DUAL-SYSTEMS PERSPECTIVE ON TURNOVER TYPES AND DESTINATION CHOICES

By

GREGORY ALLEN MILLER

Bachelor of Science in Operations Management
DeVry Institute of Technology
Addison, Illinois
1997

Master of Business Administration
Keller Graduate School of Management
Lincolnshire, Illinois
1998

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 2015

DUAL-SYSTEMS PERSPECTIVE ON TURNOVER TYPES

AND DESTINATION CHOICES

Dissertation Approved:

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Aaron Hill

Committee Member: Dr. Bryan Edwards

Committee Member: Dr. Jason Ridge

Outside Committee Member: Dr. Ramesh Sharda

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would never have been able to finish my dissertation without the guidance of my committee members and support from my family and wife.

I want to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Aaron Hill, for his excellent guidance, extraordinary patience, and tireless effort. Best of all, Dr. Hill made this an enjoyable experience and became one of my very best friends during this process.

I especially want to thank my wife, Catie, for her support and encouragement during this achievement. I would never have been able to start much less finish without having her as my best friend and partner in life.

Name: GREGORY ALLEN MILLER

Date of Degree: JULY, 2015

Title of Study: DUAL-SYSTEMS PERSPECTIVE ON TURNOVER TYPES AND DESTINATION CHOICES

Major Field: BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Abstract:

This dissertation adopts a dual-systems perspective to investigate how impulsivity and self-control relate to turnover types and destination choices. The personality traits of impulsivity and self-control are directly tested empirically for their relationship with various turnover types and destination choices, and their respective roles are identified. An archival database is used in this dissertation to circumvent the participant bias that exists with previous turnover research. Persons identified as high on self-control, regardless of their level of impulsivity, are shown to have a significant impact on their ability to retain employment. The findings call into question the belief that self-control and impulsivity exist on the same continuum.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Dissertation Purpose and Intended Contributions 2

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 5

An Overview of Trait Models of Personality 5
An Overview of Self-Control 7
An Overview of Impulsivity 8
An Overview of the Dual-Systems Perspective 10
An Overview of Turnover Types and Destination Choices 13

III. HYPOTHESES 19

Did Not Turnover 19
Involuntary Turnover 21
Voluntary Turnover Destination – Attain Another Job Prior to Exit 22
Voluntary Turnover Destination – Non-Work or No Option 23

IV. METHODS 25

Dependent Variable Measures 26
Did Not Turnover 26
Involuntary Turnover 26
Voluntary Turnover Destination – Attain Another Job Prior to Exit 27
Voluntary Turnover Destination – Non-Work or No Option 28
Independent Variable Measures 29
Cross-Validation Measure 30

V. ANALYSIS 33

Tests of Hypotheses 1a and 1b 34
Tests of Hypotheses 2a and 2b 36
Tests of Hypotheses 3a and 3b as well as 4a and 4b 36
Additional Tests of Hypotheses 2a through 4b 39
Bivariate Probit Model Testing of Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4 42

VI. CONCLUSIONS 46

Research Contributions 46
Harrison Assessment Measures 50
Future Research 50
Improving the Measurement 50
Terminations 51
The Sample 51
Conclusion 51

REFERENCES 53

APPENDIX 59

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Cross-Validation Test/Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix 32

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix 33

Table 3. Logistic Regression on Did Not Turnover.....35

Table 4. Logistic Regression on Involuntary Termination 37

Table 5. Logistic Regression on Attain Another Job.....38

Table 6. Multinomial Logistic Regression on Attain Another Job 39

Table 7. Multinomial Logistic Regression on Turnover Destinations 41

Table 8. Bivariate Probit Regression Did Not Turnover & Involuntary Turnover 43

Table 9. Bivariate Probit Regression Did Not Turnover & Resigned (VT) 44

Table 10. Bivariate Probit Regression Involuntary Turnover & Resigned (VT) 45

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A recent review by Hom, Mitchell, Lee, and Griffeth (2012: 831) highlights the notion that "how and why incumbents vacate jobs has captivated scholars and practitioners alike." Although a wealth of insights has been generated by turnover research, recent reviews state that extant theoretical and practical knowledge is limited in a number of ways. In particular, there is room for further investigation into how dispositional traits affect turnover (Zimmerman, 2008); our understanding is often limited by difficulty in differentiating the types of turnover (i.e., voluntary versus involuntary; Hom et al. 2012). The lack of understanding of the role that dispositional traits play in determining turnover, and more specifically types of turnover, is problematic in multiple ways. For example, a lack of *a priori* understanding of how dispositional traits impact turnover hinders our ability to use dispositional traits in the hiring process. Further, treating all turnovers alike assumes that all individuals leaving are homogenous outcomes. That is, regarding all observations of employees leaving their positions equally obscures differences between various types of voluntary turnover, such as opportunities for promotion, career changes, or lifestyle pursuits (i.e., retirement, education, parenting) or involuntary turnover (e.g., performance-based firing versus organizational right-sizing).

Dissertation Purpose and Intended Contributions

The purpose of this dissertation is to address the void in our understanding of dispositional traits and different types of turnover. Specifically, I adopt a dual-systems perspective (Hofmann, Friese, Strack 2009) to investigate the role of impulsivity and self-control on a more accurate typology of turnover, turnover type and destination (TTD). The focal constructs are defined as follows: a) impulsivity is defined as "actions that appear poorly conceived, prematurely expressed, unduly risky, or inappropriate to the situation and that often result in undesirable consequences" (Daruna & Barnes, 1993: 23); b) self-control is defined as "the exertion of control over the self by the self" (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000: 247); and c) TTD, which I will elaborate upon further in Chapter 2, is defined by differentiating between voluntary and involuntary turnover and their respective exit destinations (e.g., an involuntary exit as a result of firing versus downsizing are not the same; a voluntary exit to obtain an equal or lateral job versus promotion are also not equal; Hom et al., 2012).

Based on the unfolding model of turnover, we know that some individuals can be considered "impulsive quitters" (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). Ghiselli (1974) termed this disposition the "Hobo Syndrome." However, dual-systems theories of human behavior suggest that while individuals have different proclivities for impulsive behavior, actions are ultimately driven by both impulsive tendencies on one hand and self-control on the other. I take this dual-systems perspective to investigate the role of impulsivity and self-control in individual turnover decisions. A direct test of the relationship between the dual-systems perspective of impulsivity and self-control on turnover will provide new learning regarding the role of these important traits on individual behavioral outcomes and add to our knowledge of turnover. Specifically, I argue that impulsive people have a tendency to engage in behaviors that are directed by environmental stimuli, which often create spontaneous or

reactive TTD employment decisions. Further, I argue that people with high levels of self-control have the capacity to change and adapt to their surroundings, which produces an ability to better fit with the world around them (Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004), thus creating less spontaneous and reactive and more thoughtful TTD employment decisions.

In this dissertation, I intend to contribute to theory and practice alike in multiple ways. First, this research answers calls to expand the study of the role of personality on turnover (e.g., Hogan & Holland, 2003; Zimmerman, 2008) by providing a direct test of both impulsivity and self-control. Second, I will expand theoretical knowledge regarding impulsivity as a dispositional predictor of individual behavioral outcomes while also considering the role of self-control in a similar manner, addressing calls to extend the dual-systems perspective (Hofmann et al., 2009). Third, I offer an operationalization of TTD, answering calls to take a more nuanced view of turnover measurement (Hom et al., 2012). The utilization of TTD also offers a guide for future researchers. Finally, an understanding of the role of the dual-systems perspective in TTD may prove useful for managers in hiring. Specifically, if managers know the effect of these traits, they can screen more effectively during the hiring process (e.g., if managers know impulsive people are more likely to quit spontaneously or without notice, they may chose not to hire impulsive people). Such a mechanism would also allow managers to develop training and tracking processes to create greater productivity in light of individuals' natural tendencies toward impulsivity and self-control.

The sample used in this study is a longitudinal database collected pre-hire from a national, Midwestern-based technical services organization, which I refer to as The Company. The sample includes 155 employees from the period October, 2009 to January,

2015. Before being hired, each employee completed a personality trait test that was developed using the Harrison Assessment. Each employee also had a matched set of annual performance evaluations. Of the original 155 employees, 83 were still employed by The Company at the end of the measured period (January, 2015). Each of the 72 that turned over completed exit interviews that included the exact turnover type (e.g., voluntary or involuntary) and the destination choice (e.g., attain another job or not). A problem with previous turnover research has been having access to long-term samples of people who turnover. This problem is circumvented through the use of an archival database.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this dissertation, I develop arguments that combine elements of impulsivity and self-control from a dual-systems perspective on turnover types and destinations (TTD). Prior to creating those arguments, I provide a review of the trait models of personality, self-control, impulsivity, dual-systems perspective, and TTD. From a literature perspective, trait models of personality are covered first, self-control is second, impulsivity is third, the dual-systems perspective is fourth, and TTD is fifth. Hypothesis development follows the literature review.

An Overview of Trait Models of Personality

In the personality assessment domain, several approaches emphasize the importance and persistence of enduring behavioral characteristics (Kanfer & Karoly, 1972). The best-known approach to defining personality and the role that self-control (which is sometimes referred to as constraint or restraint) and impulsivity play is perhaps provided by the Big Five, or Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality (Goldberg, 1981; Digman, 1990; McCrae & John, 1992; Wiggins, 1996; McCrae & Costa, 1997; Carver, 2005). The Big Five Model defines broad personality traits (conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness, and extraversion) with two factors that relate to self-control and impulsivity: conscientiousness and agreeableness.

Conscientiousness is defined as the tendency for an individual to be very deliberate in planning and to show self-discipline toward achievement on the upper end of the scale versus engaging in spontaneous and unorganized behavior at the lower end. Individuals who score low on conscientiousness tend to have a laid back attitude, are less driven to succeed, and are less goal oriented. Conscientiousness reflects the extent to which an individual shows restraint from haphazard impulses and predicts specific behaviors that reflect the relationship between self-control and impulsiveness. The extent to which people consider future consequences in choosing their actions is strongly related to their degree of conscientiousness (Strathman, Gleicher, & Boninger, 1994). Individuals exhibiting high conscientiousness prefer to think before acting and also use negotiation as a strategy to resolve conflict (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001). Conscientious individuals are also seen as having a high need for achievement and commitment to work (Costa, McCrae, & Dye, 1991).

Agreeableness is another trait from the Big Five Model that is important to differentiate when addressing impulsivity and self-control. Agreeableness reflects an individual's degree of concern with maintaining relationships. On the upper end of the scale, agreeableness is defined by social harmony and inhibition of negative feelings (Hogan, Johnson, & Briggs, 1997) versus selfish antagonism and a general unconcern for the well-being of others at the low end of the scale (Digman, 1990). Individuals who score high on agreeableness tend to think of others as being honest and trustworthy. Agreeableness seems to have relevance when considering impulsive behavior versus constraint; impulsive behavior is self-interested and shows a disagreeable quality of placing self above getting along with others (Carver, 2005). Yet, agreeable people may also act impulsively or exhibit low self-control but do so in a considerate way; hence, agreeableness is different from both impulsivity and self-control.

An Overview of Self-Control

Self-control is an individual's ability to control desires, emotions, and behaviors in response to the external environment and its stimuli, or *"*the exertion of control over the self by the self" (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000: 247). It is also a critical element in one's behavior that enables an individual to control impulses that would otherwise prove to have a negative impact for the individual. These behaviors are related to the way individuals control and direct their actions to optimize their long-term best interests (Kanfer & Karoly, 1972; Mischel, 1996; Barkley, 1997). They occur when individuals attempt to alter their behavioral patterns to prevent or inhibit the immediate responses that they would normally have. Thus, when individuals make the decision to override impulses, delay gratification, and inhibit desires, they are exerting self-control (Hayes, Gifford, & Ruckstuhl, 1996).

The act of self-control involves controlling, overriding, or inhibiting competing urges, behaviors, or desires (Shallice & Burgess, 1993; Baumeister, Heatherton, & Tice, 1994; Barkley, 1997). Solving complex problems may require an individual to call on behaviors that can be difficult and take effort but that require minimal overriding or inhibiting of urges, behaviors, desires, or emotions (e.g., creating a business plan or budget). Not all difficult behaviors require self-control (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000).

Muraven and Baumeister (2000) note that "self-control is also critical to the influential distinction between automatic and controlled processes" (e.g., Shiffrin & Schneider, 1977; Hasher & Zacks, 1979; Bargh, 1994). Automatic processes are efficient, whereas controlled processes are costly in terms of effort. Research provides evidence that the majority of behaviors occur automatically, with minimal effort or thought. However, an important minority of behaviors requires that individuals implement different responses, resulting in the

need to override their initial impulses. The amount of exertion and personal resources required to overcome initial responses is unclear. It does seem likely that a dual system of factors interact (e.g., self-control and impulse), which may be dependent on the individual's established pattern of behavior and level of self-control. For some individuals, the resource may be unlimited (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000).

Fujita, Trope, and Liberman (2006) state that researchers are increasingly interested in the idea of self-control, noting a particular interest in why individuals fail to do what they desire when they possess both the skills and expertise as well as the opportunity to accomplish the goal. Baumeister, Heatherton, and Tice (1994) suggest that self-control lies in the ability to consciously inhibit undesirable automatic reactions to stimuli. For example, a person who is trying to stop drinking must consciously fight the urge to have a drink while with friends drinking at a bar.

An Overview of Impulsivity

For the purpose of this research, I will define impulsivity as a personality trait that covers a "wide range of actions that are poorly conceived, prematurely expressed, unduly risky, or inappropriate to the situation and that often result in undesirable outcomes" (Evenden, 1999: 348). When I consider the meaning of impulsive behavior, I am referencing very specific impulses that are activated by the environment (e.g., the desire for a cold drink on a hot day) (Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996).

Impulses are also driven by hedonic reactions to stimuli based on patterns imprinted on the brain (e.g., Loewenstein, 1996; Metcalfe & Mischel, 1999). Impulses are directed toward immediate gratification and greatly influenced by time and distance. As gratification is delayed, the incentive for impulsive behavior diminishes (Ainslie, 1975). Impulses often

occur without individuals' knowledge that they are acting impulsively (e.g., finishing a six-pack of beer while watching a football game). In cases where the execution is met without resistance, individuals may not be consciously aware of their actions. Following our impulses is both a simple and even natural act. As a result, it can also be difficult to define what exactly is socially acceptable impulsive behavior. This can vary greatly depending on the culture and context (Evenden, 1999; Hofmann, Friese, & Strack, 2009).

Researchers on human personality traits provide evidence that impulsivity is made up of several different factors, which can explain why there is little agreement as to what actually constitutes impulsivity (Evenden, 1999). Some researchers consider impulsivity to be a multidimensional trait (Patton & Stanford, 1995), while others consider it to be much more one dimensional (Schalling, 1978). Researchers also differ regarding what dimensions make up impulsivity (e.g., functional versus dysfunctional; Dickman, 1990). Some variation of impulsivity can be found in every significant model of personality (Miller, Flory, Lynam, & Leukefeld, 2003). It is unclear whether impulsivity-related constructs that include control, disinhibition, excitement seeking, novelty seeking, and self-discipline should be considered sub-types of impulsivity; they may simply be unique dispositional traits (Depue & Collins, 1999; Magid & Colder, 2007).

Whiteside and Lynam (2001) note that impulsivity suffers from both the "jingle" and "jangle" fallacies (Block, 1995).

> *The jingle fallacy refers to situations in which two constructs with equivalent labels are in reality quite different; in the present instance, measures labeled impulsivity may reject constructs as diverse as a short attention span and a tendency to participate in risky behavior. On the other hand, the jangle fallacy refers to situations*

in which two constructs with different labels are actually the same; for example, Tellegen's control (Tellegen, 1982) and Zuckerman's disinhibition (Zuckerman, 1994) scales seem to measure similar constructs despite bearing different labels (Whiteside & Lynam, 2001: 670).

Reynolds, Ortengren, and Richards (2006) note that impulsivity is defined as an inability to wait and a tendency to act without thinking while having an insensitivity to the consequences of behavior. They also suggest that impulsivity is strongly linked to substance abuse and various other sensation-seeking behaviors. Wallace, Newman, and Bachorowski (1991) consider that maladaptive behaviors resemble a fundamental similarity with individuals who suffer from anxiety disorders. In either case, the concept of response modulation is central to the role of impulsive behaviors (McCleary, 1966).

I take the position here that impulsivity-related constructs should be considered sub-types of impulsivity despite the jingle and jangle fallacies. My reasoning is that all impulsive behaviors that determine outcomes relating to ill-conceived or short-term reactions to environmental stimuli resulting in turnover should be considered impulsivity.

An Overview of the Dual-Systems Perspective

Although individuals have the ability to create and act on planned behavior, they can also act impulsively. Individuals are often caught in a tug of war between choosing self-control behaviors or following their hedonic impulses (Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996; Carver, 2005). To maximize benefit and pursue longer term goals, one must use self-control; everyday self-control requires resisting hedonic impulses. Researchers have taken a dual-systems perspective on the subject, providing evidence that very different systems may ultimately be responsible for self-controlled versus impulsive behavior. This dual-systems

perspective integrates both behaviors and the situational and boundary conditions that may determine which system will prove dominant (Hofmann, Friese, & Strack, 2009).

One of the most important traits individuals may have is the capacity to alter their behavior by removing themselves from the immediate effects of direct stimuli that drive hedonic impulses. Self-regulation is a complex process with multiple dimensions that can break down in many different ways. As a result, it is very difficult to predict or determine the exact chain of events that causes self-regulation failure in an individual (Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996).

A fundamental assumption regarding human social behavior is that it is controlled by two systems that interact and are based on different operating principles. The first is the reflective system, which makes behavioral decisions based on facts, values, and social norms. The second is the impulsive system, which determines behavioral decisions based on motivation and connections between memories formed by shared emotions, sensations, cognitions, and auditory materials.

Human beings are generally described as “rational animals" insomuch as they engage in behaviors that are considered beneficial to their stated goals and objectives while acting within their value structures. But individuals do not always act in this way; hence, in certain situations individuals may act contrary to their value systems.There are several strategies that account for this phenomenon. The first strategy assumes a lack of knowledge on the part of the individual. This assumes that individuals act accordingly if they know what action is in their best interest. The second strategy assumes that a behavior may occur mindlessly or automatically (Langer, Blank, & Chanowitz, 1978), which suggests that patterned responses are to blame for the phenomenon. The third strategy is to understand human behavior as a

function of hedonistic impulses. These basic impulses include hunger, thirst, or reproduction. The strength of these impulses may override considerations of utility and drive behaviors requiring immediate gratification. Dual-process theories lead to the conclusion that an individual's behavior is driven by more than a single underlying process. Dual-process models do not necessarily provide alternatives to rational models of human behavior, nor do they provide evidence for the consequences of the behaviors that they describe (Strack & Deutsch, 2004). Researchers observe the behavioral dimension of impulse versus constraint, which are important aspects of human behavior. Many theories in personality psychology address these traits (Carver & Scheier, 2004). Theories range from cognitive self-regulation models to trait and temperament (Carver, 2005).

Smith and DeCoster (2000) provide evidence that people use different process strategies when solving logical problems, evaluating persuasive arguments, and making value judgments regarding other people. They conclude that people use two separate memory systems to process information, one very slow and deliberate and the other for rapid learning. Wastell (2014) claims that neither side has demonstrated the superiority of its position (Kruglanski & Gigerenzer, 2011). Wastell introduces complex emergence modularity theory, which asserts that our reasoning is a product of our interaction with the environment. His theory accepts the notion that the human mind is subject to errors and biases but does not find the mind to be irrational. Wastell's theory does not attend to the fact that if reasoning is a product of the environment and impulsive persons lack the ability to disinhibit behavior, then there may be a dual-systems type dyadic initiation, either conscious or unconscious, by which to explain an individual's ability (or lack there of) to redirect focus from unproductive stimuli.

An Overview of Turnover Types and Destination Choices

Turnover has been studied by both scholars and practitioners alike for the past half-century. Turnover occurs when an employee leaves an organization and has to be replaced. Current turnover research is focused on either involuntary or voluntary turnover as well as avoidable or unavoidable turnover (Abelson, 1987), typically using the lenses of behavior motivated by the employee's choice and the subsequent consequences for the organization (Campion, 1991). Recently, scholars have focused on adding insight to our understanding of turnover by studying the causes and consequences of a number of factors, including collective turnover (i.e., employee turnover at unit and organizational levels; Heavey & Holwerda, 2013), predictor strengths of turnover antecedents (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000), employee turnover as a predictor of firm performance (Hancock, Allen, & Bosco, 2013; Park & Shaw 2013), proximal withdrawal states as a reason for employees quitting or staying. These studies focus on both turnover type and destination choices (i.e., another job, full-time parenting) and have recently expanded the measurable turnover criteria (Hom et al., 2012). TTD expands upon our knowledge of turnover by differentiating between voluntary and involuntary turnover types and their respective exit destinations. (Involuntary exit as a result of firing and downsizing are not the same; voluntary exit to obtain an equal or lateral job is not equal to promotion; Hom et al. 2012). Specifically, TTD develops a typology of turnover that considers the differences between turnover types (voluntary and involuntary) and destinations such as attaining another job (including whether the job is more, equally, or less desirable) or quitting without lining up an alternative job. In this way, Hom et al. (2012) take the view that past approaches to researching turnover have been limited because of limited access to accurate data discriminating between voluntary versus involuntary exits and

post-employment destination choices and reasons. For example, a firm may classify an employee who leaves voluntarily as a lay-off so that the employee can receive social insurance benefits, which can be biased based on various demographic factors such as gender and race (Latimer, 2003). Hom et al. (2012) note that a literature review identifies shortcomings of prevailing turnover dimensions, extending arguments from other researchers who are focused on finding new predictors of turnover besides quit intentions and attitudes (e.g., O'Reilly, 1991; Holtom, Mitchell, & Lee, 2008). For firms, turnovers incur financial costs (as recruiting and training replacements cost from 90% to 200% of annual pay; Allen, Bryant, & Vardaman, 2010) and disrupt operations (Ton & Huckman, 2008; Hom et al., 2012). The majority of scholarly research has focused on job attitudes and accessibility (Maertz & Campion, 1998). Some scholars studied personality traits (Zimmerman, 2008), the hobo syndrome (Woo, 2011), cognitive ability (Maltarich, Nyberg, & Reilly, 2010), or person-job fit as predictors (Chatman, 1989).

March-Simon models view organizations as systems of interrelated social behaviors that result from stimuli influenced by the processes of the firm (Cyert & March, 1963). Despite these and other sophisticated models, much of what drives turnover (motivations and decision processes) remains unexplained (Maertz & Campion, 2004). Employees exit for many reasons other than dissatisfaction with current employers or jobs elsewhere (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Maertz & Campion, 1998) and explanations remain convoluted and incomplete. Much of this confusion results from the lack of access to accurate data regarding turnover type and destination choice at exit. To account for confusion regarding job exits and reasons for quitting, Lee and Mitchell (1994) put forward the “unfolding model” of turnover. They conclude that exiting employees follow many different turnover paths that may be

activated by “shocks” such as pregnancies or spousal relocations (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Hom et al., 2012). Such models note that three distinct forces embed incumbents: their fit, which depends on how closely they match the job or community; their links to their work and outside ties; and their sacrifices, which include both on-the-job and off-the-job benefits they surrender upon exiting (Holtom, Mitchell, & Lee, 2008). Job embeddedness is more remotely related to turnover than is quit intention. Although much is known about turnover, turnover types and destinations add insight into both how people leave and what people do after they leave a job. The list of these possible destinations is extensive and is often ignored by researchers. There are also many unexamined reasons for staying in a job. The ways in which both scholars and practitioners define and measure turnover (voluntary versus involuntary, avoidable versus unavoidable) do not appropriately identify the various types of staying or leaving. As a result of this under-identification, it is difficult to understand why people either stay or exit a job (Campion, 1991; Griffeth & Hom, 2001).

Voluntary turnover occurs when employee paid employee decides to leave the organization (Griffeth & Hom, 1995). In contrast, involuntary turnover occurs when the employer asks an employee to leave, which may happen for any number of reasons, such as poor performance or a reduction in force. We routinely distinguish between voluntary and involuntary turnover, though we tend to focus more on voluntary (Campion, 1991; Hom et al., 2012). Voluntarily turnover is an important element, but operationalizing this dimension poses problems. Post-employment exit interviews may yield incomplete information that omits decisive factors for understanding domain criterion. Employers often categorize involuntary exits as dismissals, layoffs, retirements, disability, and death (Abelson, 1987) and treat voluntary exits as attrition outside those categories (Salamin & Hom, 2005; Hom,

2011). When firms fail to accurately categorize involuntary quits, some such cases may end up being classified as voluntary by default. The contamination of criteria is exacerbated by employers falsifying records to protect the reputation of involuntary exits (Campion, 1991, Hom et al., 2012). Some researchers suggest that more accurate turnover criteria can be gathered from follow-up interviews with leavers, or those who exit, to learn the true destination behind their exits. Although this may be difficult to operationalize, this information could improve turnover predictions (Barrick & Zimmerman, 2005).

With regard to employee departures, researchers and practitioners may make false assumptions about employee-initiated turnover. For example, suppose they assume that leaving was something the employee desired. They may also assume that the leaver had either a likely job prospect or an actual job offer. Both assumptions are often false, however, as research provides evidence that up to half of all employee who quit do so without another job in hand (Mattila, 1974). Research also indicates that employees often exit for reasons that feel slightly self-initiated. This suggests that I should recognize criteria that employee-initiated exits vary in voluntariness and include firm-mandated exits (Hom et al., 2012).

Most organizations are focused on measuring turnover based on avoidability and voluntariness, which limits the extent to which they pose questions and accumulate data during exit interviews (Hom et al., 2012). Commenting on the work of Hom et al., Bergman, Payne, and Boswell (2012), note that exiting employees may not know precisely where they will end up until after they leave. Rather than depending exclusively on data from exit interviews, they call for researchers to create temporal databases by expanding the time during which they collect information regarding destination. The TTD is a useful framework for doing this as it explicitly incorporates typologies of both voluntary and involuntary

turnover as well as post-turnover destinations based upon three levels: first, whether an individual turned over (i.e., did the person stay employed or exit the firm); second, the type of turnover — involuntary or voluntary; and third, the destination post-exit (e.g., did the individual accept another job).

For the first level of exit/non-exit, Hom et al. (2012) define those employees who did not turnover as "Stayers" and those that did turnover as "Leavers." I use the phrase "Did Not Turnover" for simplicity when referring to Stayers. Employees who do turnover (i.e., the Leavers) can be classified based upon a second-level regarding the type of turnover — involuntary or voluntary. Involuntary exits are those initiated by the firm, whereas voluntary are initiated by the Leaver and are often referred to as a resignation. For the third-level of detail, Hom and colleagues differentiate based upon the destination of those who turnover. Involuntary exit destinations include three possible outcomes: No Option, Retirement Destinations (forced avocations), and Attain Another Job via practices such as outplacement or bridge retirements. For this research model, I consider all involuntary outcomes as homogenous. I do so because this study is focused on determining the role of impulsivity and self-control in turnover and the choice of post-involuntary exit destination may be based upon a host of other factors outside the scope of this study (e.g., human capital). Voluntary exits are delineated with "Attain Another Job" (which may include Unpaid Employment) and "Non-work/No Option." I utilized these variables in the same way for the model although they may be viewed as the reverse of each other. Thus, a final typology of the TTD may be viewed as follows, and I follow this typology for hypotheses development.

1. Did not Turnover (also referred to as "Stayers")
2. Turnover (also referred to as "Leavers")

a. Involuntary Exit

b. Voluntary Exit (also referred to as “Resignations”)

    i. Attain Another Job

    ii. Non-Work or No Option

CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES

In this chapter, I develop hypotheses that argue that there is a direct relationship between an individual's impulsivity and self-control and their employment status, turnover type (voluntary versus involuntary), and their exit destination when voluntary. I develop a set of hypotheses to create understanding of the potential drivers from a dual-systems perspective by examining this direct relationship and expanded criteria of individual turnover type and exit destination. A literature review suggests that research has narrowly focused on voluntary turnover with the intent to leave as the primary criterion influencing the exit. I predict that by examining more robust criteria using the TTD, I will find that the dual-systems of impulsivity and self-control drive turnover versus non-turnover (Hypothesis 1). I also predict that the dual-systems of impulsivity and self-control directly affect voluntary versus involuntary turnover outcomes (Hypothesis 2) and the destinations of those who turnover voluntarily (Hypotheses 3 and 4).

Did Not Turnover

During various times in his/her career, an employee may face a lack of expected challenges and opportunities for growth, find dissatisfaction with the scope of the job, or have conflict with management. Individuals must manage the challenges of

appropriate reaction to opportunities and satisfaction (or lack of) with their current employment. During the challenging times, utilizing self-control and avoiding immediate and impulsive feelings and reactions to environmental stimuli is critical to success and ultimately retaining employment.

I hypothesize that individuals with higher levels of self-control manage the expected social norms and challenges of the environment and retain employment in their current firms (i.e., they will be Stayers). Individuals with a tendency toward self-control will be able to control their behaviors and direct their attention away from impulsive urges that are not in their long-term employment benefit. These individuals are valued by organizations and as a result will be able to retain employment and avoid negative turnover outcomes.

I hypothesize that those individuals who have higher scores for impulsive behavior will not be able to direct their actions in a way that will enable them to manage through dissatisfaction and conflict with management. Thus they will not be able to retain employment. Individuals with tendencies toward impulsivity lack the critical behavioral elements that enable them to control actions that cause negative consequences. Thus, the ability for impulsive individuals to direct their actions toward the longer-term benefit of retained employment seems unlikely. Their inability to alter established behavioral patterns to inhibit immediate response will create conflict with organizations and result in turnover outcomes.

Hypothesis 1a: Impulsivity will be negatively related to remaining employed. That is, more impulsive employees are less likely to remain employed.

Hypothesis 1b: Self-control will have a positive relationship with remaining employed. That is, employees with more self-control are more likely to remain employed.

Involuntary Turnover

Individuals who turnover can leave either voluntarily or involuntarily. Involuntary turnover has a very high cost to organizations, possibly including needing temporary employees and paying for overtime, administrative costs, separation costs, unemployment, etc. Keeping employees engaged, healthy, safe, satisfied, and productive is a constant concern of management. For some employees, a lack of career challenges and opportunities for growth, dissatisfaction with the scope of the job, and conflict with management are predictors of high turnover. With most jobs — and with most aspects of life — individuals must manage the balance required as opportunities and satisfaction with current employment may be sporadic. During the challenging times, utilizing self-control and avoiding immediate and impulsive feelings and reactions to environmental stimuli is critical to success and ultimately retaining employment.

I hypothesize those individuals with higher scores for self-control manage and modify the behaviors that would cause them to be fired from their jobs. Individuals with a tendency toward self-control have the ability to take a longer-term view of any current unsatisfactory conditions and use that information to modify their reactions until they reach a better career utility decision. While the use of self-control in these individuals may ultimately end in an exit from current employment, the result is likely to be determined by the employee rather than the employer. I hypothesize that those individuals with higher scores for impulsive behavior will not be able to direct their actions in a way that enables them to manage through

dissatisfaction and conflict with management. Individuals with a tendency toward impulsive behaviors will be much more likely to express their feelings prematurely, which would potentially create greater conflict with their employers, thus initiating involuntary turnover outcomes. Impulsive individuals lack the ability to modify their reactions to direct environmental stimuli, which can often be interpreted as irrational response, putting an individual at risk for involuntary termination in many organizations.

Hypothesis 2a: Impulsivity will have a positive relationship with involuntary termination. That is, more impulsive employees are more likely to turnover involuntarily.

Hypothesis 2b: Self-control will have a negative relationship with involuntary termination. That is, employees with more self-control are less likely to turnover involuntarily.

Voluntary Turnover Destination – Attain Another Job Prior to Exit

If individuals turnover and they do not do so involuntarily, that means they leave voluntarily — often referred to as resigning. There are many differences in the destinations of those employees that voluntarily leave organizations. For example, research has shown that only about half of the individuals leaving a job have another job in hand (Mattila, 1974). I hypothesize that those individuals who have the awareness and determination to line up a new job prior to exiting have higher scores for self-control and lower scores for impulse behavior. Individuals who engage in responsible, organized, and persistent behavior at work require higher levels of self-control and also have the ability to focus on behaviors that optimize their long-term career utility. One way to optimize career utility is to ensure they have a continuous job resource. People who have a greater tendency toward impulsivity tend

to engage in actions that are poorly conceived, risky, or inappropriate in their job situations. Thus their behavior will result in a discontinuous job resource situation. People with a tendency toward impulsive behavior will generally not have another job resource lined up prior to quitting. In contrast, individuals with greater degree of self-control will engage in more deliberate, thoughful actions such that they will generally have another job lined up prior to quitting.

Hypothesis 3a: Impulsivity will have a negative relationship with having attained another job prior to initiating an exit from current employment. That is, more impulsive employees are less likely to have attained another job prior to voluntary exit.

Hypothesis 3b: Self-control will have a positive relationship with having attained another job prior to initiating an exit from current employment. That is, employees with more self-control are more likely to have attained another job prior to voluntary exit.

Voluntary Turnover Destination – Non-Work or No Option

Some individuals voluntarily initiate an exit from their current jobs without attaining a new job resource and thus fall into the destination category of non-working and no job resource option. This option is essentially the reverse of attaining another job yet I hypothesize this outcome to fully develop the TTD. As with Hypotheses 3a and 3b, I argue that the destination of non-work or no option will be filled with those individuals having a tendency toward impulsive behavior — they apparently quit without having the necessary self-control to consider the longer-term benefit of remaining employed.

Individuals with a tendency toward self-control consider the longer-term consequences of their actions, which include all facets of optimizing revenues from job resource opportunities. These include current job (not quitting prior to obtaining a new job resource), attaining another job that maximizes career utility, being unemployed while receiving unemployment benefits, and weighing the benefits of terminating employment for the purpose of creating or pursuing another option post-exit. People with a tendency toward impulsive behavior may act capriciously, triggering consequences that reduce their attractiveness in the market when pursuing other job resource options. As a result, impulsive individuals have a lesser opportunity for attaining new work and other options.

Hypothesis 4a: Impulsivity will have a positive relationship with <u>not</u> having attained a new job resource after initiating an exit from current employment. That is, more impulsive employees are more likely to have no work lined up prior to voluntary exit.

Hypothesis 4b: Self-control will have a negative relationship with <u>not</u> having attained a new job resource after initiating an exit from current employment. That is, employees with more self-control are less likely to have no work lined up prior to voluntary exit.

CHAPTER IV

METHODS

The sample used in this study is a longitudinal database collected pre-hire from a national, Midwestern-based technical services organization. The sample includes 155individuals who were employed from the period October, 2009 – January, 2015. Each employee, pre-hire, completed a personality trait test based on the Harrison Assessment. Each employee also has a matched set of annual performance evaluations. Of the original 155 employees, 83 were still employed by The Company at the end of the measured period (January, 2015) and thus did not turnover, while 72 left the organization during the sample period. Each of the72 individuals that turned over a) was divided into either involuntary or voluntary exits by the organization; and b) completed exit interviews that included the exact turnover type and destination choice. Involuntary exits were defined by the organization as being terminated at the initiation of the organization, whereas voluntary exits were defined as being initiated by the employee. A problem with previous turnover research is access to long-term samples of people who turnover. I circumvent this problem by using an archival database.

Another problem with prior literature is that researchers have had to focus on predictors (since there was no post-exit access to employees) such as measurement of withdrawal states, employee self-reported intentions to quit or stay, biased or poorly constructed exit interviews, inter-organizational collection of turnover data, and — perhaps most importantly — a lack of pre-hire information on personality traits to understand the predisposition of employee turnover intentions before they actively attempt to accomplish their employment goal (e.g., stay or leave; Allen, Weeks, & Moffitt, 2005). I chose this sample because it explicates the deficiencies of samples in prior research.

Dependent Variable Measures

Did Not Turnover

The variable *Did Not Turnover* is defined by Stayers or individuals who remain employed by the same organization and did not voluntarily or involuntarily exit the organization.

Did Not Turnover will be measured as 1 if an individual is currently employed by the firm and 0 if they are not. A total of 83 individuals did not turnover.

Involuntary Turnover

The variable *Involuntary Turnover* is defined as an individual being terminated from employment, thus the outcome is initiated by the employer rather than the employee. *Involuntary Turnover* will be measured as 1 if an individual was terminated from employment with termination initiated by the employer and 0 if they did not. Of the 72

individuals who left the organization, a total of 25 were involuntary exits, or terminations. The remaining 47 individuals who left the organization are categorized as voluntary turnovers.

Voluntary Turnover Destination – Attain Another Job Prior to Exit

Voluntary turnover is divided into those individuals who Attained Another Job and those who did not (Non-work/No Option). The variable *Attain Another Job* is defined as an individual lining up a new job resource prior to voluntarily initiating the exit from The Company. While having a job lined up prior to resigning is in and of itself an outcome, the variable can be further decoupled into three possible outcomes: 1) attaining a better job (e.g., higher pay or position), 2) attaining a lateral position (e.g., same pay and position), or 3) attaining a lesser job resource (e.g., lower pay and position). For robustness testing and to add nuance into the test of the effects of impulsivity and self-control on attaining another job, both the broader and more nuanced measurements will be utilized.

First, *Attain Another Job* will be measured as 1 if an individual attained another job prior to exit and a 0 if they did not. Second, there will be three subtypes of the measure if the response of 1 is indicated: *Subtype 1*, if an individual attained a better job upon resignation it will be measured as 1 (0 if they did not); *Subtype 2*, if an individual attained a lateral job upon resignation it will be measured as 1 (0 if they did not); *Subtype 3*, if an individual attained a lesser job upon resignation it will be measured as 1 (0 if they did not). There were a total of 47 voluntary exits from the organization; 42 attained another

job prior to resigning. Five individuals resigned with no job lined up prior to voluntarily exiting the organization. Of the 42 individuals who attained another job prior to resignation, 23 took a better job, 12 moved to lateral positions, and seven (7) moved to lesser jobs. The determination of a job being better, lateral, or worse was taken from the exit interviews and was determined by the employee. That is, exit interviews utilized words indicating whether *the employee* (not the interviewer) believed the job to be better, similar/lateral, or worse. Two coders were utilized to cross-validate the determination; they had full agreement on each of the measures.

Voluntary Turnover Destination – Non-Work or No Option

The variable *Non-Work or No Option* is defined by individuals who voluntarily initiated an exit from their current jobs without first attaining a new job resource and who did not file for unemployment compensation status. Importantly, this variable is essentially the inverse of *Attain Another Job*; however, I also include *Non-Work or No Option* so that I can test the full model of possible outcomes simultaneously. *Non-Work or No Option* will be measured as 1 if an individual was able to attain another job and did not file for unemployment and 0 if they did not. Notably, this variable is the inverse of the variable *Attain Another Job*. As such, of the 47 voluntary exit decisions, five fall into the category of Non-Work or No Option.

Independent Variable Measures

The personality trait testing was accomplished using the Harrison Assessment, which assesses both impulsivity and self-control. The Harrison Assessment is proprietary in nature and as such, item-level data is not attainable. The Harrison Assessment measures each variable in the assessment (e.g., impulsivity) on a scale from 1 to 10. One is considered the lowest and ten is considered the highest score. I averaged the Harrison Assessment measures *Analyzes Pitfalls* and *Risking* per Harrison Assessment's guidance from the assessment description. That is, items that are aggregated into the measures of *Analyzes Pitfalls* and *Risking* are averaged to create *Impulsivity*. While the Harrison Assessment provides a measure for impulsivity, it provides no guidance on how to measure self-control. Thus, I created a measure based upon theoretical definitions of self-control: the exertion of control over the self by the self (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). Based upon their theoretical definition of the construct and to remain consistent with the operationalization of impulsivity using two measures, I selected two measures from the Harrison Assessment that best matched the definition: *Handles Conflict* and *Judgment Strategic. Handles Conflict* is appropriate because higher levels of self-control are correlated with better interpersonal relationships, better personal accommodation, and

better dyadic adjustment. *Judgment Strategic* was chosen because higher self-control also predicted better perspective taking (Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004). These two measures were averaged to create the measure *Self-Control–Harrison*.

Because the Harrison Assessment is proprietary, I cross-validate the measure in a first study before using the measure to test the hypotheses to help gather evidence regarding the validity of the Harrison instrument. The Harrison Assessment provides a claim relative to reliability and content validity of the assessment as a whole. With respect to construct validity, Harrison claims that independent studies have been done that compare the test results of the Harrison Assessment traits to other traits (e.g., MBT1, 16PF and Neo). Harrison (2014) also claims that the results show substantial relationships between test result but does not provide comparison data. It is important to note that the Harrison Assessment does not measure impulsivity and self-control directly. Rather, several items that would reflect first order constructs are aggregated to form the respective measures. Further, since there is no evidence of the reliability or validity of the Harrison Assessment measure, I cross validate the measure in an attempt to provide evidence as to the degree to which the measure taps the focal construct. Specifically, using a validated instrument with sound psychometric properties and comparing the validated instrument against the measure obtained via the Harrison Assessment would provide evidence as to whether the Harrison Assessment measures are indeed measuring impulsivity and self-control.

Cross-Validation Measure

The Brief Self-Control Scale (BSCS) was developed by Tangney, Baumeister, and Boone (2004) to assess dispositional self-control and impulsivity following the dual systems theoretical perspective. As Maloney, Grawitch, and Barber (2012: 112) note:

This 2-factor structure of BSCS as represented by self-discipline and impulse-control is similar to the distinction made between restraint and impulsivity, which has broad theoretical support from psychodynamic, trait, biological, cognitive, and developmental literatures (Carver 2005). Carver indicated that while restraint represents the tendency to be deliberative or disciplined and engage in effortful control, impulsivity represents the tendency to be spontaneous and act on intuition or heuristics. Although related, these two components operate simultaneously, and they compete with one another to affect behavioral outcomes (Carver 2005, Hofmann et al. 2009). As such, the empirical and theoretical literature provided a basis for suggesting that (a) the BSCS may measure multiple factors, and (b) these factors evidence differential relationships with important correlates.

Maloney and colleagues (2012) cross-validate the Tangney, Baumeieter, and Boone (2004) BSCS measure across three samples and find a consistent two-factor structure of self-control and impulsivity, which I use to compare to the measures of the same constructs obtained from the Harrison Assessment. Consistent with both Tangney Baumeieter, and Boone (2004) and Maloney, Grawitch, and Barber (2012), when using the BSCS, I operationalize self-control — also referred to as restraint — and impulsivity as distinct factors (see Appendix). The BSCS was sent to employees who completed the Harrison Assessment. Correlation between the BSCS and the employee scores on the Harrison will be assessed to help provide evidence of the validity of the measures drawn from the Harrison Assessment.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics and correlation matrix from the cross-validation test between the measures of impulsivity and self-control drawn from the BSCS

and the Harrison Assessment. I denote the Harrison measure for impulsivity as *Impulsivity–Harrison* to differentiate it from the measure obtained via the BSCS.

Sixty-one employees who had completed the Harrison Assessment pre-hire were administered the BSCS. The measures of both *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control* obtained from the BSCS exhibited adequate internal consistency (alphas of .71 for both). The measures obtained from the BSCS were correlated with those obtained from the Harrison Assessment, and the results appear in Table 1. The results of the correlational assessment indicate that the Harrison and BSCS measures of both constructs do not correlate significantly. That is, the two measures of self-control are not significantly correlated, nor are the two measures of impulsivity. There is evidence of a significant negative correlation between the *Self-Control* and *Impulsivity-BSCS* measures and the *Self-Control* and *Impulsivity-Harrison* measures. This may indicate that self-control and impulsivity are not separate constructs but instead exist on the same continuum, a topic to which I will return in the discussion. Nonetheless, the correlations suggest that the measures obtained via the two sources do not seem to be assessing the same construct. This causes concern as to the validity of the measure. However, I utilized the measure in hypothesis testing and note the limitation of the measure.

Table 1. Cross-Validation Test/Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix

	Variable	M	SD	1	2	3
1	Self-Control – BSCS	3.93	0.64			
2	Self-Control – Harrison	7.57	0.75	0.06		
3	Impulsivity – BSCS	1.44	0.44	-0.46*	-0.03	
4	Impulsivity – Harrison	0.10	0.37	-0.12	-0.29*	0.13

$n = 61$; Correlation significance* $p < 0.05$.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for study variables. *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control* were taken from the Harrison Assessment. The Assessment utilizes proprietary data, so I was unable to obtain alphas for these measures. The data is based on 155 unique employees. The observations equal 846 employee-year combinations since many employees are extended over multiple employment years. The reason I use the employment years is that each employee has a unique annual performance review for each employed year.

The variable *Attained Another Job* accounts for 42 employees who chose to leave The Company (*Voluntary Turnover*) during the observation years. The variable *Resigned* comprises a total of 47 employees who voluntarily exited the organization, 42 of whom attained another job prior to exit and five of whom did not. Those five who did not attain another job prior to exit are categorized as *Non-work or No Option*. The variable *Did Not Turnover* accounts for 83 employees who were still employed by The Company at the end of the observation period. Finally, the variable *Involuntary Turnover* accounts for 25 employees who were terminated for various reasons during the observed employment period.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix

	Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1	Impulsivity	0.35	0.97					
2	Self-Control	7.32	0.91	-0.41*				
3	Attained Another Job (VT)	0.26	0.44	0.24*	-0.53*			
4	Resigned (VT)	0.30	0.46	0.27*	-0.57*	0.91*		
5	Did Not Turnover	0.54	0.50	-0.15	0.38*	-0.64*	-0.71*	
6	Involuntary Turnover	0.16	0.37	-0.13	0.20*	-0.26*	-0.29*	-0.47*

n = 155; Correlation significance* $p < 0.05$; VT = Voluntary Turnover.

I conducted a power and sample size analysis for each of the variables. All of the variables passed the power test with values above the default of 0.80 except *Involuntary Turnover*, which had a power of 0.70.

Test of Hypotheses 1a and 1b

To test the hypotheses, I extended the data longitudinally to form an unbalanced panel. That is, I treated each employee-year combination as an observation such that an individual who was employed for four years would have four observations, the first three of which would correspond to being still employed; the final one would correspond to the appropriate outcome (i.e., termination, resignation, still employed). Thus, the 155 employees resulted in 846 employee-year combinations. For each panel analysis, a random effects logistic regression was utilized as a Hausman test rejected the null hypothesis of employee-specific fixed effects ($p > .05$).

Table 3 represents the results of testing Hypotheses 1a and 1b for employees who *Did Not Turnover*. In this regression, I included control variables *Age*, *Tenure*, *Spouse*, and *Number of Children* in Model 1. Column 2 of Table 3 represents the results for the personality trait of *Impulsivity* relating to employees' tendencies to remain employed with their current job resource (they did not turnover). The coefficient on *Impulsivity* is negative and significant (-0.23, $p < .05$), offering support for Hypothesis 1a, that *Impulsivity* would have a negative relationship with remaining employed.

Column 3 of Table 3 represents the result for the personality trait of *Self-Control* relating to employees' tendencies to remain employed with their current job resources. The coefficient on *Self-Control* is positive and significant (0.59, $p < .05$), offering support for

Hypothesis 1b that *Self-Control* would have a positive relationship with remaining employed/not turning over.

Column 4 of Table 3 represents the results for the dual-systems perspective having personality traits of both *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control* in the same model for Hypotheses 1a and 1b. Both independent variables remain directionally supportive of the hypothesis, but only *Self-Control* has a significant relationship. This finding suggests that the effect of *Impulsivity* on remaining employed is not significant when considered in concert with *Self-Control*

Column 5 of Table 3 tests whether there is an interaction effect between *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control*. The interaction does not weaken or alter the results of the regression. This suggests that the observed relationship between *Impulsivity* and remaining employed that becomes non-significant in the presence of *Self-Control* is not due to an interactive effect that would weaken the former direct relationship.

Table 3. Logistic Regression on Did Not Turnover

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Constant	1.00*	1.12*	-3.10*	-2.99*	-2.75*
	(0.48)	(0.48)	(1.05)	(1.15)	(1.21)
Age	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Tenure	0.14*	0.13*	0.12*	0.12*	0.12*
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Spouse	0.53	0.54	0.62*	0.62*	0.61*
	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)
Number of Children	0.25	0.26	0.19	0.20	0.19
	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)
Impulsivity		-0.23*		-0.03	-0.58
		(0.12)		(0.13)	(0.83)
Self-control			0.59*	0.57*	0.54*
			(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Impulsivity × Self-Control					0.09
					(0.14)
χ^2	29.83*	34.05*	48.69*	48.91*	49.50*
Change in χ^2		4.10*	18.92*	19.01*	0.45

n = 846; Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.05$.

Test of Hypotheses 2a and 2b

Table 4 represents the results of testing of Hypotheses 2a and 2b. In this regression, I introduced controls variables *Age*, *Tenure*, *Spouse*, and *Number of Children* in Column 1. Column 2 of Table 4 represents the results for the personality trait of *Impulsivity* relating to an employee's tendencies to be involuntarily terminated from a job resource. The coefficient on *Impulsivity* is negative (-0.92) and not significant, offering no support for Hypothesis 2a that *Impulsivity* would have a positive relationship with involuntary termination from current employment.

Column 3 of Table 4, in the rows under the heading *Involuntary Termination*, represents the results for the personality trait of *Self-Control* relating to an employee's tendencies to be involuntarily terminated from a job resource. The coefficient is positive (0.59) and not significant, offering no support for Hypothesis 2b that *Self-Control* would have a negative relationship with not having being involuntarily terminated from current employment.

Column 4 of Table 4 displays the results for the dual-systems perspective having both personality traits of *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control* in the same model for Hypotheses 2a and 2b. Neither independent variable is directionally supportive of the hypotheses, nor do they have a significant relationship with the outcome.

Column 5 of Table 4 tests whether there is an interaction effect between *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control*. The interaction was also not statistically significant and thus, there is no evidence that an interaction alters results.

Table 4. Logistic Regression on Involuntary Termination

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Constant	-4.23*	-3.96*	-8.67*	-7.82*	-7.13*
	(1.58)	(1.74)	(3.55)	(3.53)	(3.46)
Age	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Tenure	-0.12	-0.13	-0.11	-0.12	-0.11
	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Spouse	-0.97	-0.96	-0.99	-1.01	-1.00
	(0.61)	(0.61)	(0.65)	(0.65)	(0.63)
Number of Children	-0.55	-0.56	-0.60*	-0.61*	-0.62*
	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.30)
Impulsivity		-0.92		-0.70	-7.10
		(0.76)		(0.76)	(9.27)
Self-Control			0.59	0.48	0.39
			(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.35)
Impulsivity × Self-Control					0.88
					(1.23)
χ^2	13.20*	14.61*	15.31*	15.09*	15.70*
Change in χ^2		1.49	2.78	2.86	0.51

n = 846; Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.05$

.

Test of Hypotheses 3a and 3b as well as Hypotheses 4a and 4b

The dataset for testing Hypotheses 3a and 3b as well as Hypotheses 4a and 4b is not longitudinal since the outcome observed is after the turnover type. Rather, I focus here on the turnover destination: is the outcome another job or non-work, no option? Thus, ordinary logistic regression was utilized. The results of the test of Hypotheses 3a and 3b appear in Table 5. Since the outcome of Attain Another Job is binary in nature, I utilize a logistic regression. Notably, since Attain Another Job is the inverse of Non-work or No Option, the table can also be used to test Hypotheses 4a and 4b.

Table 5 displays results testing the relationship of *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control* with the attaining another job. No support was found for Hypotheses 3a or 3b. Column 1 of Table 5 represents the results for the personality trait of *Impulsivity* relating to an employee's ability to attain another job prior to resigning from the current position. The coefficient on *Impulsivity* is negative but not significant (-0.02, $p > .05$), offering no support for Hypothesis

3a that *Impulsivity* would have a negative relationship with attaining another job prior to initiating an exit from current employment. Similarly, a positive relationship would have indicated support for Hypothesis 4a.

Column 2 of Table 5 represents the results for the personality trait of *Self-Control* relating to an employee's ability to attain another job prior to resigning from the current position. The coefficient on *Self-Control* is negative and not significant (-0.19, $p > .05$), offering no support for Hypothesis 3b that *Self-Control* would have a positive relationship with attaining another job prior to initiating an exit from current employment. Likewise, this coefficient can be used to assess Hypothesis 4b, but the non-significant results does not support the hypothesis.

Column 3 of Table 5 represents the results for the dual-systems perspective having both personality traits of *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control* in the same model for Hypotheses 3a and 3b. Neither independent variable has a significant relationship with Attain Another Job (*Impulsivity* is -0.11, $p > .05$; *Self-Control* is -0.29, $p > .05$), offering no support for either hypothesis and likewise, Hypotheses 4a and 4b are also not supported.

Table 5. Logistic Regression on Attain Another Job

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Attain Another Job			
Constant	1.94*	3.16	3.90
	(0.49)	(3.72)	(4.53)
Impulsivity	-0.02		-0.11
	(0.30)		(0.35)
Self-Control		-0.19	-0.29
		(0.56)	(0.66)
χ^2	0.01	0.11	0.20

n = 47; Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.05$

.

Table 6 displays results testing the relationships for the potential nuanced outcomes associated with the type of job attained using a multinomial logistic regression. A multinomial logistic regression is utilized to simultaneously assess the effect on multiple,

mutually-exclusive binary outcomes. Notably, this method requires setting a "base" outcome with which to compare. Thus, with four potential outcomes there will be three relationships (i.e., did not attain a job, attain a lesser job, attain a lateral job, and attain a better job). The results of the multinomial logistic regression suggest that neither *Impulsivity* nor *Self-Control* is significantly related to any of the possible outcomes. Thus I find no support for any of the possible outcomes for the possible alternative variables within *Attain Another Job*.

Table 6. Multinomial Logistic Regression on Attain Another Job

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Did Not Attain a Job			
Constant	-1.42*	-3.90	-3.56
	(0.57)	(4.23)	(5.12)
Impulsivity	-0.12		-0.03
	(0.33)		(0.40)
Self-Control		0.36	0.32
		(0.64)	(0.75)
Attain a Lesser Job			
Constant	-0.98*	-3.97	-2.50
	(0.48)	(3.73)	(4.40)
Impulsivity	-0.27		-0.21
	(0.34)		(0.39)
Self-Control		0.43	0.23
		(0.56)	(0.65)
Attain a Lateral Job			
Constant	-0.34	-3.68	-0.98
	(0.39)	(3.09)	(3.60)
Impulsivity	-0.58		-0.55
	(0.40)		(0.43)
Self-Control		0.46	0.10
		(0.47)	(0.53)
χ^2	3.44	1.34	3.69

n = 47; Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.05$.

Additional Test of Hypotheses 2a through 4b

Table 7 reports the results of a multinomial logistic regression used to further test Hypotheses 2 through 4. I analyze the association between the turnover destinations for dependent variables *Involuntary Termination* (Hypotheses 2a and 2b) simultaneously with

Attain Another Job (Hypotheses 3a and 3b) and *Non-work or No Option* (Hypotheses 4a and 4b) to preserve power and because the three outcomes are mutually exclusive — that is, one cannot be in more than one category. The dependent variable *Attain Another Job* from Hypotheses 3a and 3b is used as the base case in Table 5 since it has the highest number of observations.

Column 1 of Table 7, in the rows under the heading *Involuntary Termination*, represents the results for the personality trait of *Impulsivity* relating to an employee's tendency to be involuntarily terminated from a job resource. The coefficient on *Impulsivity* is negative (-1.00) and not significant, offering no support for Hypotheses 2a that *Impulsivity* would have a positive relationship with not being involuntarily terminated from current employment.

Column 2 of Table 7, in the rows under the heading *Involuntary Termination*, represents the results for the personality trait of *Self-Control* relating to an employee's tendency to be involuntarily terminated from a job resource. The coefficient on *Self-Control* is positive and significant (1.99, $p < .05$), the opposite of what was hypothesized and thus offering no support for Hypotheses 2b that *Self-Control* would have a negative relationship with not being involuntarily terminated from current employment.

Column 3 of Table 7, in the rows under the heading *Involuntary Termination*, represents the results for the dual-systems perspective having both personality traits of *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control* in the same model for Hypotheses 2a and 2b. Neither independent variable is directionally supportive of the hypothesis. Only *Self-Control* has a significant relationship, but the direction of the relationship is the opposite of what was hypothesized.

Column 1 of Table 7, in the rows under the heading *Non-Work or No Option*, represents the results for the personality trait of *Impulsivity* relating to an employee not attaining another

job after leaving the current job resource. The coefficient on *Impulsivity* is positive (0.02) but not significant, offering no support for Hypothesis 4a that *Impulsivity* would have a positive relationship with not attaining another job prior to initiating an exit from current employment.

Column 2 of Table 7, in the rows under the heading *Non-Work or No Option*, represents the results for the personality trait of *Self-Control* relating to an employee not attaining another job after leaving the current job resource. The coefficient on *Self-Control* is positive (0.15) and not significant, offering no support for Hypothesis 4b that *Self-Control* would have a negative relationship with not attaining another job prior to initiating an exit from current employment. Column 3 of Table 7, in the rows under the heading *Non-Work or No Option*, represents the results for the dual-systems perspective having both personality traits of *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control* in the same model for Hypotheses 4a and 4b. Neither independent variable has a significant relationship with the outcome of interest, again offering no support for Hypotheses 4a and 4b.

Table 7. Multinomial Logistic Regression on Turnover Destinations

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Non-work or No Option			
Constant	-2.14*	-3.13	-3.67
	(0.54)	(3.93)	(4.64)
Impulsivity	0.02		0.08
	(0.32)		(0.38)
Self-control		0.15	0.22
		(0.59)	(0.67)
Involuntary Termination			
Constant	-0.26	-14.78*	-14.10*
	(0.27)	(3.58)	(3.74)
Impulsivity	-1.00		-0.36
	(0.60)		(0.69)
Self-control		1.99*	1.91*
		(0.49)	(0.51)
χ^2	7.38*	30.78*	31.19*

n = 72; Standard errors in parentheses; * $p < 0.05$.

Bivariate Probit Model Testing of Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4

I argue that the mechanisms driving the dependent variables in the model (i.e., resigned/voluntary turnover, terminated/involuntary turnover, and still employed/did not turnover) are similar; as such, the outcomes may share a common error that can bias estimates (Greene, 2008). Since the dependent variables are binary in nature, I utilized a bivariate probit model to assess whether the correlation across outcomes may cause bias in the models. Tables 8, 9, and 10 represent the results of the bivariate probit models. The binary probit model allows for comparing the effects of independent variables on two dependent variables simultaneously. They offer an additional robustness test of the hypotheses while accounting for the potential correlated errors across outcomes. Thus, with three potential outcomes, there are three models, one with each of two dependent variables compared simultaneously. If the Likelihood Ratio of the model is nonsignificant, the models should be estimated separately; if significant, they share a common error (Greene, 2008). In each instance, the Likelihood Ratio is significant, suggesting that bivariate probit models can help account for potential correlation across outcomes.

The results of the bivariate probit models offer support for Hypotheses 1b and broadly show that those high in self-control are more likely to remain employed, while those high in impulsivity are more likely to resign voluntarily when viewed in isolation. This, however, is unrelated when considered with self-control. These findings do not directly test the items from the TTD for attaining another job or non-work or no option, but they do offer insights with respect to the need to delve deeper into TTD in future inquiries. I discuss these results in the next section.

Table 8. Bivariate Probit Regression Did Not Turnover & Involuntary Turnover

`	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Did Not Turnover					
Constant	0.67*	0.75*	-1.58*	-1.55*	-1.43*
	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.55)	(0.60)	(0.63)
Age	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Tenure	0.07*	0.06*	0.06*	0.06*	0.06*
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Spouse	0.28*	0.29*	0.32*	0.32*	0.32*
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Number of Children	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.09	0.09
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Impulsivity		-0.12		-0.01	-0.42
		(0.06)		(0.07)	(0.47)
Self-Control			0.32*	0.32*	0.30*
			(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Impulsivity × Self-Control					0.07
					(0.08)
Involuntary Turnover					
Constant	-1.93*	-1.82*	-2.73*	-2.53*	-2.52*
	(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.80)	(0.87)	(0.83)
Age	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Tenure	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Spouse	-0.24	-0.25	-0.36*	-0.36*	-0.35*
	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Number of Children	-0.24*	-0.24*	-0.18*	-0.18*	-0.17*
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)
Impulsivity		-0.23		-0.15	-2.37
		(0.23)		(0.23)	(3.09)
Self-Control			0.13	0.10	0.11
			(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.10)
Impulsivity × Self-Control					0.32
					(0.42)
χ^2	78.40*	77.55*	88.83*	87.49***	86.30***
Change in χ^2		5.26	37.27*	36.12*	1.29
Likelihood Ratio	121.94*	122.44*	143.01*	141.83*	142.62*

n = 846; Standard errors in parentheses* $p < 0.05$

.

Table 9. Bivariate Probit Regression Did Not Turnover & Resigned (VT)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Did Not Turnover					
Constant	0.65*	0.73*	-1.52*	-1.50*	-1.35*
	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.56)	(0.64)	(0.66)
Age	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Tenure	0.07*	0.06*	0.06*	0.06*	0.06*
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Spouse	0.28	0.28	0.33*	0.32*	0.31*
	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.15)
Number of Children	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.09
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Impulsivity		-0.12		-0.01	-0.41
		(0.06)		(0.07)	(0.48)
Self-Control			0.31*	0.31*	0.29*
			(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Impulsivity × Self-Control					0.07
					(0.08)
Resigned (VT)					
Constant	-0.47	-0.63*	2.74*	2.65*	2.60*
	(0.29)	(0.31)	(0.64)	(0.75)	(0.77)
Age	-0.02*	-0.02*	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Tenure	-0.07*	-0.06*	-0.07*	-0.07*	-0.07*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Spouse	-0.12	-0.17	-0.18	-0.19	-0.20
	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.21)	(0.19)
Number of Children	-0.04	-0.05	-0.05	-0.05	-0.06
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Impulsivity		0.17*		0.02	0.12
		(0.06)		(0.07)	(0.53)
Self-Control			-0.51*	-0.50*	-0.49*
			(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.10)
Impulsivity × Self-Control					-0.01
					(0.09)
χ^2	36.96*	60.24*	76.72*	75.38*	77.44*
Change in χ^2		15.24*	32.06*	36.98*	1.19
Likelihood Ratio	253.03*	248.65*	226.02*	226.00*	226.28*

n = 846; Standard errors in parentheses* $p < 0.05$.

Table 10. Bivariate Probit Regression Involuntary Turnover & Resigned (VT)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Involuntary Turnover					
Constant	-1.95*	-1.96*	-3.58*	-3.21*	-2.99*
	(0.35)	(0.36)	(0.91)	(0.95)	(0.97)
Age	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Tenure	-0.06	-0.06*	-0.06*	-0.07*	-0.06
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Spouse	-0.37	-0.40	-0.37	-0.39	-0.40
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Number of Children	-0.21*	-0.22*	-0.22*	-0.23*	-0.24*
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Impulsivity		-0.44		-0.34	-3.77
		(0.34)		(0.32)	(4.43)
Self-Control			0.22	0.17	0.14
			(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.13)
Impulsivity × Self-Control					0.47
					(0.59)
Resigned (VT)					
Constant	-0.51	-0.66*	3.54*	3.50*	3.49*
	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.70)	(0.77)	(0.81)
Age	-0.02*	-0.02*	-0.02*	-0.02*	-0.02*
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Tenure	-0.06*	-0.05*	-0.04	-0.04	-0.04
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Spouse	-0.18	-0.19	-0.31	-0.31	-0.32
	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)
Number of Children	-0.03	-0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Impulsivity		0.19*		0.01	0.02
		(0.07)		(0.08)	(0.50)
Self-control			-0.58*	-0.58*	-0.58*
			(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Impulsivity × Self-control					-0.00
					(0.08)
χ^2	37.52*	46.00*	76.72*	77.05*	77.91*
Change in χ^2		9.85*	45.09*	45.64*	0.64
Likelihood Ratio	3.96*	3.58	2.91	3.02	3.12

n = 846; Standard errors in parentheses* $p < 0.05$

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Research Contributions

The goal of this dissertation was to contribute to theory and practice alike in multiple ways. The first research goal was to answer calls to expand the study of the role of personality on turnover (e.g., Hogan & Holland, 2003; Zimmerman, 2008) by providing a direct test of the relationship between turnover and both impulsivity and self-control. The research accomplished the goal of providing this direct test. I found the relationship between impulsivity and the dependent variable outcome of "staying" — or not turning over — to be significant when tested without self-control, but not with. I found the relationship between impulsivity and all dependent variable outcomes associated with exiting the firm, including involuntary turnover, and voluntary turnover, as well as the destinations of both attaining another job or non-work/no option to be not significant when tested with or without self-control. The non-significant findings mean that either the relationships do not exist, or — what I view to be more likely — that the effect of impulsivity is muted by the presence self-control. As a metaphor, if one were to take a gallon of white paint as a base and add in just a couple of ounces of additional colors, one would create a completely different color than white. I consider the white paint to represent impulsivity with self-control representing the few ounces of additional colors. By simply adding in the few additional

ounces to the entire gallon, one could produce an entirely different outcome. I believe this is the potential effect uncovered in this dissertation. Specifically, I found the relationship between self-control and dependent variable outcomes for involuntary exit or for voluntary exit destinations of attaining another job or non-work/no option to be statistically insignificant when tested with or without impulsivity. I found the relationship between self-control and the dependent variable outcome of involuntary turnover to be significant, but directionally opposite to my hypothesis when analyzing with a multinomial logistic regression method. Further logistic regression testing (which included control variables age, tenure, spouse, and number of children) reflects that the directionality of the *Self-Control* variable matches my hypothesis. *Self-Control* did remain significant and directionally supportive of the hypothesis regarding remaining employing, or staying, when tested with or without impulsivity.

The fact that the effect of *Impulsivity* is significant when estimated without *Self-Control* but not significant with *Self-Control* in the model, coupled with a non-significant interaction of the two variables suggests that it is reasonable to conclude that the effect of impulsive behavior is redirected and muted by the impact of the intervening human resources department. It seems unlikely that impulsive behavior would lead to an immediate conclusion affecting employment unless the behavior was unduly problematic. In other instances the impulsive behaviors could potentially go on for years impacting the organization but not directly affecting the employment outcome of the employee

The second goal of this dissertation was to expand theoretical knowledge regarding impulsivity as a dispositional predictor of individual behavioral outcomes while also considering the role of self-control in a similar manner, addressing calls to extend the dual-

systems perspective (Hofmann, Friese, & Strack, 2009). The research did accomplish this goal to some degree by finding that impulsivity is not a good predictor individual behavioral outcomes related to turnover. In the only hypothesis where impulsivity was significant, its effect was muted when self-control was introduced.

Based on the evidence, I believe that self-control and impulsivity are not separate constructs, but rather exist on a continuum. It does seem fairly clear based on this research that self-control is a stronger predictor of turnover than impulsivity. The finding that impulsivity is muted in the presence of self-control may also suggest that while Tangney, Baumeister, and Boone (2004) and Maloney, Grawitch, and Barber (2012) both found a two-factor structure, the two factors may exist on a single continuum. Future research should further investigate this phenomenon to add clarity to research on the dual-systems perspective.

This research further accomplished the goal finding that self-control is not a good predictor individual behavioral outcomes relating to turnover types except for remaining employed. In the hypothesis where self-control was significant, its effect was also not affected when impulsivity was introduced.

I believe that the conclusion from the research with regard to the direct effect of self-control and *Involuntary Turnover* should be viewed with caution as a result of the human resources component. The measurement for the experiment did not take into account operationalizing any assessment of current status prior to exit (e.g., probation, demotion, job function, market replacement value), which may have impacted the outcome.

The third goal of the research was to offer an operationalization of the TTD, answering calls to take a more nuanced view of turnover measurement (Hom et al., 2012). The research

did offer a meaningful opportunity to operationalize the TTD, regardless of the lack of significance related to the chosen dependent variables. There are multiple opportunities to further explore variables that may have a more significant impact on the TTD framework introduced here. Specifically, I operationalized both relating to "staying" or "leaving" as well as a more specific categorization of the type of turnover (voluntary versus involuntary) and destination (to attain another job or to non-work/no option) for those employees who did exit the organization.

The final goal was to further develop our understanding the role of the dual-systems perspective in TTD, which may prove useful for managers in hiring. Specifically, if managers know the effect of these or other significant traits, they can screen more effectively during the hiring process. (If managers know that impulsive people are more likely to quit spontaneously or without notice, they may chose not to hire impulsive people.) Such a mechanism might also allow managers to develop training and tracking processes to create greater productivity in light of individuals' natural tendencies toward impulsivity and self-control. While the limitation of this research may be that it has not created a perfect measure for use in practice, it has provided significant evidence that impulsivity should be given less consideration as a predictor than self-control when assessing personality traits relative to turnover type. I believe this is especially important since impulsivity is the most directly cited measure as a predictor in turnover literature, even though it has not previously been directly tested empirically.

Prior to conducting this research, I recognized that there are two conflicting theories regarding self-control and impulsivity. This research uncovered mixed evidence, which suggests that self-control dominates impulsivity and that they exist on the single continuum.

This suggests that additional research is needed to more clearly determine whether self-control and impulsivity are different constructs or exist on the same continuum.

Harrison Assessment Measures

The Harrison Assessment provides a claim relative to reliability and content validity of the assessment as a whole. With respect to construct validity, they claim that independent studies have been done that compare the test results of the Harrison Assessment traits to other traits (MBT1, 16PF, and Neo). They claim that the results show substantial relationships between test result but do not provide comparison data. During the process of conducting the cross-validation test for the Harrison measures *Impulsivity* and *Self-Control*, I did find some traits that did not fit the nomological model for previously identified directional relationships. I consider this finding a potential limitation of Harrison's measures, even though I was able to cross-validate the variables of interest for this dissertation. Dr. Harrison was asked to provide both item-level data as well as alpha scores for the measures used in this study, but decided to decline citing confidential proprietary reasons.

Future Research

Improving the Measurement

I used Harrison Assessment data for this experiment. While I was able cross-validate Harrison's measures, it would have been preferable to have access to his item measures of internal consistency to obtain maximum validity. Future research would benefit by improving the assessment measures by utilizing other validated instruments of psychometric measures while operationalizing the variables in tests on outcomes associated with TTD. This research would provide a clearer picture of the impact of the chosen variables on the predicted and potential outcomes.

The question of the dual-systems properties of impulsivity and self-control have been called into questions by this research. It would be beneficial to provide additional research into whether these are two different factors or they exist on a single continuum. Utilizing an instrument specifically designed to evaluate that questions coupled with a field experiment would bring valuable insight.

Terminations

Human resource practices have significant impact on employees' termination dispositions. Employees are often not immediately terminated as a result of transgressions; rather, several intervening steps are taken to provide the employee with an opportunity to correct behaviors deemed worth of termination. As a result, human resources practices must be categorized and included in investigations of the TTD framework so their direct effect can be fully realized.

The Sample

Future research should extend the operationalization of TTD to other samples, taking into account variables associated with the organization's human resource policies and the validity of the instrument used for psychometric evaluation. An additional opportunity would be to increase the sample size of the data being observed to determine its impact on the results obtained in this research.

Conclusion

The results of this study suggest that self-control and impulsive behavior are not separate factors but instead exist on a single continuum. This research also suggests that when self-control is introduced in an employment outcome, the significant effect of impulsive tendencies are muted to the point of non-significance. This evidence has important and quite

different implications on dispositional personality domain pre-employment prediction for turnover types and destination choices.

REFERENCES

Abelson, M.A. (1987). "Examination of avoidable and unavoidable turnover." *Journal of Applied Psychology* **72**(3): 382.

Ainslie, G. (1975). "Specious reward: A behavioral theory of impulsiveness and impulse control." *Psychological Bulletin* **82**(4): 463.

Allen, D.G., P.C. Bryant, and J.M. Vardaman (2010). "Retaining talent: Replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies." *The Academy of Management Perspectives* **24**(2): 48-64.

Allen, D.G., K.P. Weeks, and K.R. Moffitt (2005). "Turnover intentions and voluntary turnover: The moderating roles of self-monitoring, locus of control, proactive personality, and risk aversion." *Journal of Applied Psychology* **90**(5): 980.

Bargh, J. (1994). "The four horsemen of automaticity: Intention, awareness, efficiency, and control as separate issues." *Handbook of Social Cognition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Barkley, R.A. (1997). "Behavioral inhibition, sustained attention, and executive functions: Constructing a unifying theory of ADHD." *Psychological Bulletin* **121**(1): 65.

Barrick, M.R., and R.D. Zimmerman (2005). "Reducing voluntary, avoidable turnover through selection." *Journal of Applied Psychology* **90**(1): 159.

Baumeister, R.F., and T.F. Heatherton (1996). "Self-regulation failure: An overview." *Psychological Inquiry* **7**(1): 1-15.

Baumeister, R.F., T.F. Heatherton, and D.M. Tice (1994). *Losing Control: How and Why People Fail at Self-Regulation*, San Diego: Academic Press.

Bergman, M.E., S.C. Payne, and W.R. Boswell (2012). "Sometimes pursuits don't pan out: Anticipated destinations and other caveats - Comment on Hom, Lee, and Griffeth (2012)." *Psychological Bulletin*, **138**(5): 865-870.

Block, J. (1995). "A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality description." *Psychological Bulletin* **117**(2): 187.

Campion, M.A. (1991). "Meaning and measurement of turnover: Comparison of alternative measures and recommendations for research." *Journal of Applied Psychology* **76**(2): 199.

Carver, C.S. (2005). "Impulse and constraint: Perspectives from personality psychology, convergence with theory in other areas, and potential for integration." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* **9**(4): 312-333.

Carver, C.S., and M.F. Scheier (2004). "Self-regulation of action and affect." *Handbook of Self-Regulation: Research, Theory, and Applications*: 13-39. Vohs, K.D. (Ed); Baumeister, R.F. (Ed). Guilford Press.

Chatman, J.A. (1989). *Matching People and Organizations: Selection and Socialization in Public Accounting Firms*. Academy of Management Proceedings, Academy of Management.

Costa Jr., P.T., R.R. McCrae, D.A. Dye (1991). "Facet scales for agreeableness and conscientiousness: A revision of the NEO personality inventory." *Personality and Individual Differences* **12**(9): 887-898.

Cyert, R.M., and J.G. March (1963). "A behavioral theory of the firm." Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Daruna, J., and P. Barnes (1993). "The impulsive client: Theory, research and treatment." *A Neurodevelopmental View of Impulsivity*. McCown, William G. (Ed); Johnson, Judith L. (Ed); Shure, Myrna B. (Ed), (1993). The impulsive client: Theory, research, and treatment. , (pp. 23-37). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association, ix, 446 pp.

Depue, R.A., and P.F. Collins (1999). "Neurobiology of the structure of personality: Dopamine, facilitation of incentive motivation, and extraversion." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **22**(03): 491-517.

Dickman, S.J. (1990). "Functional and dysfunctional impulsivity: Personality and cognitive correlates." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **58**(1): 95.

Digman, J.M. (1990). "Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model." *Annual Review of Psychology* **41**(1): 417-440.

Evenden, J.L. (1999). "Varieties of impulsivity." *Psychopharmacology* **146**(4): 348-361.

Fujita, K.,Y. Trope, and N. Liberman (2006). "Construal levels and self-control." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **90**(3): 351.

Ghiselli, E.E. (1974). "Some perspectives for industrial psychology." *American Psychologist* **29**(2): 80.

Goldberg, L.R. (1981). "Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons." *Review of Personality and Social Psychology* **2**(1): 141-165.

Greene, W.H. (2008). *Econometric Analysis* (Sixth edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Griffeth, R.W., and P.W. Hom (1995). "The employee turnover process." *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* **13**(3): 245-293.

Griffeth, R.W., and P.W. Hom (2001). *Retaining Valued Employees*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Griffeth, R.W., P.W. Horn, and S. Gaertner (2000). "A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium." *Journal of Management* **26**(3): 463-488.

Hancock, J.I., D.G. Allen, and F.A. Bosco (2013). "Meta-analytic review of employee turnover as a predictor of firm performance." *Journal of Management* **39**(3): 573-603.

Harrison, D. (2014). "Harrison Assessments." from www.harrisonassessments.com/ index.

Hasher, L., and R.T. Zacks (1979). "Automatic and effortful processes in memory." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* **108**(3): 356.

Hayes, S.C., E.V. Gifford, and L.E. Ruckstuhl Jr. (1996). "Relational frame theory and executive function: A behavioral approach." Lyon, G. Reid (Ed); Krasnegor, Norman A. (Ed), (1996). Attention, memory, and executive function. , (pp. 279-305). Baltimore, MD, US: Paul H Brookes Publishing, xvii, 424 pp.

Heavey, A.L., and J.A. Holwerda (2013). "Causes and consequences of collective turnover: A meta-analytic review." *Journal of Applied Psychology* **98**(3): 412.

Hofmann, W., M. Friese, and F. Strack (2009). "Impulse and self-control from a dual-systems perspective." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* **4**(2): 162-176.

Hogan, J., and B. Holland (2003). "Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective." *Journal of Applied Psychology* **88**(1): 100.

Hogan, R., J.A. Johnson, and S.R. Briggs (1997). *Handbook of Personality Psychology*, New York: Elsevier.

Holtom, B.C., T.R. Mitchell, and T.W. Lee (2008). "5 turnover and retention research: A glance at the past, a closer review of the present, and a venture into the future." *The Academy of Management Annals* **2**(1): 231-274.

Hom, P.W. (2011). "Organizational exit." In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Handbook of Iindustrial/ Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 67–117). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hom, P.W., T.R. Mitchell, T.W. Lee, and R.W. Griffeth (2012). "Reviewing employee turnover: Focusing on proximal withdrawal states and an expanded criterion." *Psychological Bulletin* **138**(5): 831.

Jensen-Campbell, L.A., and W.G. Graziano (2001). "Agreeableness as a moderator of interpersonal conflict." *Journal of Personality* **69**(2): 323-362.

Kanfer, F.H., and P. Karoly (1972). "Self-control: A behavioristic excursion into the lion's den." *Behavior Therapy* **3**(3): 398-416.

Kruglanski, A.W., and G. Gigerenzer (2011). "Intuitive and deliberate judgments are based on common principles." *Psychological Review* **118**(1): 97.

Langer, E.J., A. Blank, and B. Chanowitz (1978). "The mindlessness of ostensibly thoughtful action: The role of 'placebic' information in interpersonal interaction." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **36**(6): 635.

Latimer, M. (2003). "comprehensive analysis of sex and race inequities in unemployment insurance benefits, A." *Journal of Society & Social Welfare* **30**: 95.

Lee, T.W., and T.R. Mitchell (1994). "An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover." *Academy of Management Review* **19**(1): 51-89.

Loewenstein, G. (1996). "Out of control: Visceral influences on behavior." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **65**(3): 272-292.

Maertz, C.P., and M.A. Campion (1998). "Turnover." *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* **13**: 49-82.

Maertz, C.P., and M.A. Campion (2004). "Profiles in quitting: Integrating process and content turnover theory." *Academy of Management Journal* **47**(4): 566-582.

Magid, V., and C.R. Colder (2007). "The UPPS Impulsive Behavior Scale: Factor structure and associations with college drinking." *Personality and Individual Differences* **43**(7): 1927-1937.

Maloney, P.W., M.J. Grawitch, and L.K. Barber (2012). "The multi-factor structure of the Brief Self-Control Scale: Discriminant validity of restraint and impulsivity." *Journal of Research in Personality* **46**(1): 111-115.

Maltarich, M.A., A.J. Nyberg, and G. Reilly (2010). "A conceptual and empirical analysis of the cognitive ability – voluntary turnover relationship." *Journal of Applied Psychology* **95**(6): 1058.

Mattila, J.P. (1974). "Job quitting and frictional unemployment." *The American Economic Review*: 235-239.

McCleary, R.A. (1966). "Response-modulating functions of the limbic system: Initiation and suppression." *Progress in Physiological Psychology* **1**: 209-272.

McCrae, R.R., and P.T. Costa Jr. (1997). "Personality trait structure as a human universal." *American Psychologist* **52**(5): 509.

McCrae, R.R., and O.P. John (1992). "An introduction to the Five-Factor Model and its applications." *Journal of Personality* **60**(2): 175-215.

Metcalfe, J., and W. Mischel (1999). "A hot/cool-system analysis of delay of gratification: Dynamics of willpower." *Psychological Review* **106**(1): 3.

Miller, J., K. Flory, D. Lynam, and C. Leukefeld (2003). "A test of the four-factor model of impulsivity-related traits." *Personality and Individual Differences* **34**(8): 1403-1418.

Mischel, W. (1996). "From good intentions to willpower." *The Psychology of Action: Linking Cognition and Motivation to Behavior* **197**: 218.

Muraven, M., and R.F. Baumeister (2000). "Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle?" *Psychological Bulletin* **126**(2): 247.

O'Reilly III, C.A. (1991). "Organizational behavior: Where we've been, where we're going." *Annual Review of Psychology* **42**(1): 427-458.

Park, T.Y., and J.D. Shaw (2013). "Turnover rates and organizational performance: A meta-analysis." *Journal of Applied Psychology* **98**(2): 268.

Patton, J.H., and M.S. Stanford (1995). "Factor structure of the Barratt impulsiveness scale." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* **51**(6): 768-774.

Reynolds, B., A. Ortengren, and J.B. Richards (2006). "Dimensions of impulsive behavior: Personality and behavioral measures." *Personality and Individual Differences* **40**(2): 305-315.

Salamin, A., and P.W. Hom (2005). "In search of the elusive U-shaped performance-turnover relationship: Are high performing Swiss bankers more liable to quit?" *Journal of Applied Psychology* **90**(6): 1204.

Schalling, D. (1978). "Psychopathy-related personality variables and the psychophysiology of socialization." *Psychopathic Behavior: Approaches to Research*: 85-106.

Shallice, T., and P. Burgess (1993). "Supervisory control of action and thought selection." Baddeley, Alan D. (Ed); Weiskrantz, Lawrence (Ed), (1993). Attention: Selection, awareness, and control: A tribute to Donald Broadbent. , (pp. 171-187). New York, NY, US: Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press, xv, 436 pp.

Shiffrin, R.M., and W. Schneider (1977). "Controlled and automatic human information processing: II. Perceptual learning, automatic attending and a general theory." *Psychological Review* **84**(2): 127.

Smith, E.R., and J. DeCoster (2000). "Dual-process models in social and cognitive psychology: Conceptual integration and links to underlying memory systems." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* **4**(2): 108-131.

Strack, F., and R. Deutsch (2004). "Reflective and impulsive determinants of social behavior." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* **8**(3): 220-247.

Strathman, A., F. Gleicher, and D.S. Boninger (1994). "The consideration of future consequences: Weighing immediate and distant outcomes of behavior." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **66**(4): 742.

Tangney, J.P., R.F. Baumeister, and A.L. Boone (2004). "High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success." *Journal of Personality* **72**(2): 271-324.

Tellegen, A. (1982). "Brief manual for the multidimensional personality questionnaire." Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Ton, Z., and R.S. Huckman (2008). "Managing the impact of employee turnover on performance: The role of process conformance." *Organization Science* **19**(1): 56-68.

Wallace, J.F., J.P. Newman, and J.A. Bachorowski (1991). "Failures of response modulation: Impulsive behavior in anxious and impulsive individuals." *Journal of Research in Personality* **25**(1): 23-44.

Wastell, C.A. (2014). "An emergence solution to the reasoning dual processes interaction problem." *Theory & Psychology*: 0959354314533442.

Whiteside, S.P., and D.R. Lynam (2001). "The Five Factor Model and impulsivity: Using a structural model of personality to understand impulsivity." *Personality and Individual Differences* **30**(4): 669-689.

Wiggins, J.S. (1996). *The Five-Factor Model of Personality: Theoretical Perspectives*, New York: Guilford Press.

Woo, S.E. (2011). "A study of Ghiselli's hobo syndrome." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* **79**(2): 461-469.

Zimmerman, R.D. (2008). "Understanding the impact of personality traits on individuals'turnover decisions: Ameta-analytic path model." *Personnel Psychology* **61**(2): 309-348.

Zuckerman, M. (1994). *Behavioral Expressions and Biosocial Bases of Sensation Seeking*, Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX

Self-Control and *Impulsivity* Items

Brief Self-Control Scale (Tangney, Baumeister, and Boone, 2004)

Items rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = not at all like me, 2 = not much like me, 3 = somewhat like me, 4 =like me, 5 = very much like me)

Self-Control Items

SC1 - I am good at resisting temptation

SC2 - I have a hard time breaking bad habits - R

SC3 - I wish I had more self-discipline - R

SC4 - People would say that I have iron self-discipline

Impulsivity Items

IMP1- I do certain things that are bad for me if they are fun - R

IMP2 - Pleasure and fun sometimes keep me from getting work done - R

IMP3 - Sometimes I can't stop myself from doing something, even if I know it is wrong - R

IMP4 - I often act without thinking through all the alternatives – R

R-Reversed Items

VITA

Gregory A. Miller

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: DUAL-SYSTEMS PERSPECTIVE ON TURNOVER TYPES AND DESTINATION CHOICES

Major Field: Business Administration

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Business Administration at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in July, 2015.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Business Administration at Keller Graduate School of Management, Lincolnshire, Illinois/USA in 1998.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Science Operations Management at DeVry Institute of Technology, Addison, Illinois/USA in 1997.

Experience: President and CEO, CrossCom National LLC

Professional Memberships: Southwest Management Association, Academy of Management, Phi Kappa Phi