were significantly positively correlated to each other, with correlations ranging from .47 to .48, $p < .05$.

Tests of Hypotheses

A series of regression analyses were conducted to test each of the hypotheses. Each of the hypotheses stated that an individual's desire to be successful would partially

mediate the relationship between a personality variable and networking behavior.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that an internal locus of control would be directly related to networking behavior and indirectly through desire to be successful. Hypothesis 2 stated that self-efficacy toward networking would be directly related to networking behavior and indirectly through desire to be successful. Hypothesis 3 expected that self-monitoring would be directly related to networking behavior and indirectly through desire to be successful. The personality variables were: locus of control, self-efficacy toward networking, and self-monitoring. The mediator variable was Career Planning. The three networking variables were: Increasing One's Visibility, Maintaining Contacts, and Socializing.

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), three prior conditions must be met before a mediating effect can be established. The first condition requires the predictor variable(s) to have an effect on the mediator. The second condition requires the mediator to have an effect on the criterion variable(s). The third condition requires the predictor variable(s) to have an effect on the criterion variable(s).

The first series of regression equations were used to establish whether the predictor variables significantly related to the mediator variable. To examine the first condition, three regression analyses were conducted in which the three predictor variables (locus of control, self-efficacy toward networking, and self-monitoring) were each entered in as the predictor variable and Career Planning was entered as the criterion variable. Career planning was regressed on each of the personality traits. Results of the regression analyses are shown in Table 4. Locus of control and self-efficacy toward

networking significantly predicted Career Planning ($R^2 = .06$, $p < .05$ and $R^2 = .18$, $p < .05$ respectively). Self-monitoring did not predict Career Planning ($R^2 = .05$, n.s). Thus, the first condition required for mediation effects was partially met. The R^2 values yielded small effect sizes.

The second series of regression equations were used to establish the relationship between the mediator and the networking variables. To examine the second condition, the mediator variable Career Planning was entered as the predictor variable, and the networking variable was entered as the criterion variable. Each of the networking behaviors was regressed on to Career Planning. As there were three networking variables, three separate regression analyses were required. The results are shown in Table 5. Career Planning significantly predicted all three networking variables. Thus, the second condition for mediation was met in establishing the relationship between the mediator and the networking measures. The R^2 values for these three regressions ranged from .06 to .18, yielding small effect sizes.

The third series of regression equations was conducted to establish the relationship between the personality variables and the networking variables. The three personality variables were entered in as the predictor variables simultaneously. Each of the networking variables was regressed on to the personality variables. There were three networking variables so three separate analyses were required. Results of these regressions are shown in Table 6. The R^2 values for all three analyses indicated that the three personality variables accounted for a significant amount of variance in the networking measures. In examining the Beta weights for each of the personality

variables, self-efficacy toward networking was the only variable that contributed a significant amount of variance in each of the networking measures (Increasing One's Visibility, $\beta = .39$, $p < .001$; Maintaining Contacts, $\beta = .43$, $p < .001$; Socializing, $\beta = .39$, $p < .001$). Thus, the third condition for mediation was only met for the variable self-efficacy toward networking.

As the prior regression conditions were partially met, the fourth series of regressions were conducted to examine if any mediation effects existed. The following equations were used to examine whether the personality variables had any effect on the networking variables after controlling for the mediator. The first regression equation involved entering the mediator variable Career Planning in step 1. Although self-efficacy toward networking was the only personality trait that met the requirements for mediator analysis, the other two personality variables were included in this step to provide a comparison between this step and the previous step where Career Planning was not entered in step 1. All three personality variables were entered into step 2. The criterion variable is Increasing One's Visibility. The other two networking measures (Maintaining Contacts and Socializing) are entered as the criterion variable for the second and third regression equations. Results of the regression analyses are shown in Table 7. Of the three personality variables, only Self-efficacy toward networking met the three prior regression equation conditions. Controlling for the mediator (Career Planning), the R^2 change value remains significant for all three regression equations. The Beta weight for self-efficacy toward networking for all three regression equations is a lower than when the mediator was not controlled for in the third series of regression equations. The

reduced Beta weights remain significant at the .05 significance level. These results show that Career Planning partially mediates the relationship between Self-efficacy toward networking, and Increasing One's Visibility, Maintaining Contacts, and Socializing. Thus, Hypothesis 2 is supported. Since the personality variables locus of control and self-monitoring did not satisfy the first three regression equation conditions for mediation, Hypotheses 1 and 3 are not supported. Self-monitoring did not predict Career Planning ($R^2 = .05$, n.s.). The Beta weights for Self-monitoring did not contribute any significant amount of variance to Increasing One's Visibility, Maintaining Contacts, and Socializing ($\beta = -.04$, n.s.; $\beta = -.14$, n.s.; $\beta = -.10$, n.s., respectively). The Beta weights for internal locus of control also did not contribute a significant amount of variance to the networking variables ($\beta = .07$, n.s.; $\beta = -.13$, n.s.; $\beta = .04$, n.s., respectively).

Discussion

The major purpose of this study was to examine whether personality traits are related to the engagement of networking behavior, and whether such relationships are mediated by motivation. It was expected that each of the three personality traits would be directly related to networking behavior and indirectly through an individual's desire to be successful. The three personality variables examined in the present study were internal locus of control, self-efficacy toward networking, and self-monitoring. An individual's desire to be successful was measured as a motivation construct using two scales: Desire for Mobility and Career Planning. Networking behavior was measured in terms of three indices: Increasing One's Visibility, Maintaining Contacts, and Socializing.

Results of the present study supported only Hypothesis 2, which predicted that self-efficacy toward networking would be directly related to networking behavior and indirectly through desire to be successful. This suggests that individuals who feel competent in their ability to network are likely to be motivated to achieve their career goals, which in turn, are more likely to engage in networking behaviors. These individuals can utilize their networking ability to assist them in achieving their desired career outcomes.

The results did not support Hypothesis 1, which stated that an internal locus of control would be directly related to networking behavior and indirectly through desire to be successful. It was thought that individuals high on internal locus of control would likely be motivated to achieve their career goals, which in turn, would likely engage in networking behaviors. If individuals with an internal locus of control believe that they have control over their own actions and efforts, they should be more likely to network in order to reach their long-term goals. The results did not find support for this hypothesis. Although Hypothesis 1 was not fully supported, the results showed that internal locus of control predicted the mediator Career Planning. This suggests that individuals with an internal locus of control are motivated to achieve their career goals, but do not necessarily utilize networking as means of advancing their career. However, internal locus of control was related to Increasing One's Visibility ($r = .22, p < .05$) but not to the other two networking variables. This suggests that individuals high on internal locus of control directly engage in networking behaviors that help them increase their visibility. It

also suggests that these individuals with high internal locus of control do not network as a means of maintaining their contacts or to socialize with others.

The results did not support Hypothesis 3, which stated that self-monitoring would be directly related to networking behavior and indirectly through desire to be successful. It was thought that high self-monitors would likely be motivated to achieve their career goals, which in turn would likely engage in networking behaviors. High self-monitoring was not related to Career Planning. However, upon examining the correlations, self-monitoring was negatively correlated to all three networking variables: Increasing One's Visibility, Maintaining Contacts, and Socializing. It was expected that high self-monitors are likely more likely to network because of their ability to adjust their behavior to different social settings. Instead, the results indicated that low self-monitors are more likely to network than high self-monitors. The results suggest that low self-monitors directly engage in networking behaviors to increasing their visibility, maintain their contacts, and socialize with others. These findings may be due to low self-monitors feeling less worried about what is appropriate behavior in different situations, thus they will be more likely to network with others, since they do not feel the necessity to adjust their behavior accordingly.

Upon examining the mediator variable, Career Planning was a significant predictor of Increasing One's Visibility, Maintaining Contacts, and Socializing. This finding highlights the critical role Career Planning plays in networking. An individual who is strongly oriented toward achieving their career goals is more likely to utilize networking as a means to achieving that end. Desire for Mobility was not included as a

mediator in the regression analyses because it was not correlated to any of the personality variables. The three personality traits were not found to be related to Desire for Mobility. This suggests that Desire for Mobility is not an important consideration for individuals who are motivated to achieve their career goals. These individuals may be more oriented towards planning their career path rather than worrying about trying to move out of their current job or position. These individuals may be satisfied with their current position but still want to have a clear strategy for planning out their careers.

The control variables: degree, hours worked per week, and total years of work experience, were not significant predictors of networking behaviors. This contrasts with the findings from Forret and Dougherty's (2001) study, which found these control variables to be significant predictors of networking behaviors. A possible reason for this finding is that the sample in this study consisted of graduate level students who had relatively less work experience because they were currently pursuing their degrees. This likely limits the amount of hours that the sample participants can work while pursuing their degree.

Overall, the findings provide partial support that personality traits are directly related to networking behaviors and indirectly through desire to be successful. Specifically, self-efficacy toward networking was directly related to networking behaviors and indirectly through Career Planning. Another key finding was that low self-monitors rather than high self-monitors, directly engage in networking behaviors to increase their visibility, maintain contacts, and to socialize with others.

Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations to this study must be acknowledged. The sample utilized graduate level students with the criteria that they had to be working at least part-time to participate in the study. It is not known whether the results from this sample would generalize to a sample of working professionals who likely have work more hours and have more work experience. Also, the sample size of 107 participants was very small, reducing the amount of power in the study. The use of Baron and Kenny's (1986) mediation analyses also contributed to the low power of the study. A comparison of methods to test mediation found this mediation analyses to have low statistical power and low Type I error rates unless the effect or sample size is large (MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, & Sheets, 2002). Low Type I error rates help reduce the risk of finding nonexistent effects. However, low power may result in failure to detect real effects that exist in the population.

Implications

This study has both theoretical and practical implications. Support was found that self-efficacy toward networking predicts networking behavior indirectly through an individual's desire to be successful, as operationalized by the variable Career Planning. Researchers can take this finding and integrate it with the theoretical model proposed by Seibert et al. (2001). Specifically, the significance of self-efficacy toward networking contributes to the theoretical model as a personality factor that predicts networking. This will allow researchers to re-evaluate the theoretical models of social networking. The results also have practical implications for training and selection processes. Having established that self-efficacy toward networking predicts networking, organizations

selecting potential candidates for high-level managerial positions can screen for individuals who have the competence and ability to network as a desired competency. Organizations can also use this knowledge when assigning tasks that require the individual to network with business partners to perform his or her job functions. Although these individuals may have high self-efficacy toward networking, organizations can provide them with additional training to ensure they have all the skills and resources to network effectively.

Conclusion

This study was conducted to examine the possible link between personality and networking behavior. Support for self-efficacy toward networking predicting networking behavior opens up many paths for practitioners to explore other variables in the networking research. The results of this study provide an opportunity for researchers to integrate personality variables in the networking literature. By demonstrating the linkage between personality and networking, organizations can take advantage of these findings in the selection, recruitment, and training of individuals to perform network-oriented job functions. This study also provides suggestions for future researchers interested in the networking research. Future research should focus on replicating this study using working professionals who are not also students to see if the results can be generalized to the working population. Additional variables should be examined to see if there are other personality variables that may predict networking. Since Career Planning mediated the relationship between self-efficacy toward networking and networking behavior,

researchers can also examine other potential mediators that may be involved in predicting networking.

References

- Bandura, A. (1982). Self efficacy mechanisms in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 35, 122-147.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes: The social structure of competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1982). Boundary spanning and individual performance: The impact of self-monitoring. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 124-127.
- Cianni, M. (1994). Self-efficacy, Race, and gender. *Applied HRM Research*, 5, 44-63.
- Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 539-546.
- Forret, M. L. & Dougherty, T. W. (2001). Correlates of networking behavior for managerial and professional employees. *Group & Organization Management*, 283-311.
- Furnham, A. F., & Capon, M. (1983). Social skills and self-monitoring processes. *Personality and individual Differences*, 4, 171-178.
- Gangestad, S., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 530-555.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.
- Gould, S. (1979). Characteristics of career planners in upwardly mobile occupations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 539-550.
- Gould, S., & Penley, L. E. (1984). Career strategies and salary progression: A study of their relationship in a municipal bureaucracy. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, 244-265.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 6: 1360-1380.

- Greenberg, J. (2002). *Managing behavior in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hall, J. (1976). To achieve or not: The manager's choice. *California Management Review*, 18, 5-18.
- House, R. L., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. Presidency: A psychological theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364-396.
- Kaplan, R. E. (1984). Trade Routes: The manager's network of relationships. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12, 37-52.
- Kilduff, M., & Day, D. V. (1994). Do chameleons get ahead? The effects of self-monitoring on Managerial careers, *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1047-1060.
- Kotter, J. P. (1982). *The general managers*. New York: Free Press.
- Liden, R. C., & Mitchell, T. R. (1988). Ingratiation behaviors in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 572-587.
- Luthans, F., Hodgetts, R. M., & Rosenkrantz, S. A. (1988). *Real managers*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Luthans, F., Rosenkrantz, S. A., & Hennessey, H. W. (1985). What do successful managers really do? An observational study of managerial activities. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 21, 255-270.
- Luzzo, D. A., & Ward, B. E. (1995). The relative contributions of self-efficacy and locus of control to the prediction of vocational congruence. *Journal of Career Development*, 21, 307-317.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., Hoffman, J. M., West, S. G., & Sheets, V. (2002). A comparison of methods to test mediation and other intervening variable effects. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 83-104.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 81-90.
- McCann, D., & Hancock, R. D. (1983). Self-monitoring in communicative interactions: Social cognitive consequences of goal-directed message modification. *Journal of*

Experimental Social Psychology, 19, 109-121.

Mehra, A., Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. (2001). The social networks of high and low self-monitors: Implications for workplace performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 121-146.

Michael, J., & Yukl, G. (1993). Managerial level and subunit function as determinants of Networking behavior in organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, 18, 328-351.

Mueller, R. K. (1986). *Corporate networking: Building channels for information and influence*. New York: Free Press.

Myers, D. G. (1999). *Social Psychology* (6th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill College.

Orpen, C. (1992). The work locus of control scale as a predictor of employee attitudes and behaviour; a validity study. *Psychology, A Journal of Human Behavior*, 29, 35-37.

Orpen, C. (1995). Self-efficacy beliefs and job performance among black managers in South Africa. *Psychological Reports*, 76, 649-650.

Raider, H. J., & Burt, R. S. (1996). Boundaryless careers and social capital. In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *The boundaryless career* (p.187). New York: Oxford University Press.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, (Whole No. 609).

Seibert, S. E., & Kraimer, M. L. (2001). The five-factor model of personality and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58 (1), 1-21.

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden. R. C. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44 (2), 219-237.

Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 125-139.

Solberg, V. S., Good, G. E., Nord, D., Holm, C, Hohner, R., Zima, N., Heffernan, M., & Malen, A. (1994). Assessing career search expectations: Development and validation of the career search efficacy scale. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 2, 111-123.

- Sonnenberg, F. K. (1990). The professional (and personal) profits of networking. *Training & Development Journal*, 44, 55-60.
- Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of the Work Locus of Control Scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 335-340.
- Spector, P. E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91 (3), 482-497.
- Spector, P. E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sullivan, S. E. (1999). The changing nature of careers: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 25, 457-484.
- Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tremblay, M., & Roger, A. (1993). Individual, familial, and organizational determinants of career plateau: An empirical study of the determinants of objective and subjective career plateau in a population of Canadian managers. *Group and Organization Management*, 18, 411-435.
- Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1994). Role of protégé personality in receipt of Mentoring and career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 688-702.
- Wanberg, C. R., Kanfer, R., & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of networking intensity among unemployed job seekers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 491-503.
- Wayne, S. J., Liden, R. C., Kraimer, M. L., & Graf, I. K. (1999). The role of human capital, motivation and supervisor sponsorship in predicting career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 577-595.
- Whitely, W., Dougherty, T. W., & Dreher, G. F. (1991). Relationship of career mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers' and professionals' early career progress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 331-351.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G., Wall, S., & Lepsinger, R. (1990). Preliminary report on validation of the managerial practices survey. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Tables

Table 1
Factor Loadings of Networking Items

Item (Abbreviated)	Increasing One's Visibility	Maintaining Contacts	Socializing
Accepted speaking engagements (4)	.79		
Accepted new, highly visible work assignments (3)	.71		
Been on highly visible task forces or committees at work (7)	.64		*.33
Given professional seminars or workshops (17)	.60		
Attended social functions of your organization (2)	.48		*.39
Sent cards, newspaper clippings, faxes, email to keep in touch (12)		.79	
Sent thank you notes or gifts to others who have helped you in your work or career (13)		.64	
Attended professional seminars or workshops (8)	*.49	.59	
Attended meetings of business-related organizations (9)	*.43	.57	
Given business contacts a phone call to keep in touch (1)		.53	
Given out business cards (5)		.50	
Gone out for drinks with others after work (6)			.73
Participated in social gatherings with people from work (11)			.69
Gone to lunch with persons outside the company (14)			.60
Stopped by others' offices to say hello (10)		*.44	.58
Gone to lunch with your current supervisor (16)			.52
Contacted your friends from college (15)			.51
Eigenvalue =	5.19	1.62	1.50
% Variance accounted for	30.52	9.55	8.80
Cumulative % variance	30.52	40.07	48.87

Note. Original item number is in parentheses

*Denotes item loading was removed

Table 2
Factor Loadings of Motivation Items

Item	Career Planning	Desire for Mobility
I know what I need to do to reach my career goals (9)	.90	
I have a plan for my career (8)	.89	
I have a strategy for achieving my career goals (7)	.83	
I have not really decided what my career objectives should be yet (11)	.80	
My career objectives are not clear (10)	.73	
I change my career objectives frequently (12)	.47	
I would feel much better working at my company if I were promoted (3)	.37	
I would be satisfied remaining at my current level at my company for a long time (2)		.86
I would be content remaining at my present level at my company as long as I was continually challenged (1)		.80
I am not interested in moving from my present job to a higher-level position (4)		.78
Moving up the organizational hierarchy at my company is not very important to me (5)		.55
If I'm not promoted from my present job within three to five years, I will be disappointed (6)		.41
Eigenvalue =	4.06	2.35
% Variance accounted for	33.86	19.63
Cumulative % variance	33.86	53.49

Note: Original item number is in parentheses.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (N = 107)

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Degree	1.41 ^a	.49											
2 Hours worked/week	38.10	11.8	.04										
3 Total years work experience	6.90	5.59	.22*	.29*									
4 Locus of Control	4.57 ^b	.53	.15	.11	-.06	.63							
5 Self-efficacy toward networking	6.40 ^c	1.27	.15	.09	-.18	.34**	.87						
6 Self-monitoring	1.48 ^d	.21	-.05	.08	.23*	-.10	-.35**	.69					
7 Career Planning	5.14 ^e	1.17	.15	.11	.06	.25*	.45**	-.13	.87				
8 Desire for Mobility	5.75 ^e	1.14	.03	.03	.07	.06	.10	-.08	.05	.72			
9 Increasing One's Visibility	2.87 ^b	.90	.15	.18	-.01	.22*	.46**	-.21**	.40**	-.14	.76		
10 Maintaining Contacts	2.91 ^b	.91	.08	.00	-.01	-.02	.42**	-.31**	.31**	-.17	.48**	.74	
11 Socializing	3.31 ^b	.89	.08	.16	-.16	.17	.44**	-.27**	.25*	-.08	.47**	.47**	.73

Note. Coefficient alpha indicated on diagonal

^a Degree scale (1 = Bachelors; 2 = Advanced Degree)

^b Measured on scale of 1-6

^c Measured on scale of 0-9

^d Measured on 2-point scale (1 = true, 2 = false)

^e Measured on scale of 1-7

*p < .05

**p < .001

Table 4

Personality as a Predictor of Career Planning			
Personality	Career Planning		
	R ²	SE	β
Locus of control	.06	1.14	.25*
Self-efficacy toward networking	.18	1.06	.42**
Self-monitoring	.01	1.16	-.10

Note: * $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

Table 5
Career Planning as a Predictor of networking

Predictor	Increasing One's Visibility		Maintaining Contacts		Socializing	
	R ²	β	R ²	β	R ²	β
Career Planning	.18	.42**	.12	.35**	.06	.25*

*p<.05

**p<.001

Table 6
Personality as a Predictor of Networking

Predictors	Networking Measures								
	Increasing One's Visibility			Maintaining Contacts			Socializing		
	R ²	SE	β	R ²	SE	β	R ²	SE	β
Locus of Control		.16	.07		.16	-.13		.16	.04
Self-efficacy toward networking		.07	.39**		.07	.43**		.07	.39**
Self-monitoring	.19**	.41	-.04	.22**	.40	-.14	.20**	.40	-.10

**p< .001

Table 7
Personality as a Predictor of Networking, Controlling for Mediator

Predictor variables	Networking Measures								
	Increasing One's Visibility		Maintaining Contacts		Socializing				
	R ²	R ² change	SE	β	R ²	R ² change	SE	β	
Step 1:									
Career Planning		.18**	.07	.42**	.12**	.07	.34**	.06*	.07 .24*
Step 2:									
Locus of control			.16	.05		.16	-.20		.16 .02
Self-efficacy toward networking			.08	.30*		.07	.31*		.08 .35*
Self-monitoring	.28	.10*	.39	-.06	.27	.15**	.39	-.18	.21 .15* .40 -.12

*p< .05

**p< .001