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ABSTRACT
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Previous research on involvement’s role in the turnover process has rendered conflicting results. There has been evidence that: 1) job involvement moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover (Blau & Boal, 1989); 2) no moderation effect exists when the appropriate quantitative methods were used (Huselid & Day, 1991); and 3) job involvement and organizational commitment interactively influence turnover through the mediation of turnover intention (Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000). Additionally, the work involvement facet of the involvement construct has been omitted from previous research. This investigation replicated the previous involvement-turnover findings using the proper quantitative methodology, logistic regression. Previous research is then extended by including work involvement as an additional psychological construct to consider in the turnover process. Results provide consistent evidence that job involvement interacts with organizational commitment to predict actual turnover in two distinct samples. Results also show that work involvement does not appear to be nearly as important as job involvement in the turnover process.
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INTRODUCTION

For decades, researchers have paved a path to understanding the exceedingly complex and costly process of employee turnover (Hom & Griffeth, 1995). Turnover negatively affects organizations in a variety of ways, from loss of high performers and productivity to the added financial burden of replacing employees who have left (Mobley, 1982). As a result, a variety of turnover models seeking to understand the process have been proposed, tested, and revised as research has emerged (Mobley, 1977; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Price & Mueller, 1981; Sheridan, 1985; Lee, Mitchell, Wise, Fireman, 1996; Trevor, 2001; Steel, 2002; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004).

Although there has yet to be full agreement and support for the adoption of one single model of turnover, there is agreement that the psychological (sometimes labeled “attitudinal”) construct organizational commitment is a centerpiece to turnover theory (Steel, 2002). In fact, a variety of samples have focused on this particular multifaceted psychological variable to dissect the turnover process, while also investigating how other work related (and non-psychological) variables, such as job availability, ease of movement, and expected job utility affect an employee’s decision to leave an organization (March & Simon, 1958; Mobley, 1977; Hom & Griffeth, 1995). Through such investigations, researchers continue to uncover and further develop an understanding of the variables which contribute to employee turnover.

Job involvement is another psychological variable that has been shown to influence turnover within an organization (Blau & Boal, 1989; Hom & Griffeth, 1995; Huselid & Day, 1991). Previous research, however, has reported conflicting views of
involvement and the role that it plays in the turnover process. Additionally, the multifaceted nature of the psychological construct involvement has largely been ignored; particularly the work involvement-turnover relationship.

Therefore, in the following thesis, I replicated the previous findings on the topic of job involvement and its role with turnover. I then extended the conceptual basis of involvement research by investigating work involvement’s role in the turnover process. This research was completed within the context of two distinct samples: employees of a national insurance company and retail sales personnel in a large department store. The results of this research will make a significant contribution to the turnover field as it thoroughly examines involvements’ role in the turnover process considering both job and work involvement and their potential role as moderators in the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover.

*Job Attitudes Translating to the Behavioral Act of Leaving an Organization*

The behavioral act of leaving, or employee turnover, is defined as voluntary termination of membership within an organization by an employee who receives monetary compensation for participating in that organization (Mobley, 1982). Although March and Simon (1958) established the first formal turnover theory, Mobley (1977) was the first to pave a path to tackling the concept of turnover as a decision making process that ends with an employee choosing to stay with or depart from an organization. Mobley’s model was created in response to Porter and Steers (1973) declaration that urged researchers to examine the psychology of the decisional process underlying turnover. Additionally, Mobley recognized Locke’s (1976) claim that the relationship
between turnover and job satisfactions was consistent, but not particularly strong (rarely exceeding a correlation of .40) suggesting there could be more to this relationship than what was being studied. Mobley’s model was based on the notion that dissatisfaction prompts thoughts of quitting, leading to a series of intermediate linkages that play a role between an employee’s job satisfaction, or lack thereof, and the behavioral act of quitting.

Previous research by Hom, Griffeth, and Sellaro (1984) tested Mobley’s model and found evidence that most of the pathways do exist. A further revision of Mobley’s original model was proposed by Hom and Griffeth (1995) based on empirical and meta-analytical research. Due to the notion that poor attitudes (captured by the measurement of psychological constructs, specifically job satisfaction) stimulate the voluntary turnover process, Hom and Griffeth’s decision making utility model incorporated job satisfaction and organizational commitments’ role in the turnover process. These psychological constructs have been shown to initiate withdrawal cognitions leading an employee to evaluate the expected utility of withdrawing from the organization. Components of withdrawal cognitions include an employee’s thoughts of quitting, intention to search for other employment, and intention to quit the current organization (Dalessio, Silverman, & Shuck, 1986). High and low levels of the previous constructs can prevent or induce such withdrawal cognitions. For example, increased withdrawal cognitions as a result from dissatisfaction or low organizational commitment may lead an employee to evaluate the perceived costs and benefits of quitting and job seeking before pursuing alternatives (Hom & Griffeth, 1995).
The expected utility of withdrawal component in the Hom & Griffeth (1995) model highlights an employee’s evaluation and comparison of their current job with both prospective jobs, as well as those that have already been offered. Positive expected utility of withdrawal (i.e., an employee’s evaluation and recognition that another job may be more fitting) further stimulates job seeking and brings the employee one step closer to potentially leaving the organization. Previous empirical investigations support the notion that searching for a job precedes the comparison of different jobs (Hom, Griffeth, & Sellaro, 1984; Hom & Griffeth, 1991). At this point, if an employee finds a different job to be more favorable, their previously established negative attitudes towards their job (captured by measuring psychological constructs such as job dissatisfaction) translate to behavioral withdrawal from the organization (Hom & Griffeth, 1995). Finally, like Mobley’s (1977) model, the Hom & Griffeth (1995) model recognizes the fact that some employees do not go through the complex decision making process and quit impulsively. It is recognized that other factors not included in the model, such as occupational demand, work orientation, and family situations, may also cause an employee to quit without securing an alternative job (Hom & Griffeth, 1995).

Job Involvement as a Psychological Construct

As mentioned above, psychological constructs such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment have the ability to influence organizational behavior (Locke, 1976; Porter & Steers, 1973). Such constructs are often referred to as “attitudinal” variables because they represent cognitive (as opposed to physical) constructs that have the ability to influence behavior (Muchinsky, 2006). As such variables are researched, it
must be recognized that these psychological constructs are multi-faceted and that several components may be included in the full construct. For example, job satisfaction can be measured as a global construct or a facet construct including several components of satisfaction, such as satisfaction with supervisor and satisfaction with pay (Price & Mueller, 1981). Likewise, organizational commitment can be measured as a general measure, or as a faceted construct, which includes affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Allen & Myer, 1990). Although not always recognized, job involvement is also a multi-faceted psychological construct that has the ability to influence behavior.

The following sections review the evolution of the psychological construct of involvement, its relationship with other psychological variables and turnover, and the importance of the distinguishing between the job involvement and work involvement facets when conducting involvement research.

*Previous Research on Job Involvement*

As work consumes a considerable amount of people’s time, job involvement becomes an important construct. An employee who has high job involvement is likely to be engaged in their work, making it a more meaningful and fulfilling experience (Brown, 1996). The earliest research on job involvement attempted to establish the conditions in which ego involvement in work took place (Lewis & Franklin, 1944). Simply stated, this study found that individuals become ego involved in their tasks at work within both individual and group contexts. To add further support that such a construct exists, Dubin (1955) created a 40 item questionnaire to survey the life experiences of an individual and found that 24% of those surveyed were “job oriented.” These were individuals who chose
work related responses on at least half of the items. Such preliminary job involvement investigations were able to display that involvement with one’s job is a potentially important job related construct, but they lacked an understanding of what exactly job involvement was. As a result, Lodahl and Kejner (1965) constructed a psychometrically reliable psychological measure of job involvement in hopes to understand why people become job involved and how it affects organizational outcomes.

Lodahl and Kejner (1965) defined job involvement as the degree to which an employee psychologically identified with their work, or the importance of work to one’s total self image. This definition was based on previous job involvement definitions (Allport, 1947; French & Kain, 1962; Guion, 1958) that all shared the same core characteristics: someone for whom work plays an essential role in their life and is personally affected by their overall job situation including their work tasks, co-workers, and company (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). This particular individual can be contrasted with the non-job involved worker who does not possess the significant connections to all aspects of their work and does not feel as though work is an important part of their psychological life. For these people, work does not affect their identity and they are described as doing their living “off the job” (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965).

Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) conceptualization and measurement of job involvement was comprehensive and broken down into five factors to classify the construct. The first factor, hopeless quality, refers to the extent an individual cares about their work. An individual that has a high level of hopeless quality becomes apathetic and lacks concern for their work. High job involvement refers to how personally involved an
individual is with their work. Such a factor discriminates the different magnitudes of involvement an individual has with their job. The third factor of the job involvement construct contains items that have high face validity regarding job involvement. Such items clearly convey high involvement and a high duty towards work. The fourth factor identifies negative involvement. Individuals who exhibit high levels of negative involvement avoid coming to work and do not show a sense of concern or guilt with unfinished or poorly completed work. Finally, the fifth item of Lodahl and Kejner’s job involvement construct dealt with pride in the organization. This factor determines an individual’s pride in the organization and measures one’s participation in the workplace. This conceptualization of the job involvement construct was one of the first developed and has been successful in allowing researchers to identify antecedents of job involvement and determine how it affects other workplace outcomes (Rabinowitz, Hall, & Goodale, 1977; Morrow, 1983; Gould & Penly, 1985).

Criticisms of the Job Involvement Construct

Although Lodahl & Kejner’s (1965) construct development created an identity and meaning for job involvement, Kanungo (1982) argued that their conceptualization carried “excessive meaning” and as a result suffered from serious construct validity issues. Due to these measurement issues, data using previous conceptions of job involvement could be misleading and difficult to interpret. Kanungo claimed that Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) job involvement construct was contaminated with measures of intrinsic motivation for satisfying self-esteem needs, and included items that were descriptive of both affective and cognitive states. For example, the item for the negative
involvement dimension “sometimes I’d like to kick myself for the mistakes I’ve made in my work (reverse coded)” is directed at the intrinsic motivation of a person for fulfilling self-esteem needs at work. Other items, such as “the major satisfaction in my life comes from my job” and “the most important things that happen to me involve my work,” are directed towards and individuals affective and cognitive states, respectively (Kanungo, 1982).

Kanungo also stated that the most obvious problem with the previously developed constructs was their inability to distinguish the different contexts in which an employee can show personal involvement. Involvement within a particular job is not the same as centrality of work in one’s life. Involvement with a particular job refers to the extent a current job satisfies an employee’s present needs, while centrality of work in one’s life is a general belief that is not necessarily tied to ones current job (Kanungo, 1982). This distinction highlighted the difference between one being involved with a specific job, and the degree that one is involved with work, or compensated employment in general (Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994). To settle this issue, Kanungo separated involvement into two distinct constructs: job involvement and work involvement. This distinction recognizes that the involvement constructs are different and may differentially affect organizational outcomes, an idea that is central to the direction of this paper.

The involvement construct has continued to develop and become more defined throughout the years. Earlier theorists identified the idea that people become involved in their job although, they did not understand the role involvement played in the workplace. Lodahl and Kejner (1965) took the next step in the evolution of the involvement construct
by psychometrically validating an instrument to measure it. However, Kanungo (1982) criticized such a conceptualization, stating that it was too vague and required the distinction of involvement within a job, and involvement with work in general. I will now review the important research investigations that have focused on the job involvement component of the involvement construct and the effect it has on turnover.

**Job Involvement and Employee Turnover**

The earliest research on job involvement and turnover was completed by Wickert (1951) who found that telephone operators and service representatives were less likely to quit if they were more “ego-involved” in their work. A meta-analytic review (Hom & Griffeth, 1995) of the involvement construct identifies a consistent, though modest, negative relationship with turnover ($r = -.17$). Blau and Boal (1987) expanded the scope of turnover research to include both job involvement and organizational commitment. Previous models (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979) have shown that organizational commitment plays a significant role in the turnover process, such that the more committed an individual is, the less likely they are to leave the organization. Recognizing this finding and the fact that job involvement has also accounted for a significant amount of variance in explaining turnover (Farris, 1971), Blau and Boal (1987) chose to focus their research efforts on these two variables. Quite often job involvement and organizational commitment have been investigated individually, but their joint effect has not been acknowledged.

Job involvement and organizational commitment are related, but according to Morrow (1983) the two constructs are distinct work attitudes due to their different
referents. An employee who possesses high job involvement identifies with and cares about their present job and sees it as important to satisfying one’s self image (Kanungo, 1982). An employee who possesses high organizational commitment, however, has an attachment to the particular organization and strives to maintain such a relationship (Porter & Steers, 1973). Therefore, employees who have high levels of both job involvement and organizational commitment should be the most motivated of all workers due to their attraction to their job and attachment to the organization. Blau and Boal (1987) believed this finding exemplifies the potential for a significant interactive effect that may exist between job involvement and organizational commitment, resulting in distinct “orientations.” According to Kanungo, (1982) one’s job can help one meet their intrinsic growth needs, while the actual organization is an outlet for one to meet their social and other extrinsic rewards needs (Angle & Perry, 1983). Based on such empirical research, Blau and Boal (1987) believed job involvement and organizational commitment would complement each other as multiplicative predictors of turnover and proposed that the two variables would interact to predict employee turnover.

Blau and Boal (1987) believed examining the different levels of individual job involvement and organizational commitment could give them a more detailed insight into understanding and explaining turnover behavior. They proposed a four-category taxonomy based on the different combinations of high and low levels of each construct (see Figure 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>High Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Job Involvement</td>
<td>High Job Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathetic Employee</td>
<td>Lone Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Citizen</td>
<td>Institutionalized Star</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Blau & Boal’s (1987) four cell taxonomy*

Their theoretical proposition stated that each cell would have a different impact on turnover. These distinct cells will now be reviewed.

The first cell of their model, labeled “institutionalized stars”, consists of employees who possess both high job involvement and high organizational commitment. These individuals view their job as important to their self image and strive to maintain their current membership within the specific organization. Due to their identification with their job as well as their strong relationship with the organization, these employees would be the least likely to voluntarily leave the organization. These individuals exhibit both task-related effort (ie: concern for effective completion of job tasks and duties) and group maintenance effort (ie: concern to maintain the organization). As a result, institutionalized stars are particularly sensitive to the work they do, their role within the company, their co-workers, and their future within the organization. Persistent dissatisfaction within these contexts may prompt thoughts of leaving. If these employees were to leave the organization, this dysfunctional turnover – turnover that negatively affects the organization – would have the largest detrimental effect than any other category of the model, as the organization would be losing valued employees who are difficult and expensive to replace. Not only would costs negatively affect the
organization, but institutionalized stars are likely to be valued by other co-workers and their loss may disrupt social and communication patterns, as well as satisfaction of those who are still in the organization (Blau & Boal, 1987).

The second cell of the model are employees who have high job involvement and low organizational commitment, or as Blau and Boal (1987) label them – “the lone wolves.” For these individuals, their job is important to them, but they do not particularly care if they are doing that job for their current organization or another one. These people will show much effort regarding task-related activities, but lack effort in maintaining extrinsic social ties within the organization. Such individuals will only attract other workers who share a similar job interest. Lone wolves are sensitive to facets of satisfaction related to their particular job skill or specific working conditions in which they achieve their tasks, and they would be more prone to voluntarily leave if a more appealing job prospect comes their way. Blau and Boal (1987) proposed that lone wolves impact on turnover will be mixed such that their commitment to task related effort benefits the organization, while their disconnection from the membership of the organization may cause resentment among employees. Upon voluntarily leaving the organization, the company will lose the lone wolves dependability regarding effective task completion, but their departure may benefit the cohesiveness of workgroups. Therefore, this cell is also considered to be a form of dysfunctional turnover, but the impact of a lone wolf leaving is not as severe as the loss of an institutionalized star.

Employees that possess low job involvement and high organizational commitment are classified as “corporate citizens” (Blau & Boal, 1987). These individuals show a high
concern for the organization and its goals, however, they do not find their job to be personally important to them. As a result, these individuals do not put forth task-related effort, but focus on social involvement and the maintenance of the organization. Such individuals make their way through the organization through their understanding of company politics and are sensitive to satisfaction with their co-workers as well as the norms of the company. Disruptions in such areas may induce thoughts of leaving. Although these individuals are not as valuable to the organization as institutionalized stars or lone wolves, they can have a significant negative impact when they voluntarily leave. Due to their commitment to and allocation of effort towards social ties and group maintenance, the loss of a corporate citizen can significantly affect the cohesiveness of an organization. At the same time, the result of having too many corporate citizens can also be detrimental to productivity.

The final cell of Blau and Boal’s (1987) taxonomy consists of the “apathetic employees”. Individuals in this cell lack both job involvement and organizational commitment. Therefore, they do not possess task-related or group-related effort. Apathetic employees are sensitive to reward satisfaction, such as pay or promotion as well as more favorable employment opportunities external to their current organization. That is, pay increases may retain such employees while more attractive external opportunities will cause them to leave. Such members are not valued by the organization and, unlike the other three cells in their model, the departure of apathetic employees result in functional turnover – that is, the organization benefits from losing their employment (Blau & Boal, 1987).
After conceptually developing their four taxonomy model, Blau and Boal (1989) empirically tested it. They predicted that apathetic employees would be the most likely to voluntarily leave the organization, while institutionalized stars would be the least likely to leave. Likewise, they predicted that lone wolves would be more likely to leave the organization than corporate citizens, due to the fact that lone wolves lack personal attachment to the organization and are more willing to pursue employment elsewhere if it is more relevant to their job specific skill and advancement. To test the existence of their conceptual model, Blau and Boal (1989) used analysis of variance (ANOVA). A median split was used on the job involvement and organizational commitment variables to create high and low job involvement categories. Post hoc tests were then conducted to determine significant differences in the group means.

The results of their study showed that job involvement and organizational commitment do significantly interact to predict turnover such that the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover is stronger when job involvement is low. This showed support for Blau and Boal’s (1989) hypotheses and it was determined that the frequency of turnover was significantly higher for apathetic employees than it was for lone wolves, corporate citizens, and institutionalized stars. Additionally, lone wolves had significantly higher frequency of turnover than institutionalized stars (see Figure 2). In their study comparing part time employees with their full time counterparts, Martin and Hafer (1995) rendered a similar interaction between job involvement and organizational commitment in predicting turnover. However, this study focused on the outcome variable of turnover intention.
Although Blau and Boal’s (1989) model provided empirical support that job involvement interacted with organizational commitment to predict turnover, there has been some concern regarding the validity of findings among researchers. In their study, Huselid and Day (1991) attempted to replicate Blau and Boal’s study using a two factor definition of organizational commitment (attitudinal commitment and continuance commitment) and the more appropriate statistical procedure of logistic regression. When using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression, Huselid and Day (1991) found that the attitudinal commitment by job involvement interaction significantly predicted turnover. However, when dealing with a dichotomous outcome variable such as turnover, logistic regression is preferred over ANOVA and OLS regression, due to the fact that the latter are conventional linear estimation procedures that incorrectly test a dichotomous dependent variable (Huselid & Day 1991). When logistic regression was used, Huselid & Day (1991) failed to find support for the Blau and Boal’s (1989) proposed job involvement moderation.
The non-significant job involvement moderation found by Huselid and Day (1991) does provide some evidence that job involvements’ interaction with organizational commitment in predicting employee turnover may not be so definite. However, the criticism can be made that their study utilized Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) measure of job involvement, as opposed to Kanungo’s (1982) measure which was used by Blau and Boal (1989). As you may recall, I have previously discussed the issues with using Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) as it has been conceptualized as carrying “excessive meaning” and may result from serious construct validity issues (Kanungo, 1982). Therefore, caution must be taken when interpreting Huselid and Day’s (1991) null findings. Upon identifying the mixed results found by Blau and Boal (1989) and Huselid and Day (1991), Sjoberg and Sverke (2000) offered yet another solution to settle the conflicting job involvement moderation results.

Sjoberg and Sverke (2000) revisited Blau and Boal’s (1989) model, but with a different proposition. They believed that the mixed findings regarding involvement and commitment’s interactive role in predicting turnover were attributed to a focus on the direct causal link between the interaction and turnover, without the mediation of turnover intention. Turnover intention refers to the estimated probability that an employee will be permanently leaving the organization within the near future (Mobley, 1982). Although this variable has been a stronger predictor of actual turnover than other job attitudes (such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment), the strength or the relationship has varied across samples typically explaining about 25 percent of variance in actual turnover or less (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). As a result, the possibility that turnover
intention plays a significant role regarding relationship with attitudinal variables in predicting actual turnover is likely. Therefore, Sjoberg and Sverke (2000) replicated and extended Blau and Boal’s (1989) conceptual model that job involvement and organizational commitment interact to influence actual turnover through the mediation of turnover intention (see Figure 3) (Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000). Unlike Huselid and Day’s (1991) replication, this study utilized Kanungo’s (1982) measurement of job involvement and can directly be compared to Blau and Boal’s (1989) study on job involvement and turnover.

When they (Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000) entered job involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term into a logistic regression model, the three variables significantly predicted variation in the dependent variable of actual turnover. However, when turnover intention was added to the same model, job involvement, organizational commitment, and the interaction term were no longer significantly related to actual turnover, supporting the notion that turnover intention mediates the effects of job involvement and organizational commitment on turnover (Sjober & Sverke, 2000). This finding bridged the gaps between previous job involvement-turnover research investigations utilizing the proper statistical procedures.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 3. Sjoberg & Sverke’s (2000) moderated mediation results*
Job Involvement-Work Involvement Distinction

Although there has been a variety of studies investigating job involvement and how it affects workplace variables, the multifaceted components of the involvement construct have been disregarded in the turnover literature. Kanungo’s (1982) claim that the involvement construct must be divided into two distinct constructs recognizes that involvement is a cognitive state of psychological identification with both a particular job as well as with work in one’s life. However, these two identifications do not refer to the same context. This identification depends on the saliency of an employee’s intrinsic and extrinsic needs, and the perceptions that employee has about the needs-satisfying potentialities of the job or work in their life. Factor analysis provides supports that these constructs are indeed different (Kanungo, 1982). To further understand this distinction, Blau, Paul, and St. John (1993) referred to the two constructs on a time line. They classified job involvement as a construct of more immediate focus while work involvement was classified as a long term focus. This brings further distinction to the involvement variable as job involvement is concerned with the present job, while work involvement is more abstract and a function of value of work in one’s life (Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993). Although job involvement and work involvement are often positively related to each other (Kanungo, 1982), the two constructs have been identified as distinct psychological variables that may have different relationships with outcome variables. As previous research has failed to shine light on both facets of involvement, an investigation with a focus on the work involvement component of the involvement construct is warranted. Work Involvement as a Moderator
Previous research (Kanungo, 1982; Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993) has stated that the two involvement referents are different. It is proposed that work involvement has a different interactive effect than job involvement in predicting employee turnover. For example, Cohen (1998) found that Kanungo's conceptualization of work involvement was positively related to turnover intention, including intention to leave the organization, intention to leave the job, and intention to leave the occupation. As discussed earlier, job involvement possesses a consistent negative relationship with turnover (Blau & Boal, 1989; Huselid & Day, 1991; Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000). The positive relationship that Cohen (1998) discovered between work involvement and turnover provides support that work involvement may have a different relationship with turnover than job involvement. Cohen’s study, however, did not investigate work involvement and its relationship with other psychological variables and turnover. Therefore, the present thesis investigated the interaction between work involvement and organizational commitment and how their multiplicative effect predicts turnover.

To investigate work involvement’s role in predicting turnover when interacting with organizational commitment, a four cell taxonomy will be used (see Figure 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>High Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Work Involvement</td>
<td>High Work Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Apathetic</td>
<td>Work Centrality Unfulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Attached</td>
<td>Work Centrality Fulfilled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4. Proposed work involvement taxonomy*
It is proposed that those who have high work involvement (i.e. those who state work is a central part of their life) will be more sensitive to the positive and negative effects that attitudinal variables have on work outcomes due to the individual’s high “investment” to the importance of work in their life. Specifically, it is proposed that high work involvement will strengthen the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention. Therefore, those who are “work centrality fulfilled” (possess high work involvement and high organizational commitment) will possess the lowest level of turnover intention of all four cells. The rationale for this prediction is that these individuals perceive work to be a central part of their life and strive to maintain a positive work situation. Therefore, the combination of their identification with work in their life and commitment to the organization keeps these employees engaged in completing their work within their specific organization. In their eyes, work is a central part of their life and they are fulfilled by doing such work in an organization that promotes their psychological identification with work.

Individuals who are “commitment attached” (possess low work involvement and high organizational commitment) are those who possess the second lowest level of turnover intention behind those who are work centrality fulfilled. These individuals are indifferent about the importance of work in their life, but they are attached to their organization, and such an attachment reduces their thoughts of leaving the organization. Similar to Blau & Boal’s (1989) corporate citizen, these individuals play an important role in the cohesiveness of the organization but do not identify work as a central component of their life.
The final two cells, those who are “work centrality unfulfilled” (high work involvement and low organizational commitment) and those who are “work apathetic” (low work involvement and low organizational commitment) will have similar levels of high turnover intention. These two groups of will be the most likely to possess turnover intention leading to withdrawal from the organization. Opposite to those who are work centrality fulfilled, those who are work centrality unfulfilled value work in their life, but lack an attachment to the organization. As work is a central part of life to these individuals, they will strive to be in the best possible work situation. Therefore, their lack of commitment to their organization may result in leaving it for an organization in which they feel more attached to, allowing them to maximize the salience of work in their life.

Those who are work apathetic will share a similar high level of turnover intention as those who are work centrality unfulfilled. The difference between these two groups is that work centrality fulfilled individuals will be proactively leaving to pursue opportunities that improve their work situation, while work apathetic individuals will suffer from a disposition of indifference and apathy, often leaving because they find other opportunities, or they are driven away from the organization.

Therefore, it is predicted that those who are work apathetic and work centrality unfulfilled will possess similar levels of turnover intention, but such levels will be significantly higher than those who are commitment attached and work centrality fulfilled. Finally, it is predicted that those who are work centrality fulfilled will have significantly lower levels of turnover intention than the other three groups of the taxonomy (see Figure 5).
Figure 5. Work involvement moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention.

Similar to Blau and Boal’s (1989) study, the taxonomy described above was developed to understand how work involvement may interact with organizational commitment to predict turnover. As depicted in Figure 5, it is believed that work involvement will interact with organizational commitment to predict turnover such that the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover will be stronger for those who have high work involvement.
THE PRESENT STUDY

The purpose of the present study is two-fold. The first is to revisit past job involvement models (Huselid & Day, 1999 and Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000) within two distinct work samples. This analysis seeks to clarify the conflicting findings regarding the job involvement moderation hypothesis. Secondly, this investigation extends the previous involvement research to determine work involvement’s interactive role in the turnover process.

Job Involvement Replication Hypotheses

The current study seeks to replicate the findings obtained by the previous job involvement investigations.

Hypothesis 1: Using OLS and logistic regression, I will further test the hypothesis that job involvement interacts with organizational commitment to predict actual turnover (Blau & Boal, 1989). It is predicted that the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover will be stronger when job involvement is low.

Hypothesis 2: Turnover intention mediates the additive and multiplicative effects of job involvement and organizational commitment on subsequent turnover (Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000).

Work Involvement Moderation Hypotheses

As mentioned, an emphasis that the different involvement referents are not the same construct (Kanungo, 1982; Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993) leads researchers to wonder how the different forms of involvement impact organizational outcomes. As
discussed, I propose that work involvement has a different interactive effect than job involvement in predicting employee turnover such that those who have high work involvement will be more sensitive to the positive and negative effects that attitudinal variables have on outcomes, specifically employee turnover. As mentioned, previous research (Blau & Boal, 1989; Huselid & Day, 1991; Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000) on job involvements’ role in the employee turnover process has been inconsistent and has failed to acknowledge that the work involvement construct make affect the relationship.

*Hypothesis 3:* Work involvement moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention such that high work involvement strengthens the negative relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention. Figure 5 depicts this relationship.

*Hypothesis 4:* Turnover intention mediates the additive and multiplicative effects of work involvement and organizational commitment on subsequent turnover.
METHOD

Participants and Procedure

This study uses samples from two different organizations that will test the proposed hypotheses.

Sample 1: The initial sample size comprised of 443 employees from a national insurance company. However, only 373 individuals fully responded (84.1%). The sample contained 22% males and 78% females, with an average age of 30. Of those who participated in the survey, the average tenure is 3.75 years. The turnover rate for this sample is 7.5%.

Sample 2: The initial sample size comprised 264 employees from a national retail store. However, 245 individuals fully responded (92.8%). The sample contained 4% males and 95.8% females with an average age of 34. Of those who participated in the survey, the average tenure is 3.45 years. The turnover rate for this sample is 44%.

All participants were treated in accordance with the ethical principles established by the American Psychological Association. A power analysis was conducted using G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) to determine sample size; it was determined that 132 participants are required to have an effect size of .10 with .95 power, \( \alpha = .05 \), with 3 predictors; change in \( R^2 \) was used for this analysis.

The data collection process was coordinated by each organizations human resource manager. A cover sheet was attached to the survey outlining why the research was being conducted. This letter also ensures confidentiality and assures the information an employee provides will not be used to evaluate them. Before completing the survey,
participants read and signed a consent form and were informed that they could withdrawal from the survey at any time with no penalty. Upon completion, participants were informed that they could contact the Human Resource Manager with any additional questions regarding the survey.

**Measures**

*Job involvement.* Kanungo’s (1982) job involvement scale was used to measure an employee’s job involvement. This survey contained 10 items that evaluated the level of employee job involvement. The responses to the survey are evaluated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 6 = *strongly agree*. Sample items from the job involvement scale include “I have very strong ties with my present job which would be very difficult to break,” and “the most important things that happen to me involve my present job.” The coefficient alpha for this scale was .87 (Kanungo, 1982). The coefficient alpha for job involvement is .80 in sample 1 and .76 in sample 2.

*Organizational commitment.* Organizational commitment was measured using Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian’s (1974) 15-item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The responses to the survey were evaluated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. Sample items from the scale include “In my job, I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar,” and “in my job, I feel very little loyalty to this organization (reverse coded).” The coefficient alpha level for this scale is .84 and has been commonly used by many researchers. The coefficient alpha level for organizational commitment is .90 in sample 1 and .88 in sample 2.
Work involvement. Kanungo’s (1982) work involvement scale was used to measure an employee’s work involvement. This survey contained 6 items that evaluated the level of employee work involvement. The responses to the survey are evaluated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree. Sample items from the work involvement scale include “work should be considered central to life,” “work should be only a small part of one’s life (reverse coding),” and “Life is worth living only when people are absorbed in work.” The coefficient alpha for this scale was .75 (Kanungo, 1982). The coefficient alpha for work involvement is .69 in sample 1 and .68 in sample 2.

Employee turnover. Turnover was measured by determining if the employee was still a member of the organization at time 2, one year after completing the survey. If the employee left the organization, they were coded as 1 and identified as a leaver; if they were still a member of the organization they were coded as 0 and identified as a stayer. Upon departure from the organization, each employee was classified as a voluntary leaver (voluntarily left the organization; coded 1) or involuntary leaver (terminated; coded 2). For the purposes of this investigation, voluntary leavers were analyzed as they are the individuals who negatively affect the organization upon departure. Thus, three employees who were terminated during the study were not included.

Turnover intention. Hom, Griffeth, and Sellaro’s (1984) turnover intention scale is composed of questions regarding organizational resignation. Participants were asked questions regarding their likelihood of remaining in the organization at or before the end of the year. The responses to the construct are evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale with
different labels, depending on the question being addressed such as $1 = \text{no chance}$ to $5 = 100\% \text{ chance}$, and $1 = \text{definitely not}$ to $5 = \text{definitely yes}$. The coefficient alpha level for turnover intention is .94 in sample 1 and .95 in sample 2.

**Data Analyses**

Hypothesis 1 (job involvement and organizational commitment interact to predict actual turnover) was tested by using both ordinary least squares (OLS) hierarchical regression and logistic regression with turnover as the outcome variable. In the first step, job involvement and organizational commitment were entered into the equation. In the second step, the interaction term of job involvement and organizational commitment were entered into the equation. By examining the significant change in $R^2$ in the full model, we can detect whether the interaction term is predicting turnover above and beyond the main effects, thus indicating a significant moderator. As suggested by Aiken and West (1991), the two predictor variables that create the interaction term were centered to minimize the multicollinearity that may exist.

Hypothesis 2 (job involvement and organizational commitment interactively influence turnover through the mediation of intention to quit) was tested using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) mediation procedure. To test for a mediation model for hypothesis 2, the first step required significant relationships to exist between job involvement and turnover intention, organizational commitment and turnover intention, and the interaction term and turnover intention. The second step requires the latter predictor variables (job involvement, organizational commitment, turnover intention) to significantly predict actual turnover. As previous research (Huselid & Day, 1991; Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000)
has been critical of inappropriately using OLS regression to test for turnover, logistic regression will be utilized to predict turnover as a binary outcome variable (0 = still working, 1 = turnover). The third step to this process introduces the mediator (turnover intention) to the model; if full mediation does in fact exist, turnover intention has to emerge as the sole significant predictor of turnover when in a model with the main effect predictor variables their multiplicative interactions (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Finally, Sjoberg and Sverke’s (2000) analysis used Baron and Kenny’s (1986) mediation procedure to test for mediation.

Hypothesis 3 (work involvement and organizational commitment interact to predict turnover intention) was tested using ordinary least squares (OLS) hierarchical regression analysis with turnover intention as the outcome variable. In the first step, work involvement and organizational commitment were entered into the equation. In the second step, the interaction term of work involvement and organizational commitment were entered into the equation. By examining the significant change in $R^2$ in the full model, we can detect whether the interaction term is predicting turnover intention above and beyond the main effects, thus indicating a significant moderator. As suggested by Aiken and West (1991), the two predictor variables that create the interaction term were centered to minimize the multicollinearity that may exist.

Hypothesis 4 (work involvement and organizational commitment interactively influence turnover through the mediation of intention to quit) was also tested using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) mediation procedure. The same steps used to test hypothesis 2 were used to test hypothesis 4.
RESULTS

Sample 1 Results

Means, standard deviations, and variable intercorrelations for sample 1 are summarized in Table 1. There was a significant positive relationship between job involvement and work involvement ($r = .56, p < .01$). Both variables were also significantly related to turnover intention ($r = -.45, p < .01$ and $r = -.17, p < .01$, respectively). Job involvement and work involvement, however, were not significantly related to actual turnover ($r = -.05, ns.$ and $r = -.02, ns.$ respectively). Organizational commitment was significantly related to both turnover intention ($r = -.68, p < .01$) and actual turnover ($r = -.14, p < .05$). Finally, consistent with previous research, there was a significant relationship between turnover intention and actual turnover ($r = .26, p < .01$).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among Sample 1 Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Involvement</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work Involvement</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Org. Commitment</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turnover Intention</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Turnover</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 378 to 434

Note: Coefficient alphas are displayed in parentheses

**p < .01
*p < .05
Analyses for Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis stated job involvement moderates the relationship between
organizational commitment and actual turnover. This hypothesis was tested using both
hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) regression and hierarchical logistic regression.
For both procedures, turnover was first regressed onto job involvement and
organizational commitment, and then their interaction term. The results of the OLS
analysis are presented in Table 2. The omnibus test of the full regression model was
significant $F(3, 352) = 7.14, p < .01, R^2 = .06$. In the first step, job involvement and
organizational commitment significantly predicted actual turnover $F(2, 353) = 3.57, p <
.05, R^2 = .02$. However, only organizational commitment uniquely predicted turnover ($\beta =
-.16, p < .01$). Consistent with Blau & Boal’s (1989) finding, there was a significant
interaction ($\beta = .20, p < .01$) between job involvement and organizational commitment in
predicting actual turnover in the second step, $F(1, 352) = 7.14, p < .01, \Delta R^2 = .04$. Figure
6 depicts the nature of this relationship. For employees with high job involvement (one
standard deviation above the mean) the slope between organizational commitment and
turnover is nearly zero ($\beta = .03$). However, for employees that have low job involvement
(one standard deviation below the mean) the slope between organizational commitment
and turnover becomes negative ($\beta = -.29$) such that each standard unit increase in
organizational commitment is associated with a .29 standard unit decrease in the
likelihood of turnover.
Table 2.
**OLS Regression on Turnover**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>β&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Involvement</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. JI × OC</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.57*</td>
<td>7.14**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 356

<sup>a</sup>standardized regression weight

**p < .01
* p < .05

Figure 6. Job Involvement Moderation Plots – OLS Regression Sample 1

I also tested hypothesis 1 using hierarchical logistic regression, entering the variables in the same order as in the previous analyses. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3. Together the two predictors were significantly related to turnover in the first step, $G^2 (2, N = 356) = 6.84$, *Nagelkerke R<sup>2</sup> = .05, p < .05*. Once again, only
organizational commitment was uniquely associated with turnover ($B = -.62$), Wald $\chi^2 (1, N = 356) = 6.16$, $OR = .54 \ p < .05$. Contrary to the findings of Huselid and Day (1999) the interaction term ($B = .50$) accounted for a significant amount of variance ($Nagelkerke \Delta R^2 = .05$) in the presence of the main effect terms in the second step, Wald $\chi^2 (1, N = 356) = 7.86$, $OR = 1.64, \ p < .01$. Figure 7 depicts the nature of this relationship. When job involvement is fixed at one standard deviation below its mean, the negative relationship between organizational commitment and turnover is stronger than when job involvement is fixed at one standard deviation above its mean.

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logistic Regression on Turnover</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B^a$</td>
<td>$B^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Involvement</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-.62*</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. JI × OC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke $\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $\chi^2$</td>
<td>6.84*</td>
<td>14.29**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 356

*a standardized regression weight

**$p < .01$

*p $p < .05$
Analyses for Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis stated turnover intention mediates the additive and multiplicative effects of job involvement and organizational commitment on subsequent turnover. This hypothesis was tested using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) procedure for detecting mediation. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4. Following the first step of the mediation procedure, turnover intention was regressed onto job involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term. The complete equation was significant $F(3, 399) = 120.87, p < .01, R^2 = .48$. The main effects for job involvement and organizational commitment significantly predicted turnover intention ($\beta = -.12, p < .05$, and $\beta = -.59, p < .01$, respectively). The interaction term was marginally significant ($\beta = .07, p < .06$).

Following the second step in the procedure, actual turnover was regressed onto job involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term, using
simultaneous logistic regression. Results show a significant model $G^2 (3, N = 356) = 14.29$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .10$, $p < .01$. The main effect for job involvement did not significantly predict turnover ($B = .49$, Wald $\chi^2 = 2.18$, ns.) while main effect for organizational commitment was marginally significant in predicting actual turnover ($B = -.50$, Wald $\chi^2 = 3.61$, $p < .06$). The interaction term significantly predicted actual turnover ($B = .50$, Wald $\chi^2 = 7.86$, $p < .05$). The nature of the relationship is similar to the relationship depicted in Figure 7.

In the final step in testing mediation, actual turnover was regressed onto job involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term in the presence of turnover intention. Results show a significant model $G^2 (4, N = 343) = 25.98$, Nagelkerke $\Delta R^2 = .08$, $p < .01$. After controlling for turnover intention, the main effects for job involvement and organizational commitment did not significantly predict actual turnover ($B = .35$, Wald $\chi^2 = 1.07$, ns. and $B = .32$, Wald $\chi^2 = .93$, ns. respectively). However, the interaction term remained a significant predictor of actual turnover after controlling for the effects of turnover intention, ($B = .48$, Wald $\chi^2 = 6.96$, $p < .01$). Finally, turnover intention was a significant predictor of actual turnover showing support for partial mediation ($B = 1.00$, Wald $\chi^2 = 12.63$, $p < .01$).
Table 4.
Procedure for Detecting Mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Turnover Intention Step 1</th>
<th>Turnover Step 2</th>
<th>Turnover Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-.59**</td>
<td>-.50†</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI × OC</td>
<td>.07†</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke $R^2$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $\chi^2$</td>
<td>14.29**</td>
<td>25.98**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N                  | 403                       | 356             | 343             |

*standardized regression weight  
**p < .01  
*p < .05  
† p < .06

Analyses for Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis stated work involvement moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention such that high work involvement strengthens the negative relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention. This hypothesis was tested using hierarchical OLS regression and followed the same procedure used for testing hypothesis 1. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 5. The omnibus test of the full regression model was significant $F (3, 406) = 112.64, p < .01, R^2 = .45$. Together, work involvement and organizational commitment significantly predicted turnover intention in the first step, $F (2, 407) = 169.36, p < .01, R^2 = .45$. However, only organizational commitment uniquely predicted turnover intention ($\beta = -.68, p < .01$). The main effect for work involvement did not significantly predict turnover intention ($\beta = .01, ns.$). The interaction term ($\beta = .01, ns.$), entered in the second
step, did not significantly predict turnover intention $F (1, 406) = 112.64, \Delta R^2 = .00$, failing to provide support for hypothesis 3.

Table 5.

OLS Regression on Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Step 1 β</th>
<th>Step 2 β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work Involvement</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WI × OC</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>169.36**</td>
<td>112.64**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 410

*a*standardized regression weight

**p < .01

* p < .05

Analyses for Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis stated turnover intention mediates the additive and multiplicative effects of work involvement and organizational commitment on subsequent turnover. This hypothesis was tested using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) procedure for detecting mediation and followed the same procedures used to test hypothesis 2. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 6. Following the first step of the mediation procedure, turnover intention was regressed onto work involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term. The complete equation was significant $F (3, 406) = 112.64, p < .01, R^2 = .45$. Results show that organizational commitment significantly predicted turnover intention ($\beta = -.68, p < .01$). However, work
involvement and the interaction term did not significantly predict turnover intention (β = .01, ns. and β = .01, ns. respectively), therefore there is no need to continue Baron and Kenny’s (1986) mediation procedure.

Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure for Detecting Mediation</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI × OC</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R²</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model χ²</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*standardized regression weight

**p < .01

*p < .05

Sample 1 Discussion

The results from sample 1 presents evidence that job involvement moderated the relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover, providing support for hypothesis 1. The nature of the interaction shows that there is a stronger negative relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover when employees have low job involvement, a finding that is consistent with Blau and Boal’s (1987) framework, although their empirical analysis (Blau & Boal, 1989) used ANOVA. This interaction is depicted in Figure 7. The interaction plots seem to indicate that apathetic employees (i.e., low levels of both job involvement and organizational commitment) may
be the most likely to leave the organization and corporate citizens (i.e., high organizational commitment and low job involvement) may be the least likely to leave the organization. This interactive depiction is also similar to Blau & Boal’s (1989) four cell framework.

Results provide partial support for hypothesis 2. The main effect relationship between job involvement and turnover was non-significant; therefore, turnover intention did not mediate the relationship between job involvement and turnover. Turnover intention fully mediated the main effect relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover. Finally, turnover intention only partially mediated the relationship between the involvement-commitment interaction and actual turnover.

Work involvement failed to significantly moderate the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover, failing to provide support for hypothesis 3 and hypothesis 4. Once again turnover intention fully mediated the main effect relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover in the presence of work involvement and the interaction of involvement and commitment.

Sample 2 Results

Means, standard deviations, and variable intercorrelations for sample 2 are summarized in Table 7. There was a significant positive relationship between job involvement and work involvement \((r = .54, p < .01)\). Job involvement was significantly related to turnover intention \((r = -.26, p < .01)\) but work involvement was not \((r = -.09, ns.)\). Similar to sample 1 results, neither variables were significantly related to actual turnover \((r = .01, ns.\) and \(r = \)
.01, ns., respectively). Organizational commitment was significantly related to both turnover intention \((r = -0.64, p < 0.01)\) and actual turnover \((r = -0.26, p < 0.01)\). Finally, as displayed by previous research, there was a significant relationship between turnover intention and actual turnover \((r = 0.31, p < 0.01)\).

Table 7.  
**Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among Sample 2 Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Involvement</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work Involvement</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Org. Commitment</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turnover Intent</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Turnover</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 238 \text{ to } 260 \)
Note: Coefficient alphas are displayed in parentheses  
**\( p < .01 \)  
*\( p < .05 \)

Analyses for Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis stated job involvement moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover. This hypothesis was tested using both hierarchical ordinary least squares (OLS) regression and hierarchical logistic regression. For both procedures, turnover was first regressed onto job involvement and organizational commitment, and then their interaction term. The results of the OLS analysis are presented in Table 8. The omnibus test of the full regression model was significant \( F(3, 216) = 11.96, p < .01, R^2 = .09 \). In the first step, job involvement and organizational commitment significantly predicted actual turnover, \( F(2, 217) = 7.82, p < .01, R^2 = .07 \). However, only organizational commitment uniquely predicted turnover (\( \beta =\)
-.27, \( p < .01 \)). Consistent with Blau & Boal’s (1989) finding, there was a significant interaction (\( \beta = -.13, \ p < .05 \)) between job involvement and organizational commitment in predicting turnover in the second step, \( F(1, 216) = 11.96, \ p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .02 \). Figure 8 depicts the nature of this relationship. For employees with high job involvement (one standard deviation above the mean) the slope between organizational commitment and turnover is slightly negative (\( \beta = -.18 \)). However, for employees with low job involvement (one standard deviation below the mean) the slope between organizational commitment and turnover becomes more negative (\( \beta = -.38 \)) such that each standard unit increase in organizational commitment is associated with a .38 standard unit decrease in the likelihood of turnover.

Table 8. *Ordinary Least Squares Regression on Turnover*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta^* )</td>
<td>( \beta^a )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Involvement</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. JI × OC</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Delta R^2 = .07 \quad 0.02 \]
\[ F = 7.82** \quad 11.96** \]

\( ^* \)standardized regression weight
\( ** p < .01 \)
\( * p < .05 \)
I also tested hypothesis 1 using hierarchical logistic regression, entering the variables in the same order as in the previous analyses. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 9. Together the two predictors were significantly related to turnover in the first step, \( G^2(2, N = 220) = 15.39, \text{Nagelkerke } R^2 = .09, p < .01 \), although, only organizational commitment was uniquely associated with turnover (B = -.63), Wald \( \chi^2(1, N = 220) = 13.57, OR = .53 p < .01 \). Once again, contrary to the findings of Huselid and Day (1999) the interaction (B = .43, p < .05) term accounted for a significant amount of variance (Nagelkerke \( \Delta R^2 = .03 \)) in turnover beyond both main effect terms in the second step, Wald \( \chi^2(1, N = 220) = 4.49, OR = 1.53, p < .05 \). Figure 9 depicts the nature of this relationship. When job involvement is fixed at one standard deviation below its mean, the negative relationship between organizational commitment and turnover is stronger than when job involvement is fixed at one standard deviation above its mean.
Table 9. 
Logistic Regression on Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (^a)</td>
<td>B (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Involvement</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td>-.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. JI × OC</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nagelkerke ∆R\(^2\) | .09*     | .03**    |
Model χ\(^2\)       | 15.39*   | 20.15**  |

N = 220

\(^a\)standardized regression weight
\(^*\)p < .05
\(^**\)p < .01

Figure 9. Job Involvement Moderation Plots – Logistic Regression Sample 2

Analyses for Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis stated turnover intention mediates the additive and multiplicative effects of job involvement and organizational commitment on subsequent
turnover. As before, I tested this hypothesis using Baron and Kenny’s (1986) procedure for detecting mediation. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 10. Following the first step of the mediation procedure, turnover intention was regressed onto job involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term. The complete equation was significant $F(3, 214) = 52.17, p < .01, R^2 = .42$. The main effect for job involvement did not predict turnover intention ($\beta = -.08, \text{ns.}$) while the main effect for organizational commitment significantly predicted turnover intention ($\beta = -.62, p < .01$). The interaction term also did not significantly predict turnover intention ($\beta = .01, \text{ns.}$).

Following the second step in the procedure, actual turnover was regressed onto job involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term. Results show a significant model $\chi^2(3, N = 220) = 20.15, Nagelkerke R^2 = .12, p < .01$. The main effect for job involvement did not significantly predict turnover ($B = .18, \text{Wald } \chi^2 = .80, \text{ns.}$) while the main effect for organizational commitment significantly predicted actual turnover ($B = -.69, \text{Wald } \chi^2 = 14.79, p < .01$). The interaction term significantly predicted actual turnover ($B = .43, \text{Wald } \chi^2 = 4.49, p < .05$). The nature of the relationship is similar to the relationship depicted in Figure 9.

For the final step in testing mediation, actual turnover was regressed onto job involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term in the presence of turnover intention (mediator). Results show a significant model $\chi^2(4, N = 211) = 35.77, Nagelkerke \Delta R^2 = .09, p < .01$. After controlling for turnover intention, the main effects
for job involvement and organizational commitment did not significantly predict actual turnover (B = .28, Wald $\chi^2 = 1.77, ns.$ and B = -.23, Wald $\chi^2 = .96, ns.$). However, the interaction term remained a significant predictor of actual turnover after controlling for the effects of turnover intention, (B = .45, Wald $\chi^2 = 4.60, p < .05$). Finally, turnover intention was a significant predictor of actual turnover showing support for partial mediation (B = .66, Wald $\chi^2 = 14.29, p < .01$).

Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure for Detecting Mediation</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>$\beta^a$</td>
<td>B$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI × OC</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>-.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $\chi^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*standardized regression weight
**$p < .01$
* $p < .05$

Turnover intention, however, fails to mediate the relationship between the interaction term and actual turnover. Although the interaction term is significantly related to actual turnover in step 2 and step 3, the interaction term does not have a significant relationship with turnover intention in step 1 and therefore does not fulfill Baron and Kenny’s (1986) criteria for mediation.
Analyses for Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis stated work involvement moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention such that high work involvement strengthens the negative relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention. This hypothesis was tested using hierarchical OLS regression and followed the same procedure used for testing hypothesis 1. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 11. The omnibus test of the full regression model was significant $F(3, 219) = 54.12, p < .01, R^2 = .43$. Together, work involvement and organizational commitment significantly predicted turnover intention $F(2, 220) = 81.24, p < .01, R^2 = .43$. However, only organizational commitment uniquely predicted turnover intention ($\beta = -.65, p < .01$). The main effect for work involvement did not significantly predict turnover intention ($\beta = -.01, ns.$). The interaction term ($\beta = .01, ns.$), entered in the second step, also did not significantly predict turnover intention, $F(1, 219) = 54.12, \Delta R^2 = .00$, failing to provide support for hypothesis 3.
Table 11.

**OLS Regression on Turnover Intention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Work Involvement</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-0.65**</td>
<td>-0.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WI × OC</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ΔR^2 | .43** | .00
F    | 81.24** | 54.12**

N = 223

*a*standardized regression weight

**p < .01
*p < .05

Analyses for Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis stated turnover intention mediates the additive and
multiplicative effects of work involvement and organizational commitment on
subsequent turnover. This hypothesis was tested using Baron and Kenny’s (1986)
procedure for detecting mediation and followed the same procedure used to test
hypothesis 2. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 12. Following the first
step of the mediation procedure, turnover intention was regressed onto work
involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term. The complete
equation was significant $F(3, 219) = 54.12, p < .01, R^2 = .43$. Results show that
organizational commitment significantly predicted turnover intention ($β = -.65, p < .01$).
However, work involvement and the interaction term were not significant predictors of
turnover intention ($β = -.01, ns.$ and $β = -.03, ns.$, respectively).

Following the second step in the procedure, actual turnover was regressed onto
work involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term using
simultaneous logistic regression. Results show a significant model $G^2 (3, N = 227) = 16.27$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .09$, $p < .01$. Although organizational commitment emerged as a significant predictor of actual turnover ($B = -.62$, Wald $\chi^2 = 14.45$, $p < .01$) work involvement and the interaction term did not significantly predict actual turnover ($B = .11$, Wald $\chi^2 = .41$, ns., and $B = .01$, Wald $\chi^2 = .00$, ns.).

In the final step in testing mediation, actual turnover was regressed onto work involvement, organizational commitment, and their interaction term in the presence of turnover intention. Results show a significant model, $G^2 (4, N = 216) = 31.05$, Nagelkerke $\Delta R^2 = .09$, $p < .01$. After controlling for turnover intention in the presence of work involvement and the interaction term, organizational commitment was no longer a significant predictor of actual turnover ($B = -.13$, Wald $\chi^2 = .42$, ns.). Turnover intention emerged as the sole predictor of actual turnover ($B = .64$, Wald $\chi^2 = 13.86$, $p < .01$).

Once again, results show that turnover intention fully mediated the main effect (additive) relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover, providing partial support for hypothesis 4. The main effect of work involvement was not related to turnover intention or actual turnover, nor did turnover intention mediate the relationship between work involvement and actual turnover. Similar results were found for the interaction term, failing to provide support that turnover intention mediates the multiplicative effects of work involvement and organizational commitment in predicting actual turnover.
Table 12.
Procedure for Detecting Mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-0.65**</td>
<td>-0.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI × OC</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model ( \chi^2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*standardized regression weight
**p < .01
*p < .05

Sample 2 Discussion

The results from sample 2 also provide evidence that job involvement moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover, supporting hypothesis 1. The nature of the interaction is similar to sample 1, as there is a stronger negative relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover when employees have low job involvement. The interaction plots are depicted on Figure 9. Once again, the depiction of the interaction seems to indicate that apathetic employees (i.e., low levels of both job involvement and organizational commitment) may be the most likely to leave the organization and that corporate citizens (i.e., high organizational commitment and low job involvement) may be the least likely to leave the organization.

Results provide partial support for hypothesis 2. Once again, the main effect relationship between job involvement and turnover was non-significant and turnover intention did not mediate the relationship between job involvement and turnover. Similar
to sample 1, turnover intention fully mediated the main effect relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover. Unlike sample 1, turnover intention does not mediate the relationship between the interactional term and actual turnover.

Work involvement failed to emerge as a significant moderator of the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover, failing to provide support for hypothesis 3 and hypothesis 4. Once again, turnover intention fully mediated the main effect relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover in the presence of work involvement and the interaction term.
GENERAL DISCUSSION

The involvement construct has had a history of ambiguity regarding its ability to predict voluntary turnover. Specifically, a variety of research has attempted to understand how job involvement plays a role as a moderator in the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover. This investigation sought to bring a clearer understanding to the mixed findings of the job involvement moderation hypothesis on two distinct samples using an improved methodology. Additionally, it extended the involvement research to include a distinct involvement construct, work involvement, which was proposed to have a different effect on turnover than job involvement. I will now discuss the findings of this study.

Job Involvement as a Moderator

Hypothesis 1 tested if job involvement moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover. Although previous research has reported conflicting results regarding job involvement as a moderator (Blau & Boal, 1989; Huselid & Day, 1991; Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000), the results of this investigation provides consistent empirical support that job involvement interacts with organizational commitment to predict actual turnover. In fact, results detect a significant interaction in two distinct samples.

The nature of the significant job involvement moderation was similar in both sample 1 and sample 2. In both samples the negative relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover was stronger when employee’s possessed low job involvement. This indicates that an increase of organizational commitment is more
powerful in predicting a decrease in turnover for those who have low job involvement than those who have high job involvement. In other words, those who have low job involvement can be more positively influenced to remain in the organization by escalating their organizational commitment when compared to employees who have high job involvement.

These findings were confirmed using both OLS regression as well as the more appropriate quantitative methodology, logistic regression. This improved methodology addresses Huselid and Day’s (1991) criticism regarding the use of improper statistical analysis in previous research (Blau & Boal, 1989). The present study also used a more valid measure of the job involvement construct (Kanungo, 1981). Perhaps the null job involvement moderation reported by Huselid and Day (1991) was the result of using Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) measure, which has been criticized for construct contamination (Kanungo, 1981).

From a management perspective, this shows that practitioners cannot go wrong emphasizing and promoting organizational commitment and job involvement in the workplace to reduce voluntary turnover. This investigation highlights the importance of the job involvement and organizational commitment constructs and the effects their multiplicative relationship has on voluntary turnover. The significant interaction provides evidence that increasing organizational commitment to enhance retention will be most beneficial for those who have low job involvement. Managers can strive to increase organizational commitment by providing employees with growth and achievement opportunities, increasing the autonomy and scope of their jobs, and supplying accurate
and timely communication (Brown, 1996). To decrease dysfunctional turnover (i.e., turnover that is detrimental to the organization), the manager may benefit surveying the job involvement of the workforce and focus effort on increasing the organizational commitment of high performers who have low job involvement. This method will certainly not be the absolute solution to reducing dysfunctional turnover, but it may be a starting point for practitioners who have limited resources available to increasing retention. At this point, however, such suggestions are based on speculation in light of the results of this investigation. Therefore, managers should take such action with caution.

The Four Cell Taxonomy

Blau and Boal (1989) also used a four cell taxonomy to classify the different levels of job involvement and organizational commitment, predicting that the different groups would have different levels of turnover. They found that apathetic employees (low levels of both job involvement and organizational commitment) have significantly higher turnover rates than lone wolves (high job involvement and low organizational commitment), corporate citizens (low job involvement and high organizational commitment), and institutionalized stars (high levels of both job involvement and organizational commitment). Additionally, lone wolves had significantly higher rates of turnover than institutionalized stars. Although the current sample focused on the validation of the job involvement moderation and did not make specific predictions regarding Blau and Boal’s (1989) four cell taxonomy, the turnover rates among the four cells were also evaluated.
Blau and Boal (1989) used a median split to classify their four groups into the varying levels of job involvement and organizational commitment. Research shows the median split procedure is ill-advised due to the substantial negative consequences including loss of information about individual differences, loss of effect size and power, overestimation, and loss of measurement reliability (MacCallum, Zhang, Preacher, & Rucker, 2002). Therefore, the current investigation analyzed values plus and minus one standard deviation from the means on job involvement and organizational commitment to classify the four cell taxonomy (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Unfortunately, this procedure significantly reduced the sample size for the analysis of the turnover rates amongst the group.

When the turnover rates within the four cells were analyzed in sample 1, analysis of variance shows that there are no significant differences in mean levels of actual turnover between the four groups. This null finding is likely the result of insufficient power due to the combination of a small sample size (N = 48) and a low turnover rate (12%) in sample 1. Therefore, I used turnover intention as a proxy outcome variable to be compared to Blau and Boal’s (1989) turnover frequency results. Analysis of variance shows that apathetic employees have significantly higher levels of turnover intention (M = 3.20) than the other three cells of the taxonomy (all differences significant at p < .01). Likewise, lone wolves have higher levels of turnover intention (M = 2.49) than institutionalized stars (M = 1.40) and corporate citizens (M = 1.61) (all differences significant at p < .01). Corporate citizens and institutionalized stars did not have significantly different levels of turnover intention. These results are consistent with the
results found by Blau and Boal (1989), although their analysis used actual turnover as the outcome variable.

When the turnover rates within the four cells were examined in sample 2, analysis of variance shows that significant differences exist in the mean levels of turnover between the four groups. Corporate citizens have the lowest mean turnover frequency (M = .12) which is significantly lower than apathetic employees (M = .78) and lone wolves (M = 1.0) (all differences significant at p < .01). Corporate citizens did not have significantly lower levels of turnover frequency than institutionalized stars (M = .43). Once again, classifying the group into the four cell taxonomy lowered the sample size (N = 44). However, significant effects were detected as this sample had a higher rate of turnover (44%) than sample 1.

Due to issues regarding small sample sizes and low variability of turnover in the sub samples (requiring the use of an intentions measure over behavior in sample 1), post hoc results do not provide clear evidence regarding which group in the taxonomy has the highest and lowest turnover frequency. It can be determined that apathetic employees are consistently the most likely to leave, as they had significantly higher levels of turnover intention than all three groups in sample 1, and significantly higher levels of turnover than corporate citizens in sample 2. This is consistent with Blau and Boal’s (1989) finding as these individuals do not view their job as important to their self images, nor do they seek to maintain membership with the organization. Likewise, institutionalized stars and corporate citizens had similar levels of turnover intention in sample 1, and similar turnover rates in sample 2. This was also consistent with Blau and Boal’s (1989)
structure. Institutionalized stars are bounded to the organization due to their identification with their job and strong relationship with the organization. Corporate citizens remain bounded to the organization with their low ease of movement and high level of commitment to the organization.

**Turnover Intention as a Mediator**

Not only did this investigation revisit Blau and Boal’s (1989) job involvement moderation hypothesis, but it also considered Sjoberg and Sverke’s (2000) claim that turnover intention is a necessary mediator in the relationship. Specifically, hypothesis 2 proposed that turnover intention mediates the additive and multiplicative effects of job involvement and organizational commitment on subsequent turnover. Results fail to provide full support for this hypothesis, but there is evidence for different levels of mediation. Specifically, results indicated that turnover intention did not mediate the relationship between job involvement and turnover. However, turnover intention fully mediated the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover in sample 1 and sample 2. Finally, turnover intention partially mediated the multiplicative effects of job involvement and organizational commitment in predicting actual turnover in sample 1 and but it was not a mediator in sample 2.

Sjoberg & Sverke (2000) claimed that job involvement and organizational commitment (including their interaction term) are only indirectly related to actual turnover through the mediation of turnover intention. They declare that in the presence of the intention mediator, the variables will no longer predict actual turnover. They also state that significant relationships will exist between the psychological variables and
actual turnover only when the mediator is omitted from the equation (Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000, p. 250). Theoretically, they suggest that the interactive nature of the two variables should be reconsidered regarding their ability to predict actual turnover.

The current sample provide evidence that even in the presence of the mediator variable the interaction term remains a significant predictor of actual turnover in two distinct samples. That is, turnover intention does not totally absorb the explained variance of the interaction term. This result shows that studying the multiplicative effects of organizational commitment and job involvement in predicting turnover provides unique explained variance in the presence of turnover intention and is not consistent with the findings of Sjoberg and Sverke (2000).

This finding indicates that the interaction term may be a more powerful distal factor in predicting actual turnover a year later than it is in predicting immediate turnover intention. For example, in sample 1 the interaction term was a marginally significant predictor of turnover intention ($p < .06$) and was not a predictor of intention in sample 2. However, it remained a significant predictor of actual turnover in both sample 1 and sample 2. Recall that turnover intention was measured at the same time as job involvement and organizational commitment while the turnover data was collected a year later. This finding may be attributed to the unique characteristics of the outcome variables. For example, turnover intention has been criticized for being overly sensitive to daily fluctuating disturbances of the everyday work life (Kirshenbaum & Weisberg, 1990). That is, a simple argument with a co-worker or a compliment from a supervisor can radically alter intention from day to day. Intentions are acquired from social
interaction and provide one with some degree of preparation to adjust, although, they are not necessarily correlated with actions (LaPiere, 1957). The variability in intention could be due to any local positive or negative experience that has a major effect on the intention outcome, but no impact on the behavior of leaving. The interaction term contains psychological constructs that have been identified as relatively stable over time and may be difficult to change (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Siegel, 1969). Therefore, the lack of fluctuation in this term may be the reason that the interaction term does not affect immediate turnover intention.

The stability of job involvement and organizational commitment may not impact intention, but over time sustained levels of job involvement and commitment appear to be useful for predicting turnover behavior. As job involvement and organizational commitment are relatively stable constructs, analyzing the multiplicative combinations of high and low levels of each construct characterizes the qualities of a leaver and a stayer. For example, possessing low levels of both job involvement and organizational commitment appears to be more influential to the behavior of leaving over the course of a year, while high levels of both constructs appears to influence the behavior of staying over the course of a year. This investigation did not measure job involvement and organizational commitment over time, so it cannot necessarily confirm or disprove that the two psychological variables were sustained in the two samples. However, due to the temporal stability of the two constructs established by previous research, this could be a potential explanation for the obtained results, and a goal for future research.
Finally, although the interaction term remained a significant predictor of turnover in the presence of turnover intention, adding turnover intention to the model provided 8% of incremental variance explained in sample 1 and 9% in sample 2. Therefore, if the goal is to increase the variance explained in predicting an employee’s act of voluntarily leaving the organization, studying the multiplicative effects of job involvement and organizational commitment in conjunction with turnover intention serves the researcher well.

*Work Involvement as a Moderator*

The involvement construct has had its history of issues with its inability to be clearly interpreted when evaluating outcomes, which may be attributed to overlooking its multi-faceted components (Kanungo, 1982). Therefore, the current investigation sought to further dissect the involvement construct by also analyzing work involvement, a construct that is related to, yet distinct from job involvement. Recall that work involvement, in contrast to job involvement, is the value of work in one’s life.

Hypothesis 3 stated that work involvement interacts with organizational commitment to predict turnover and hypothesis 4 stated that turnover intention mediates the additive and multiplicative effects of work involvement and organizational commitment on subsequent turnover. Unfortunately, the work involvement facet of the involvement construct failed to provide a great deal of additional insight in our understanding of why employees leave an organization. Work involvement has a significant negative bivariate relationship with turnover intention in sample 1, indicating that higher levels of work involvement are associated with lower intention to leave.
However, organizational commitment was the only significant predictor of turnover intention in sample 1 and sample 2 when controlling for work involvement. Likewise, organizational commitment was the only significant predictor of actual turnover in sample 1 and sample 2 when controlling for work involvement. In other words, work involvement does not appear to have a significant influence in predicting turnover. This provides evidence that job involvement is clearly the more important involvement facet regarding an employee’s decision to leave an organization. This also provides further evidence that two involvement constructs are distinct in their relationship with organizational outcomes and should be treated as such.

Job involvement and work involvement have significant positive bivariate relationships in both sample (ranging from .54 to .56), indicating that the two constructs are related. However job involvement was the only facet that significantly predicted turnover. Work involvement’s inability to predict turnover could be due to the different properties of the involvement constructs. For example, work involvement is specific to the value one places on the concept of work in general. Unlike job involvement, which captures the salience of employee needs-satisfying potentialities of their immediate job, work involvement focuses on the long term identification that one has with work (Kanungo, 1982). Therefore, work involvement is not necessarily tied to one’s current job and as result it is less relevant to the job specific turnover decision. Likewise, job involvement is job specific and is a result of one’s current job. When reflecting on the desire to leave, job involvement appears to be more salient to the person making the turnover decision than work involvement.
Due to work involvement’s characteristic as a more abstract construct that focuses on the overarching value of work in one’s life (Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993), perhaps organizational commitment is a poor multiplicative complement to this facet of involvement. For example, job involvement and organizational commitment are both job and organization specific, making the two ideal interactive constructs for predicting organizational outcomes. Work involvement, as discussed, is not dependent on one’s current job or immediate work situation. Perhaps work involvement would be more suitable interacting with long term organizational constructs such as desire for advancement, career commitment, and opportunities for promotion. This may be an ideal starting point for future research, as constructs that are “long term” in nature may be more likely to have an interactive effect with work involvement, resulting in significant prediction of organizational outcomes such as turnover.

Another explanation for the null work involvement findings could be the presentation of the work involvement construct to participants. When defining work and job involvement in the literature, Kanungo (1982) makes a point to distinguish that a person can show involvement in two separate contexts (i.e. work involvement and job involvement). However, the items he developed do not clarify this distinction within the measure and simply present the words “work” and “job”. For example, the item “the most important things that happen in my life involve work” is a work involvement item while “I live, eat, and breathe my job” is a job involvement item. The words “work” and “job” are not explicitly defined in the instructions and such items seem ambiguous and leave the words “work” and “job” open to interpretation. When responding to the item “the
most important things that happen in my life involve work” a respondent may refer to their current job, or they may interpret “work” as the summation of their employment experiences. The term “job” seems appropriate for job involvement as it triggers reflection of one’s current job. We may improve our understanding of organizational behavior phenomenon if we clarify the meaning of each term to further differentiate the two involvement contexts. As a result, this may lead to stronger effects when predicting organizational outcomes.

Finally, a further search outside of the turnover literature showed that Kanungo’s (1982) work involvement construct does not receive the same attention that his job involvement construct does in predicting organizational outcomes. Interestingly, a search for the term “work involvement” scarcely retrieved empirical research on the work involvement construct, but featured samples that included constructs such as Protestant work ethic (Furnham, 1990; Shamir, 2007), workaholism (Burke & MacDermid, 1999; Kravina, Falco, Girardi, & DeCarlo, 2010) and work commitment (Randall & Cote, 1991; Hackett, Lapierre, & Hausdorf, 2001). Perhaps the current construct of work involvement is simply not yet developed enough to be a consistent predictor of workplace outcomes, resulting in non-significant findings when employed in research.
LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Like all scientific research, the results regarding the roles of job and work involvement in the employee turnover process must be taken with caution. Even though this investigation provided consistent empirical support for the job involvement moderation hypothesis in two distinct samples, it is not without its limitations. First, a major limitation is that this study relied on self report psychological measures of job involvement, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. Research shows that participants seek to respond in a socially desirable manner to make them look as good as possible (Moorman & Podsakoff, 1992). Therefore, it could be that participants may have inflated their responses to the questionnaires in fear that management would gain access to their response. This concern is particularly relevant for the turnover intention measure as an employee may perceive potential consequences for identifying oneself as a member who intends to leave the organization.

Second, although categorizing the groups for the four cell taxonomy using one standard deviation above and below the mean is the more accepted methodology for classifying high and low levels of a variable, doing so resulted in a major decrease in the sample sizes. Consequently, turnover intention was used as the proxy for analyzing turnover rates in sample 1. Sample 2 did find one group to be significantly different than two of the other groups although, a larger sample size and more variability may have allowed significant differences to emerge among the rest of the taxonomy. However, it could be that the obtained results are truly more representative of the prevalence of the taxonomy categories in the actual workplace. In other words, members of such groups
classified in the taxonomy may be the minority of the workforce as opposed to the majority.

Finally, in an ideal world, research on turnover should strive to differentiate between functional and dysfunctional turnover. Unfortunately, this investigation was only able to focus on those who voluntarily left the organization within a year without identifying if the departure was beneficial or detrimental to the organization. This distinction is important as the management implications would be specific to promoting functional turnover and preventing dysfunctional turnover. A pre-analysis of performance data for those who have voluntarily left the organizational would be a relatively easy way to classify the type of turnover that an employee may exhibit. Above this limitation, controlling for performance when investigating the multiplicative effects of job involvement and organizational commitment would be a more rigorous evaluation of the interaction terms ability to predict turnover behavior.

Future research should not only control for performance when analyzing the multiplicative effects of job involvement and organizational commitment in predicting turnover, it should also evaluate the performance levels of the four cell taxonomy. Blau and Boal’s (1989) study referred to research regarding performance and its relationship with job involvement and organizational commitment. However, it did not empirically test the performance levels of the different groups. Therefore, the claims that Blau and Boal (1989) have made about striving to retain institutionalized stars and releasing apathetic employees are based on reference to performance research, not an empirical analysis of performance of the taxonomy groups. Future research can contribute to the
involvement literature by creating a theory and predicting the role of performance in the four-cell taxonomy. Such research could empirically identify which group of the taxonomy is the best for the organization to retain regarding several organizational outcomes such as performance, cohesion, leadership, and productivity.

Finally, the current sample relied on a one time measure of attitudinal data to predict turnover behavior one year later. The results provide evidence that such a measure is able to predict subsequent turnover but they do not consider the variables as dynamic constructs that are open to change. Previous research shows that job involvement and organizational commitment are relatively stable constructs (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Siegel, 1969). However, this does not mean that the two variables cannot change. Future research should investigate how the interaction of job involvement and organizational commitment can change over time and how often an employee changes from one cell in the taxonomy to another. Additionally, it can be determined if employees who shift from the lower level turnover risk groups (institutionalized stars and corporate citizens) to higher level turnover risk groups (apathetic employees and lone wolves) truly have a higher rate of turnover over time.
SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

In summary, this thesis brought a ray of clarity regarding involvement’s ability to predict an important organizational outcome. Specifically, it dissected the interactive nature of involvement and commitment as a predictor of voluntary turnover in two samples. This investigation revisited previous research and tested the conflicting results on the topic. It then extended the involvement research to include both the facets of job and work involvement. Finally, it improved the scientific methodology using the appropriate statistical analysis.

The results of this study provide empirical support consistent with Blau and Boal’s (1989) theory that job involvement and organizational commitment interact to predict turnover. Specifically, there is a stronger relationship between organizational commitment and turnover when job involvement is low. Contrary to past research (Sjoberg & Sverke, 2000), evidence is also presented that turnover intention does not fully mediate the relationship between the interaction term and turnover. In fact, the interaction term uniquely predicts turnover in the presence of turnover intention. Finally, these samples show that, although work involvement is strongly related to job involvement, it is in fact a distinct variable that does not play a significant role in predicting turnover.
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