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Withdrawal States and Destinations (PWSD) Model

Director of Dissertation: Rodger W. Griffeth

The proximal withdrawal states and destination (PWSD) model (Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012) addresses the shortcomings of current research by introducing the proximal withdrawal states (PWS) as a new construct for turnover investigations. According to Hom et al. (2012) the PWS are pre-departure mindsets that can energize participation with the organization. This study empirically investigates the PWS component of the PWSD model and its ability to predict two behaviors that reflect employee participation prior to departure: organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; indicative constructive participation) and counterproductive work behavior (CWB; indicative of destructive participation). This study also considers how the PWS affect the role of personality and its relationship with OCB and CWB. A self-reported survey was completed by 607 full-time, classified employees from a large hospital complex in South Central United States. Results from multivariate analysis of variance indicate significant effects for the PWS predicting OCB and CWB, although the PWS were most predictive of behaviors directed at the organization. Findings from moderated regression analyses also demonstrate significant and marginally significant interactions between PWS and personality in predicting behavior. Specifically, the reluctant stayer mindset depressed the relationship between positive affectivity and OCB and the enthusiastic stayer mindset
strengthened the relationship between negativity and CWB. Results are discussed and implications for turnover research are presented.
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INTRODUCTION

The act of leaving an organization has been of interest to both practitioners and scholars for nearly a century. Effective management of employee turnover can lead to cut costs, maximized productivity, and retention of valuable employees (Cascio, 2000). Therefore, researchers have focused on gaining an advanced understanding of the complex process of turnover in hopes to reduce it (Hom & Griffeth, 1995; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Mobley, 1977). Throughout the years, a wide variety of turnover research has addressed the process of leaving the organization (e.g., Hom, 2011; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004; March & Simon, 1958; Mitchell, Holton, Lee, & Sablynski, 2001; Mobley, 1977). Several formal models of turnover (e.g., Hom & Griffeth, 1995; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004; Mobley et al 1979; Price & Mueller, 1981) have attempted to organize and synthesize what researchers have discovered about the behavior. These researchers established a general sequence where distal antecedents influence attitudinal antecedents which then influence the turnover criterion space (i.e., turnover intentions and turnover) (Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012).

Recent theoretical developments, however, have challenged the way to think about the process of turnover. Specifically, Hom et al.’s (2012) proximal withdrawal states and destinations (PWSD) model removes turnover intention from the turnover criterion and redevelops it into a new construct for the future of turnover research – the proximal withdrawal states (PWS). PWS are pre-departure mental states or cognitions that individuals may experience regarding their participation within the organization that
immediately precede turnover (Hom et al., 2012). These states are defined by crossing two overarching dimensions: desired employment status (the extent employees want to stay or leave) and perceived volitional control (the extent employees have control over their quit or stay decisions). The PWS construct includes groups that have not been emphasized in previous turnover research and acknowledges that there are alternative destinations one may pursue upon leaving besides another job (e.g., retirement, further education, non-vocational interests, etc.).

In the pages to follow, I will briefly review and evaluate existing turnover models established in the literature, highlighting deficiencies. This discussion will culminate with Hom et al.’s (2012) PWSD model and how it may enhance studying turnover behavior. I then use the PWSD model coupled with past research to deduce hypotheses to predict behavior. The purpose of this study is to empirically investigate the PWS component of the PWSD model and its ability to predict employee participation prior to leaving, specifically, organizational citizenship behavior (participation that benefits the organization), and counterproductive work behavior (participation that disrupts the organization). This investigation then considers how the PWS may affect the role of personality and its ability to predict OCB and CWB.

This study contributes to the turnover literature by providing the first step in empirically testing a component of the PWSD model, specifically, the extent that the PWS may predict employee participation preceding turnover. The investigation of the PWSD advances turnover theory as it introduces and examines an improved model to
turnover, acknowledging that eventually, every employee will leave their organization (Hom et al., 2012).
TURNOVER THEORY: A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE ROAD THUS FAR

The past fifty years of research on employee turnover has led to an increased understanding of why individuals depart with their organization. This section reviews the major models and research that have defined what we know about turnover today. After summarizing and providing general evaluations of such models, I will then present Hom et al.’s (2012) PWSD model as a new direction for the future of turnover research.

The Foundational Models of Turnover

Turnover has been traditionally defined as “voluntary separation of employees from employee institutions” (Hom, 2011, p. 325). The first formal theory of turnover was established by March and Simon (1958) who believed the balance of inducement (i.e., wage) and contributions (i.e., work) encouraged employees to continue their participation, ensuring organizational survival. March and Simon’s (1958) model posited that a lack of balance influences dissatisfaction, leading to the desire to leave. When individuals who desire to leave perceive they have the ability to leave (ease of movement), turnover is the end result. March and Simon’s attempt to understand turnover set a formal framework to studying turnover behavior that continues to influence research to this day (Griffeth, Steel, Allen, & Bryan, 2005; Hom et al., 2012; Jackofsky & Peters, 1983; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Mitchell et al., 2001; Mobley et al., 1979). However, research shows that the puzzle to understanding turnover behavior is more complex than March and Simon’s proposition (Hanisch & Hulin, 1992; Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Inderrieden, 2005; Hom, Griffeth, & Sellaro, 1984; Mitchell et al., 2001).
Nearly fifteen years passed when Porter and Steers (1973) expanded March and Simon’s (1958) investigation, suggesting that turnover may be determined by the organization’s inability to meet the expectations of an employee. Porter and Steers (1973) met expectations hypothesis provides a parsimonious explanation to why many determinants are related to turnover, theorizing that expectations must be fulfilled for an employee to find a job worthwhile or they will become dissatisfied and leave. Empirical studies have found support for the notion that unmet job expectations can influence leaving (Hom, Griffeth, Palich, & Bracker, 1993; Premack & Wanous, 1985; Wanous, 1973). Although the introduction of met expectations provided a new explanation to understanding turnover, one of the most significant contributions of Porter and Steers (1973) work was their call for future research to focus on turnover as a process, influencing the seminal research conducted by Mobley (1977).

Mobley’s (1977) model of intermediate linkages answered this call with a model depicting a series of cognitive and affective processes leading to the decision to quit. He proposed employees evaluate their job resulting in job dissatisfaction, which instigates thoughts of quitting. This, in turn, leads to the evaluation of the costs and benefits (or expected utility) of searching for alternative employment and leaving a job. When a person believes actively searching for a job will result in a better job offer, he or she is begins searching for alternative jobs. Upon finding a more attractive job, an employee decides to leave and dissatisfaction translates to the act of leaving the organization. One of the most significant contributions of Mobley’s intermediate linkages model was providing a complex psychological process in the study of turnover behavior (Hom &
Griffeth, 1995). Components of Mobley’s model have been supported by many empirical investigations (e.g., Hom & Knicki, 2001; Hom et al., 1984; Lee, Mitchell, Wise, & Fireman, 1996; Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978) and has become a foundation for turnover research (Hom & Griffeth, 1991; Hulin, Roznowski, & Hachiya, 1985; Miller, Katerberg, & Hulin, 1979). Additionally, Mobley’s (1977) study played a role in establishing quit intentions as a “mainstay construct” for future turnover models (Hom, 2002).

While Mobley’s (1977) model highlighted withdrawal as a complex process stemming from dissatisfaction, Price and Mueller’s (1981; 1986) research investigated a comprehensive model of turnover determinants focusing on job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Hom & Griffeth, 1995). Their model hypothesized that antecedents related to work (e.g., participation, communication, role overload), family (e.g., kinship responsibility), and economic factors (e.g., pay, opportunity) determine turnover behavior indirectly through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Empirical research supports components of their theory as path analysis showed intent to stay and job satisfaction had negative path coefficients leading to turnover, while opportunity and general training, had positive path coefficients leading to turnover. Price and Mueller’s model emphasized the importance of job attitudes and introduced non-work variables such as family responsibilities to turnover research, setting a foundation to inspire future research (e.g., Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Mitchell et al., 2001).

Later thinking continued to be strongly influenced by Mobley (1977) and Price and Mueller (1981; 1986). For example, Mobley et al. (1979) reviewed the turnover
process and proposed a conceptual multivariate model based on expectancy theory’s expected utility of one’s present job, expected utility of alternative employment, and current job satisfaction. This model suggested that such variables influenced the most immediate precursors to turnover: search and quit intention. Another significant contribution of Mobley et al.’s (1979) model was the emphasis on both present and future evaluations. Specifically, they suggested the need to distinguish between present-oriented satisfaction and future-oriented expected utility for both present and alternative roles. Additionally, their comprehensive model integrated distal determinants including organizational (e.g., policies, climate, supervision), individual (e.g., personality, family responsibility, interests), and economic-labor market antecedents (e.g., unemployment, vacancy rates, communication).

Researchers directly tested Mobley et al.’s (1979) expanded model using both cross-sectional and longitudinal designs (e.g., Griffeth & Hom, 1988a; Johnston, 1988; Michaels & Spector, 1982; Motowidlo & Lawton, 1984; Youngblood, Mobley, & Meglino, 1983). Although such studies reported mixed findings, turnover intention was found to be a consistent predictor of turnover behavior. Mobley et al.’s (1979) model further expanded the comprehensive study of turnover and has been used by others to provide support for theory development (e.g., Arnold & Feldman, 1982; Hom et al., 1984; Steel, 2002).

Steers and Mowday’s (1981) multi-route model utilized several variables established by previous research to predict turnover including expectations, job attitudes, and desire to leave (Mobley et al., 1979; Price & Mueller, 1981). Unlike previous
research, their model expanded the scope of affective variables beyond job satisfaction to include organizational commitment and job involvement. A variety of unique distal antecedents such as available information about the job and organization, organizational characteristics and experiences, and non-work influences were proposed to affect job attitudes, leading to turnover. Steers and Mowday’s research provided a new insight regarding the turnover process, rejecting Mobley’s (1977) idea that dissatisfied employees follow a standard route to departing the organization. As such, they suggested there are several different routes that one may follow in the journey of leaving. Empirical research (Lee & Mowday, 1987) has provided limited support for Steers and Mowday’s (1981) multi-route model, although its novel approach to multiple turnover paths has played a role in shaping the future direction of turnover theory (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Stumpf & Hartman, 1984).

The foundational models of turnover provided an organized framework for exploring the many reasons that employees leave the organization. Meta-analytic research by Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner (2000) reviewed variables highlighted by these models concluding the strongest antecedents to turnover were job satisfaction ($r = -.25$), organizational commitment ($r = -.27$), search intentions ($r = .34$), and quit intentions ($r = .45$). Although the foundational studies have increased our understanding of turnover, they typically explain no more than 25% of the variance in turnover behavior (Maertz & Campion, 1998). Therefore, researchers developed the non-traditional models of turnover to provide further insights into the behavior of leaving.
The Non-Traditional Models of Turnover

Lee and Mitchell’s (1994) unfolding model was a response to the large amount of variance unexplained by the traditional models and their inability to provide a complete picture of turnover behavior. Unlike the previous models of turnover, the unfolding model puts a particular emphasis on non-attitudinal factors in the turnover process that are external to the organization. For example, an employee may be forced to resign to take care of a sick family member or to follow a relocating spouse. In such situations employee attitudes have very little to do with departure from an organization, and it is likely that leavers do not consciously evaluate the expected utilities of prospective employment (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). Traditional turnover models fail to capture this possibility.

A central concept to the unfolding model is the notion of “shocks”, defined as a distinguishable event that instigates reflection about leaving (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). Influenced by Steers and Mowday’s (1981) multi-route model, Lee and Mitchell’s (1994) unfolding model defines four separate paths that an employee may experience because of shocks. These routes include leaving for a personal, non-work related shock such as marriage, pregnancy, or graduate school entrance (Path 1, “Following a Plan”), leaving due to a negative job event that challenges values or goals (Path 2, “I’m Outta Here”), receiving a job inquiry or unexpected offer (Path 3, “Leave for Something Better”), and finally, leaving due to dissatisfaction that prompts searching, comparing alternatives, and leaving (Path 4, “Leaving Dissatisfying Job”).
Empirical research generally supports the unfolding model, suggesting people use different systematic psychological processes in their path to leaving the organization (Donnelly & Quirin, 2006; Lee et al., 1996; Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel, & Hill, 1999). Results also confirmed that shocks can instigate turnover decisions and, contrary to the explanations of traditional turnover models, many people leave their jobs without a job offer in hand (Lee et al., 1996; Maetz & Campion, 2004; Weller, Holtom, Matiaske, & Mellewigt, 2009). The unfolding model provided a fresh avenue to understanding turnover behavior, acknowledging that people leave for reasons other than dissatisfaction and the path to leaving varies substantially.

Reflecting on what researchers have discovered about job attitudes, non-work factors, and multiple paths of leaving, Mitchell et al. (2001) emphasized a different approach to studying turnover with a focus on employee retention. Specifically, “job embeddedness theory” considers a variety of factors that influence attachment or employee retention (Mitchell et al., 2001). According to their theory, job embeddedness is made up of three major work and non-work-related components: links, fit, and sacrifices. Links are connections between work or non-work related people or institutions such as co-workers, family members, and community members (Mitchell et al., 2001). Fit evaluates the extent that one’s values, career aspirations, and future ambitions are in line with the employer and community. Finally, sacrifice refers to the losses that a person acquires when leaving a particular job or community including a loss of salary, benefits, pension, stability, opportunity, and tenure. They may also include non-work related factors such as a safe neighborhood, a tight knit community, or an excellent school
system. According to job embeddedness theory, an individual who possesses several
links, strong fit, and high sacrifice will have the most enhanced retention (Holtom,
Mitchell, & Lee, 2006; Mitchell et al., 2001).

Empirical evidence has supported the concept of job embeddedness in its ability
to predict intent to leave and turnover; specifically, stronger embeddedness is related to
retention (Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2008; Holtom & Inderrieden, 2006; Lee, Mitchell,
Sablynski, Burton, & Holton, 2004; Mitchell et al., 2001; Swider, Boswell, &
Zimmerman, 2011). The construct also provided unique variance beyond traditional
predictors of turnover including satisfaction, commitment, job search, and alternatives
(Cho, Johanson, and Guchait 2009; Mitchell et al., 2001). Job embeddedness theory
highlights the importance of non-affective, off-the-job sources of turnover and
complements our understanding of why individuals stay or leave an organization.

Summary and Evaluation of Previous Turnover Models

The previous section has highlighted what researchers have uncovered about the
process of employee turnover. This brief theoretical and empirical review illustrates our
ability to tap into the complexities that lead to the end of a person’s relationship with an
employer. March and Simon (1958) and Porter and Steers (1973) provided formal
mechanisms that set the foundation to understanding turnover, suggesting this behavior
was the result of dissatisfaction from imbalance and unmet expectations. These models
served the purpose of identifying reasons to explain behavior. Mobley’s (1977) approach
to studying turnover as a process changed the way researchers thought about the concept,
highlighting the importance of not only dissatisfaction, but the psychological process of
evaluating current employment with alternatives. This model, however, focused on
dissatisfaction and maintained a narrow focus on the roots of turnover. Price and
Mueller’s (1981; 1986) causal model expanded antecedents beyond dissatisfaction to
include several work factors. This model also recognized that non-work factors, such as
family, can play a role in turnover decisions. Mobley et al.’s (1979) expanded model
focused on present and future evaluations, acknowledging that present dissatisfaction
does not necessarily translate into leaving. Steers and Mowday (1981) and Lee and
Mitchell (1994) emphasized that the path to leaving can be systematically different given
a particular work or non-work related situation. Finally, Mitchell et al. (2001) stressed the
importance of work and non-work attachment as a means to understanding why
employees stay.

On a general level, the traditional models of turnover focused on a trigger of
dissatisfaction leading to the evaluation of alternative work options (e.g. Hom & Griffeth,
1991; Hom & Knicki, 2001; Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1979). The non-traditional
models focus on non-work factors, multiple pathways, and varying psychological
processes (e.g., Holtom & Inderrieden, 2006; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Mitchell et al.,
2001). These models have painted a clearer picture regarding the phenomenon of
turnover. Yet several realities of turnover behavior exist that they fail to address.

Much of the turnover research has studied the behavior as if all employees want to
stay or leave the organization (Maertz & Campion, 2004). However, eventually, every
employee will inevitably end their relationship with the organization for alternative
employment, retirement, non-vocational interests, or even death (Hom et al., 2012). One
shortcoming of previous turnover models is the lack of flexibility to capture employee’s vision of *when* he or she foresees inevitable departure. For example, an employee with negative job attitudes and an alternative job offer foresees immediate departure, while another employee with similar attitudes, but no alternatives, must hesitantly remain for the near future. Although these individuals possess similar job attitudes at a particular time, it is likely they have very different mindsets and dissimilar turnover behavior (Greenhalgh, 1980; Burris, Detert, & Chiaburu, 2008; Hulin et al., 1985). However, current conceptualizations of turnover inadequately capture this distinction. A mechanism to distinguish mindsets prior to departure can provide insight to understanding organizational behavior and the processes leading to turnover.

On a similar note, existing turnover models emphasize the “voluntariness” of turnover with the assumption that voluntarily departing from the organization is a desired act on behalf of the leaver. However, many individuals voluntarily depart, feeling their turnover decision was just slightly voluntary (e.g., because they are following a relocating spouse, taking care of a sick family member, etc.) (Hom et al., 2012; Lee & Mitchell, 1994). In reality, the voluntariness of a turnover decision can range from very little personal control (e.g., I do not want to leave but must for a sick parent, relocation of a spouse, etc.) to control that is at one’s full discretion (e.g., I want to leave and have secured another activity [not necessarily a job]). Given these examples, turnover research is in need of a model that does not treat turnover voluntariness as a strictly dichotomous concept, but a behavior that ranges from little control to full control. Additionally,
previous models have failed to consider the complete involuntariness of organizationally mandated exits, such as layoffs or terminations.

As stated in the previous review, current research has identified turnover intentions to be one of the most robust predictors of turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000; Mobley et al., 1978; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Although previous research has incorporated turnover intention as a “backbone to contemporary turnover theory” (Steel & Lounsbury, 2009, p. 275), it has not readily acknowledged that control can impede intention (Ajzen, 1991). Research has discussed those who want to leave but cannot (Greenhalgh, 1980; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982); however, existing turnover models fail to incorporate this complexity as a core component. A model that accounts for the role of control in addition to intent would surely benefit the field and provide additional insight into leaving behavior.

Finally, the story of departing from an organization does not end at the moment a person leaves. Previous research shows that individuals depart for reasons other than alternative employment (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). However, existing turnover models do not fully consider where leavers go. Studying the destinations of leavers can provide additional information and insight regarding the motivations behind leaving.

The Proximal Withdrawal States and Destinations (PWSD) Model

The road to understanding turnover has been fruitful thus far. However, to date, turnover theorists have been unable to synthesize simultaneously the intricacies of departure on a parsimonious platform. The field is in need of a new model that incorporates the full complexity of turnover behavior. This includes studying turnover as
a psychological process (Mobley, 1977) and integrating the influence of attitudinal
variables and work and non-work related factors (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; March & Simon,
1958; Price & Mueller, 1981). This also includes the ability to account simultaneously for
present and future oriented evaluations (Mobley at al., 1979), various paths to leaving,
and the capacity to distinguish staying and leaving mindsets (Lee & Mitchell, 1994;
Mitchell et al., 2001; Steers & Mowday, 1981). The latest entry into our understanding of
turnover, Hom et al.’s (2012) proximal withdrawal states and destinations (PWSD)
model, provides a broad, yet parsimonious synthesis of such complexities, while
addressing the described shortcomings of previous turnover theory. I will now describe
the PWSD model as a new direction for the future of turnover research.
A NEW APPROACH TO STUDYING TURNOVER: THE PROXIMAL WITHDRAWAL STATES AND DESTINATIONS (PWSD) MODEL

As the previous review shows, the road to studying turnover has incorporated a comprehensive evaluation of why individuals leave, ranging from individual job attitudes (Griffeth et al., 2000) to non-work related situations (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Mitchell et al., 2001). Generally speaking, previous research portrays turnover as a process in which distal antecedents (e.g., job characteristics, family responsibility, personality, etc.; Mobley et al., 1979) influence job attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment; Hom & Griffeth, 1995; Steers & Mowday, 1981; Tett & Meyer, 1993) which then influence turnover intention and actual turnover behavior (Hom et al., 2012). Recent theoretical developments, however, have challenged the way to think about this established process of turnover.

Hom et al.’s (2012) proximal withdrawal states and destinations model (PWSD) speculates reclassifying the turnover criterion to gain a more detailed insight to the withdrawal process. In particular, Hom et al. (2012) remove turnover intentions from the turnover criterion space and developed a new conceptual construct as a direct antecedent that immediately precedes actual turnover and the destinations where leavers go: the proximal withdrawal states (PWS).

PWS are pre-departure mental states or cognitions that individuals may experience prior to departure (Hom et al., 2012). These cognitive states capture the extent to which an employee participates in or withdraws from the organization, and are composed of two dimensions: 1) desired employment status and 2) perceived volitional
control in achieving desired employment status (Hom et al., 2012). Desired employment status represents a broader intention measure that evaluates the extent to which an individual desires to stay with or leave the organization (Hom et al., 2012). Perceived control is the “perception of the ease or difficulty of performing the behavior of interest” (i.e., leaving) (Ajzen, 1991, p. 183) and can vary from little or no employee control over stay/quit decisions to high control. Together, measures of behavioral intention and perceived control can be used to directly predict the likelihood of participating in a specific behavior (Ajzen, 1991).

The PWSD model suggests crossing the dimensions of desired employment status and perceived control will provide a more thorough and richer description of the mental states an employee may experience prior to leaving the organization (Hom et al. 2012). This classification allows researchers to specify four unique groups that possess different motivation, attitudes, and behavior regarding their employment (Hom et al., 2012). These groups are: 1) enthusiastic stayers, those who desire to stay and have the control to stay, 2) reluctant stayers, those who desire to leave but lack the control to leave, 3) enthusiastic leavers, those who desire to leave and have the control to leave, and 4) reluctant leavers, those who desire to stay but lack the control to stay. Figure 1 defines these four states.
Hom et al.’s (2012) PWSD model views turnover as a process where a variety of work and non-work related antecedents (i.e., attitudes, family, alternative opportunity, etc.) influence PWS membership. Specifically, preference antecedents influence the extent that one desires to stay or leave, and constraint antecedents influence the perception of control one has over whether to stay or leave. Upon entering a PWS group, employees identify with a mindset that energizes the extent to which they participate within the organization. Accounting for desire and control captures both current and anticipated job evaluations (i.e., reluctant stayers are unhappy and see a future of dissatisfaction, enthusiastic leavers are unhappy and can see an end in sight, etc.) and considers both staying and leaving mindsets. The PWSD model suggests that PWS membership can be utilized to provide insight to varying turnover behavior including post-exit destinations in which the departing employee pursues. Incorporating destinations acknowledges the many paths employees may experience upon departure, which can include retirement, alternative job offers, non-vocational interests, and even death. Figure 2 depicts Hom et al.’s (2012) general PWSD model.
Advantages of the PWSD Model

The application of the PWSD model to turnover research presents a variety of advantages to studying the behavior. One of the major advantages to this reconfigured model is its ability to expand conceptualizations of one of the most powerful antecedent directly related to leaving, turnover intention (Ajzen, 1991, 2002; Allen, Weeks, & Moffitt, 2000; Griffeth et al., 2000; Hom, 2011; Michaels & Spector, 1982; Mobley et al., 1978; Mobley et al., 1979; Steel & Ovalle, 1984). According to Ajzen (2002), individuals are likely to carry out their behavioral intention only when they are given “a sufficient degree of actual control over the behavior” (p. 665). For example, a person may have the strongest intent to leave an organization but is unable to do so due to reasons beyond one’s control, such as a weak economy (Hom & Kinicki, 2001), ties to the community (Mitchell et al., 2001), or a job that pays too well to abandon (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004). Conversely, one may have the strongest intent to stay but is involuntarily forced to leave because of layoffs or spousal relocation (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). The current
conceptualization of turnover intention inadequately captures the complexities that come with turnover behavior, and as a result, much information is left unclear in the explanation of why individuals stay or leave the organization.

The PWSD model directly addresses this limitation by simultaneously accounting for desire and control in turnover decisions, capturing both leaving and staying mindsets and constraints that may impede with desire to stay or leave. The flexibility of the PWS to accommodate both of these mindsets is important, as they each possess different psychological processes and motivations to understanding behavior (Cho et al., 2009; Steel & Loundsbury, 1999; Westaby, 2005). Providing an outlet to incorporate concurrently both staying and leaving mindsets synthesizes previous research that have separately emphasized leaving (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Mobley, 1977) and staying (Mitchell et al., 2001; Zhang, Fried, & Griffeth, 2012).

Another advantage to the PWSD model is its approach to the voluntariness of turnover. Often, individuals who are classified by the employer as “voluntary leavers” do not necessarily view their decision to leave as voluntary (Campion, 1991; Hom et al., 2012). Including the PWS in the turnover process reinvigorates the “voluntariness” of voluntary turnover, transforming what used to be considered a dichotomous concept (i.e., turnover that is voluntary or involuntary) to a re-conceptualized classification of four unique groups. This re-classification simultaneously investigates the multitude of turnover situations previous turnover research has highlighted (e.g., Hom et al., 1984; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Lieber, 2009; Mobley, 1977; Sinclair, Tucker, & Cullin, 2005; Swider et al., 2011).
For example, the PWSD model gives researchers the capability of considering a wide variety of employee situations. This includes those who have high control and are able to happily remain for a long period of time (Sinclair et al., 2005) – enthusiastic stayers, and those who have poor job attitudes but an escape (Hom & Griffeth, 1991, 1995; Mobley, 1977; Price & Mueller, 1981) – enthusiastic leavers. This also includes those who have little control and hesitantly remain due to lack of alternative opportunities or sacrifices they would endure with leaving (Hom et al., 1984; Mitchell et al., 2001; Swider et al., 2011) – reluctant stayers, as well as those who have little control as they leave for family responsibilities or illness (Brockner, Grover, Reed, & Dewitt, 1992; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Price & Mueller, 1981) – reluctant leavers. Reluctant leavers also include those who must involuntarily depart due organizationally mandated exits such as layoffs or terminations (Lieber, 2009). Although members of these four groups inevitably depart with the organization, the motivations, attitudes, behaviors, and even departure destinations are likely substantially different (Hom et al., 2012).

Finally, one of the most unique characteristics of the PWSD model is its consideration of the destinations that an employee pursues after ending the relationship with the employer. The previous section reviewing the models of turnover highlighted the many factors that play a role in leaving; however, current models are deficient in accommodating the variety of turnover departures. Specifically, the general classification of turnover behavior into voluntary vs. involuntary leavers (Campion, 1991; Steel, 2002) does not distinguish between the different types of voluntary and involuntary leavers.
Using the traditional classification of turnover, a satisfied employee that leaves to take care of a sick family member is regarded in the same “voluntary” category as an employee that departs for another company due to dissatisfaction. However, the underlying causes of turnover for these two individuals are vastly different. The broad categorization (i.e., voluntary vs. involuntary) is unfortunate as it fails to acknowledge the details that distinguish turnover behavior. The PWSD model abandons this oversimplified categorization of leaving and emphasizes the importance of considering the many destinations one may pursue after leaving. Examining turnover destinations acknowledges that not all turnover behavior is the same and provides an avenue for researchers to gain additional insights to the motivations behind leaving. This innovative component provides the opportunity to develop more interesting and detailed research on turnover (Maertz, 2012). Therefore, the PWSD model categorizes leaving destinations, including but not limited to alternative employment, retirement, non-vocational interests, and even death (Hom et al., 2012).

In summary, the PWSD model provides a more thorough analysis of the withdrawal process as they consider the different psychological processes that come with staying and leaving mindsets and the constraint that may interfere with achieving the desire to stay or leave. For the first time in turnover history, researchers have a parsimonious platform to investigate simultaneously the complexities of staying and leaving mindsets, integrating voluntary and involuntary turnover behavior. Additionally, this conceptualization provides an avenue to incorporate the foundations of turnover research including job attitudes (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004; Mobley et al., 1979; Price &
Mueller, 1991), present and future evaluations (Mobley, et al., 1979), and work and non-work related factors (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004; March & Simon, 1958; Mitchell et al., 2001). Fittingly, this new model parallels March and Simon’s (1958) original model of turnover that focused on desire to leave and perceived alternatives. The PWSD model, however, possesses a more systematic and thorough presentation of such desire and control to incorporate the complexity of turnover behavior.

Although the PWSD model improves the approach to studying turnover, it has yet to be directly tested. Therefore, the present study utilizes the PWS to predict behavior. The following section presents two behaviors that reflect employee participation: organizational citizenship behavior (indicative constructive participation) and counterproductive work behavior (indicative of destructive participation).
THE PRESENT STUDY: USING THE PROXIMAL WITHDRAWAL STATES TO PREDICT BEHAVIOR

The PWS are distinct mindsets that energize organizational participation (Hom et al., 2012). According to Hom et al., this broad yet distinctive classification specifies four unique mindsets “that can have far reaching attitudinal and behavioral implications” (p. 835). For constructs of such broad development, Hanisch and colleagues (Hanisch, 1995; Hanisch, Hulin, & Roznowski, 1998) emphasize the utility of assessing multiple behaviors to enhance our understanding of employee reactions at work. Two categories of behavior that reflect degrees of participation are organizational citizenship behavior – indicative of positive participation (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988; Spector & Fox, 2002), and counterproductive work behavior – indicative of negative participation or withdrawal (Sackett, 2002; Spector & Fox, 2002). The following section reviews these behaviors and then uses the PWS to deduce hypotheses to predict OCB and CWB.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

A variety of behaviors in the workplace can be evaluated to capture employee participation. Performance is one of the most studied behaviors that researchers have used to assess an individual’s contribution to the organization (Campbell, 1990). Throughout the years, scholars have acknowledged that this form of participation can vary (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000). For example, the classic view of performance accentuates tasks and duties required of the job, also known as task performance (Murphy, 1989). However, classic conceptualizations fail to distinguish...
volitional participative behavior that is outside of the scope of a job description – contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

Contextual performance refers to voluntary employee behavior outside the duties of the job that supports “social and motivational context in which organizational work is accomplished” (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996, p. 521). Unlike task performance, which is required regardless of employee attitudes and job evaluations, contextual performance is not a necessary job component and can be engaged in or withheld at the will of the employee (Organ, 1990; 1997). Due to the discretionary aspect of this behavior, contextual performance is viewed as a “motivational phenomenon” and can indicate an employee’s true willingness to participate (Barnard, 1938; Bateman & Organ, 1983; Chen, Hui, & Sego, 1998). Therefore, this is an ideal behavior to study in the context of the PWS to indicate the extent of positive employee participation. One of the most popular and empirically scrutinized non-task related performance behaviors are organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ, 1997; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) are discretionary behaviors that contribute to the functioning and effectiveness of an organization (Organ, 1988). Specifically, OCBs enhance the “social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place” (Organ, 1997, p. 95). Meta-analytic research by Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, and Blume (2009) highlight the value of OCBs to organizations as they are related to a variety of individual and organizational outcomes including productivity (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997), efficiency (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997), profitability (MacKenzie, Podsakoff,
Conceptualizations of OCB have been fluid over the years. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) formalized the first OCB construct to include general helping behavior, referred to as “altruism”, and impersonal behaviors associated with adherence to organizational standards, referred to as “general compliance”. Since that time there has been some debate regarding the structure of the OCB construct (Hoffman et al., 2007; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002; Podsakoff, Podsakoff, Whiting, & Mishra, 2011). For example, Organ’s (1988) five-factor model incorporated Smith et al.’s (1983) two dimensions with the addition of courtesy (checking with others before taking action that will affect them), sportsmanship (handling workplace nuisances with grace), and civic virtue (genuine concern for the vitality of their organization). Williams and Anderson (1991) approached OCB with a broad scope classifying two major groups based on the target of the behavior: behaviors towards the individual (OCB-I) and behaviors towards the organization (OCB-O). Other scholars have referred to political philosophy and its interpretation of “citizenship” to develop OCB constructs that include dimensions of organizational obedience and loyalty (Graham, 1991; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Voice behavior (constructively challenging the status quo) has also been identified an important alternative component of the OCB construct (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

Motives of OCB

One of the most cited reasons that individuals participate in OCB is a result of satisfaction or cognitive appraisals of the employee at work (Organ, Podsakoff, &
Podsakoff, 2011). In particular, Organ (1990) hypothesized that those who have positive
cognitive evaluations of their job would be more likely to participate in OCBs. This
hypothesis is based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) and
the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), where OCBs are the result of a two way
relationship with the organization based on “good faith” in recognition of each party’s
contributions. Unlike economic/contractual exchange, where there is an explicit reward
such as pay for a particular contribution, social exchange elicits feelings of personal
obligation and gratitude (Blau, 1964). The behaviors encouraged by social exchange and
the norm of reciprocity are inspired as a means for reciprocation (e.g., this organization
satisfies my employment needs, so I will go beyond my normal duties for it). When
something of value to the employee is compromised (i.e., experience dissatisfaction,
distrust, frustration, etc.) the flow of reciprocation is halted (Emerson, 1976). This
hypothesis is particularly relevant as the PWS are associated with differing cognitive
appraisals of a work situation.

A variety of research provides empirical support for Organ’s claim that job
attitudes and cognitive appraisals are related to OCBs (Hoffman et al., 2007; LePine et
al., 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Spector & Fox, 2002). Meta-analytic research shows that
satisfaction and commitment are positively related to OCBs (Hoffman et al., 2007; Organ
& Ryan, 1995). Van Dyne et al. (1994) found that people who participate in helping
behavior (helping others with work related problems) and voice behavior (constructively
challenging the status quo and recommending improvement), in particular, are generally
satisfied with their organization. In fact, the relationships between satisfaction and OCBs
have been stronger than the relationships between satisfaction and performance (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Organ & Ryan, 1995). This is because attitudes are expressed by behavior only to the degree that external forces (Organ et al., 2006) do not regulate such behavior. For example, a supervisor may reprimand a poor performer leading to an improvement in performance. However, the discretionary nature of OCBs cannot be controlled by the organization and, therefore, an employee has the ability to withhold OCBs. Other attitudes that have been related to OCBs include supervisor satisfaction (Konovsky & Organ, 1996), fairness (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Lavelle et al., 2009), organizational support (Miao, 2011), person-organization fit (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006), justice (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr 2007) and turnover intention (Chen et al., 1998).

Due to the discretionary nature of OCBs, they are particularly important to turnover research and have been identified as a behavioral indicator of withdrawal (Chen et al., 1998; Hom, 2002). Researchers claim that the level of employee OCB implies the distance one would like to keep between the organization and themselves (Chen et al., 1998). Chen et al. (1998) proposed that OCBs have a stronger relationship with turnover than other well-researched behaviors of withdrawal such as absenteeism. Rosse and Miller (1984) suggested that employees who were dissatisfied and considering leaving would be more likely to participate in avoidance responses that are the least likely to negatively affect them, such as withholding OCBs. Doing so reduces employee participation while having little direct negative impact on the employee. Chen et al. (1998) provided empirical evidence to support this claim finding that employees who had
strong intentions to leave and (and actually left) exhibited lower levels of OCBs before leaving.

In summary, OCBs display a “willingness to cooperate” and have been referred to as an “expression of the net satisfaction or dissatisfaction experienced or anticipated” (Barnard, 1938, p. 85). According to social exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity, employees who possess or anticipate positive affective and cognitive evaluations of their jobs are likely to reciprocate with extra role behaviors (Moorman, 1993; Organ, 1997; Organ et al., 2011). The PWSD model provides an ideal outlet for studying OCBs as it is composed of four groups that hold varying cognitive perceptions of control and affective evaluations of the jobs (e.g., enthusiastic stayers are satisfied and attached, enthusiastic leavers lack such satisfaction and attachment). It also captures employee perceptions or anticipations of the future (e.g., reluctant stayers see a future of being trapped in a job they would like to leave, while enthusiastic leavers see an escape to their employment situation). Therefore, study hypotheses will predict differing levels of OCB across the PWS groups.

OCB displays constructive employee participation. However, as the PWSD model captures both staying and leaving mindsets, investigating employee participation that is destructive to the organization provides coverage of the full spectrum of participation behavior. The following section discusses counterproductive work behavior as a form of negative participation.
Counterproductive Work Behavior

The PWS are mindsets that energize participation (Hom et al., 2012). The previous section highlighted participation that benefits the organization, but there is also participation that can be detrimental to the organization. Broadly speaking, undesirable workplace participation refers to any type of behavior that threatens the well-being of the organization and its members (Kidwell & Martin, 2005; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Researchers have used a wide range of labels to study negative behaviors including but not limited to deviant behavior (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), antisocial behavior (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), dysfunctional behavior (Griffin, O’Leary-Kelly, & Collins, 1998), and organizational misbehavior (Vardi & Weitz, 2004).

An underlying theme in all the conceptualizations of negative workplace behavior is the intentional act to harm the organization. One of the most common studied negative workplace behaviors is referred to as counterproductive work behavior (CWB). Sackett (2002) views CWB as a dimensions of performance defined as “any intentional behavior on the part of an organization member viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interests” (Sackett, 2002, p. 5). These behaviors are intentional as individuals lack the motivation to conform to expected norms of the organization or become motivated to intentionally violate expectations of their organization (Kaplan, 1975). CWB theory highlights a variety of behaviors that are directed to harm the organization and its stakeholders including clients, customers, coworkers, and supervisors (Spector & Fox, 2005).
Hollinger and Clark (1983) were of the first researchers to bring to light the negative behaviors people may engage in identifying two broad CWB categories. Property deviance refers to exploitation of company assets including theft, damage of property, and misuse of resources; production deviance is behavior that violates the norms of an organization such as absenteeism, drug use, and intentionally underperforming. Robinson and Bennett (1995) expanded CWB conceptualization to develop a thorough model of negative workplace behavior based on two dimensions: behavior that ranges from minor to serious offenses (Wheeler, 1976) and behavior directed toward the organization or the individual. Utilizing the latter dimensions, Robinson and Bennett (1995) classified Hollinger and Clark’s (1983) property deviance as serious, organizationally-directed behavior, and production deviance as minor, organizationally-directed behavior. Their taxonomy also expanded CWBs directed at the individual. In particular, they developed a new category of minor, interpersonally directed behavior that puts others at a disadvantage referred to as political deviance (gossip, favoritism, blaming, and competing non-beneficially). Finally, they also developed a category labeled personal aggression, classified as serious, interpersonally directed behavior that is hostile towards other individuals (sexual harassment, verbal abuse, and endangering co-workers). Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) research united a variety of negative workplace behaviors that have been studied separately into one framework, including sexual harassment (Kahn & Robbins, 1985), discrimination (Levinger, 1987), sabotage (Crino, 1994), and theft (Greenberg, 1990).
Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) taxonomy provided a foundation to identifying the many CWBs that employees may engage in. These behaviors have been utilized and expanded upon by many researchers to aggregate the construct into broad scores. For example, some have approached CWB measurement by identifying two broad categories, CWBs that are directed toward the individual (CWB-I), and CWBs directed toward the organization (CWB-O) (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Dalal, 2005; Fox & Spector, 1999; Sackett, 2002; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). Research by Sackett (Sackett, 2002; Sackett & Devore, 2001) argues for the benefits of broad CWB measurement, as empirical studies show strong and consistent positive relationships exist between specific categories of CWBs (Sackett & DeVore, 2001). Additionally, broad categorization may be more empirically valuable as the strength of the relationships between CWBs and other variables (e.g., task performance, satisfaction, fairness, etc.) increase as CWB measures are aggregated from specific behaviors to broad categories (Kaplan, Bradley, Luchman, & Haynes, 2009; Sackett, 2002). Finally, broad categorization of CWB results in higher measure reliabilities ranging from .80 to .90 (Sackett, 2002).

Spector et al.’s (2006) dimensional approach to studying CWBs considers a finer grained analysis, calculating scores for five distinct CWB dimensions. These dimensions were developed from a comprehensive review of the CWB literature and include abuse toward others, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Specter et al., 2006). Abuse towards others refers to any type of harmful behavior directed at another employee to interfere physically or psychologically
with the ability to work. Production deviance is the intentional failure to perform required job tasks. Sabotage refers to defacing the property of the organization, and theft refers to acquiring company property without permission. Finally, withdrawal is any behavior that restricts the employee from working the required time on the job. Although Spector et al.’s (2006) CWB conceptualization specifies five dimensions, the authors acknowledge that such behaviors may be manifestations of the same underlying motive and can be used to calculate broad CWB scores, such as CWB-I and CWB-O.

Motives of CWB

Spector’s (Fox & Spector, 1999, Spector, 1978; Spector, 1997) work frustration-aggression model provides insight to the motives for behaving in ways that do not benefit the organization. This model extended Dollard et al.’s (1939) frustration-aggression hypothesis that theorizes individual’s experience frustrations when there is “an obstacle to the attainment of an expected gratification” (as cited in Berkowitz, 1998, p. 53). The basis of the frustration-aggression hypothesis is that the frustration an individual experiences instigates a sense of aggression. Simply put, counterproductive behavior is a reaction to appraisals of events, conditions, or experiences that impede achievement (also called situational constraints) of personal goals at work (Fox & Spector, 1999; Cullen & Sackett, 2003; Spector, 1997; Spector & Fox, 2002). Sources of situational constraints or frustrations can include but are not limited to supervisors, subordinates, coworkers, procedures, rules, environment, job characteristics, home life factors, or economic conditions (Cullen & Sackett, 2003; Martinko, Gunlach, & Douglas, 2002; Spector, 1978). The frustration-aggression model emphasizes cognitive processes and appraisals,
suggesting events that impede goals (i.e., frustrators) lead to a negative affective response, which motivate CWBs (Fox & Spector, 1999; Spector & Fox, 2002).

Research on CWBs further display the importance of employee control in studying negative workplace behavior. Perceptions of control have been shown to affect the extent to which negative emotions are experienced in response to workplace events. Specifically, work situations where employees perceive a lack of control are more likely to instigate frustration and negative emotions (Spector & Fox, 2002). According to Allen and Greenberger (1980), individuals who perceive low control may try to change their environment and increase feelings of control through acts that are destructive. Likewise, negative emotion or poor attitudes can lead to revenge behavior (Bies, Tripp, & Kramer, 1997). Several studies show that constraints or a lack of control has been consistently related to CWBs. For example, Chen and Spector (1992) found constraints to be related to aggression, hostility, withdrawal, and theft. Other research has found that lack of control is related to anger and anxiety (Seligman, 1975). In fact, Fox and Spector (1999) found that those who perceived low level of control possessed a higher likelihood of engaging in CWBs.

According to Spector (1978) “virtually any goal or desired end state that is blocked, or any desired state or goal attained that is interfered with, stopped, or taken away involves an instance of frustration” (p. 816). Therefore, the PWSD model is a useful framework to investigate CWB as desired end states (i.e., desire to stay or desire to leave) are perceived to be attainable or unattainable among the four groups. Possessing a particular mindset within the PWS may have implications for CWBs and the likelihood
that an employee will engage in them. First, the preference and constraint antecedents linked with each PWS may be more or less associated with frustrations or situational constraints that could instigate motives to participate in CWBs. For example, a reluctant stayer who is experiencing an abusive supervisor or bullying coworkers (Hogh et al., 2011) may resort to CWB as a response to the interference. CWB may also be a response to poor job attitudes such as job dissatisfaction, lack of commitment, job stressors, or perceptions of unfairness and injustice (Dalal, 2005; Fox & Spector, 1999; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Hollinger, 1986). On the other hand, an enthusiastic stayer who is faced with few situational constraints or frustrations regarding a work situation will likely have little motivation to engage in CWBs (Spector & Fox, 2002).

Second, the dimensions that define the PWS (desired employment status and perceived control) are likely to have an influence on CWB. For example, an employee who possesses a strong desire to leave but lacks the control to do so may develop motives to participate in CWB as a way of dealing with the unpleasant work situation that he or she cannot escape (Chen & Spector, 1992; Spector, 2011; Spector & Fox, 2002). Conversely, an employee who has a strong desire to stay and perceives high control over employment status will likely have little motive to participate in CWB (Storms & Spector, 1987).

OCB and CWB are two behaviors indicative of constructive and destructive employee participation. The following section offers additional detail describing Hom et al.’s (2012) PWS and proposes hypotheses to provide a general empirical examination of the PWS and their ability to predict OCB and CWB. Additionally, hypotheses are
presented to investigate the role of personality predicting behavior in the context of the PWS.
STUDY HYPOTHESES

Enthusiastic Stayers

On a general level, the enthusiastic stayer’s organizational participation is intrinsically motivated, wholly volitional and influenced by interest and enjoyment (Gagne & Deci, 2003; Meyer, Becker, & Vandenbergh, 2004; Porter & Lawler, 1968). Preference antecedents that influence the enthusiastic stayers desire to stay include positive affective forces (emotions that an employee may feel about their job; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004), optimistic calculative forces (calculation of one’s future with the organization and the ability to achieve goals; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004) and strong constituent forces (relationships employees have with coworkers; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004). Additionally, enthusiastic stayers have little constraint impeding with their control in remaining with the organization. For example, they lack normative forces to leave (expectations or pressure to leave from family or friends; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004) and are not enticed by alternative forces (desirable alternative to the current job; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004). Finally, this group has the capability of being able to stay as they are not faced with pressure to leave from the organization, such as termination or concerns about employee performance (Kwasniewski, 2009). I will now present hypotheses to predict OCB and CWB for the enthusiastic stayer.

OCB for Enthusiastic Stayers

Research shows that those who typically participate in OCBs tend to be satisfied with, committed to, and engaged in their jobs (Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). Enthusiastic stayers are
happy with their current job and envision a long future with the organization. These individuals generally possess job satisfaction, commitment, engagement, and job fit combined with the control to remain on the job (Hom et al., 2012). Social exchange theory predicts that given particular circumstances, individuals seek to reciprocate those who benefit them (Blau, 1964). When individuals are affectively satisfied with their job and perceive satisfying conditions, opportunities, and outcomes, they are more willing to participate in discretionary behavior (Hoffman et al., 2007; Konovsky & Organ, 1988; LePine et al., 2002; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Organ et al., 2011).

OCB such as helping behavior may be attributed to the enthusiastic stayer’s concern for coworkers and the organization as a whole (Lee et al., 2001; Williams & Anderson, 1991). The enthusiastic stayer’s perceived control in remaining with the organization combined with anticipation of future satisfaction or ability to achieve goals (positive calculative forces) may promote OCBs such as voice behavior in efforts to improve the future of the organization (Withey & Cooper, 1989). Additionally, OCB such as loyalty behavior are expected from the enthusiastic stayer’s strong connection to the organization (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Finally, research shows that perceptions of high control promote positive behavior in the workplace (Spector & Fox, 2002). Therefore, it is predicted that enthusiastic stayers will possess the highest level of OCBs when compared to reluctant stayers and enthusiastic leavers. Reluctant leavers are excluded in these hypotheses as the situational variety of this group makes their behavior difficult to predict (this will be addressed in the Reluctant Leavers section below).
Hypothesis 1: Enthusiastic stayers will have the highest level of OCBs when compared to reluctant stayers and enthusiastic leavers.

CWB for Enthusiastic Stayers

Given enthusiastic stayers enjoy a positive job evaluation and control to remain, this group is likely to experience the least amount of situational constraint and frustration with work compared to the remaining PWS groups. For example, according to Hom et al. (2012), enthusiastic stayers possess job satisfaction, commitment, and quality relationships with co-workers and supervisors. Additionally, as an enthusiastic stayer, these individuals see a long future with the organization and little interference in their ability to achieve this future. In other words, enthusiastic stayers have little in their way to obstructing their desire to remain. Given this generally positive situation where employee possess control over their preference to stay, the frustration-aggression hypothesis would suggest that enthusiastic stayers will have little motivation to engage in CWB (Spector & Fox, 2002). Therefore, it is predicted that enthusiastic stayers will possess the lowest level of CWB of all of the PWS groups.

Hypothesis 2: Enthusiastic stayers will have the lowest levels of CWBs when compared to reluctant stayers and enthusiastic leavers.

Reluctant Stayers

Reluctant stayers are “trapped” with nowhere to go (Greenhalgh, 1980; Mowday et al., 1982) and participation is likely to be extrinsically motivated where satisfaction comes from rewards of the activity (i.e., paycheck), not the activity itself (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Meyer et al., 2004). Reluctant stayers feel a sense of being controlled, participating
with a sense of pressure (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Preference antecedents that influence the reluctant stayer’s desire to leave include negative affective forces such as job dissatisfaction or injustice (Bal, de Lange, Ybema, Jansen, & Velde, 2011; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004; Mobley et al., 1979), weak constituent forces such as being bullied or harassed by coworkers (Hogh, Hoel, & Isabella, 2011; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004), and strong alternative forces, such as perceiving more attractive work elsewhere (Hom et al., 1984; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004). Additionally, poor calculative forces, such as the perception of a gloomy future with the organization may instigate the desire to leave (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004; Mobley et al., 1979).

Constraint antecedents restrain reluctant stayers from departing, such as a recession, lack of local employment (Mobley et al., 1979) or even family pressure to remain (strong normative forces) to avoid removing children from a community or school system (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004; Mitchell et al., 2001). Similarly, strong behavioral forces (costs perceived in leaving the organization; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004) such as exceptional pay, a growing 401k plan, proximity to home, or ties to the community are all reasons that employees may reluctantly remain with an organization they wish to leave (Mitchell et al., 2001).

**OB for Reluctant Stayers**

Reluctant stayers are likely to psychologically quit as they physically show up for work but consciously make the decision to not fully participate (Greenhalgh, 1980; Hulin, et al., 1985). Research has reinforced this group’s low participation, suggesting that dissatisfied or detached employees who fail to find alternatives reduce their job inputs
Consistent with social exchange theory, the reluctant stayers’ negative evaluation of their job may result in decreased participation as reciprocation for a poor work situation in which they are trapped. It is expected that OCB will be especially low for the reluctant stayer as they are not only dissatisfied, but also lack autonomy regarding desired employment and feel a sense of pressure to participate (i.e., they must remain in a job they dislike) (Deci & Ryan, 2000). This sense of pressure can further undermine the motivation to perform pro-social behaviors (Gagne, 2003). Likewise, perceptions of low control can decrease discretionary behavior (Spector & Fox, 2002). Therefore, it is predicted that reluctant stayers will be the least likely to participate in OCB.

_Hypothesis 3:_ Reluctant stayers will have the lowest levels of OCBs when compared to enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers.

*CWB for Reluctant Stayers*

Reluctant stayers must remain in a job they would like to leave (Hom et al., 2012) and, therefore, studying CWBs may be particularly important for this group as low control instigates this behavior (Spector & Fox, 2002). Experiencing dissatisfaction or poor fit (negative affective forces), the perception that one cannot achieve goals such as a promotion (negative calculative forces), or conflict with co-workers (weak constituent forces) predisposes reluctant stayers to situational constraints that may prompt CWBs (Fox & Spector, 1999; Hanisch, 1995; Spector & Fox, 2002). More importantly, low perceived control blocks the reluctant stayer’s goal of parting with the organization. This constraint may make reluctant stayers even more susceptible to participate in CWBs. Not
only is this group faced with an unpleasant work situation that individuals wish to escape, they are unable to do so. Employees who perceive low control are more likely to seek control by resorting to destructive acts as way of dealing with and reducing frustration (Allen & Greenberger, 1980; Hulin et al., 1985). Additionally, continued exposure to situations that arouse frustration elevates the likelihood that one will engage in CWBs (Spector & Fox, 2002). Therefore, it is predicted that reluctant stayers will possess the highest levels of CWBs of all of the PWS groups.

*Hypothesis 4:* Reluctant stayers will have the highest levels of CWBs when compared to enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers.

**Enthusiastic Leavers**

Enthusiastic leavers possess a strong desire to leave the organization but, unlike reluctant stayers, they have the capability and control to leave their organization for an alternative option. Such individuals may have an alternative job offer in hand, or may have a plan to leave when specified conditions are met (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). Regardless of what their endpoint is, enthusiastic leavers have a desire to leave accompanied with a plan for a way out (Hom et al., 2012). The motivation to leave from the enthusiastic leaver is similar to that of the reluctant stayer and can be a result of preference antecedents including negative affective forces, low constituent forces, strong alternative forces, and unfavorable calculative forces (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004). Unlike reluctant stayers, however, enthusiastic leavers lack constraint antecedents that interfere with their ability to leave such as strong normative forces and behavioral forces;
additionally, this group is likely be faced with strong alternative forces (alternative employment options) (Hom et al., 2012; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004).

**OCB for Enthusiastic Leavers**

Enthusiastic leavers would like to change their current employment situation and believe they are able to do so. According to Hom et al.’s (2012) PWSD model, enthusiastic leavers possess a leaving mindset and lack attachment to the organization as a result of poor job attitudes, unfavorable perceptions of the future, or unpleasant co-worker relationships. They are also likely to have alternative job opportunities or a plan in place to pursue when they leave the organization, lacking constraint in leaving. Research shows that those who are detached or possess strong intentions to leave are less likely to “go the extra mile” for the organization due to negative job evaluations and the expectation that they would not be part of it for much longer (Burris et al., 2008; Chen et al., 1998; Organ, 1997). Enthusiastic leavers have a leaving mindset similar to the reluctant stayer; therefore, it would be expected that enthusiastic leavers would also exhibit low levels of discretionary behaviors in response to an overall dissatisfaction with the employment situation (Organ, 1997; Organ et al., 2011).

Although it is predicted that enthusiastic leavers will be less likely to participate in OCB than those who wish to remain, there are reasons to believe that their OCB would not be as reduced as the reluctant stayer. This is expected as enthusiastic leavers do not possess a feeling of entrapment and have the control to act upon their preference to leave. Research shows that autonomous situations are more conducive to pro-social behavior and therefore it is not expected that this group would completely lack discretionary
participation (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Additionally, as enthusiastic leavers are not forced out of the organization, they may exert OCB to prevent burning bridges or tarnishing relationships upon leaving (Griffeth & Hom, 2001).

Hypothesis 5: Enthusiastic leavers will engage in less OCBs than enthusiastic stayers and more OCBs than reluctant stayers.

CWB for Enthusiastic Leavers

The enthusiastic leaver possesses a similar leaving mindset to the reluctant stayer as both groups desire to leave the organization. According to Hom et al. (2012) these two groups share preference antecedents (i.e., negative affective forces, low constituent forces, etc.) and are faced with similar situational frustrations that interfere with achievement of desired goals. The work frustration-aggression hypothesis states that CWB is a response to interferences in goal achievement (i.e., dissatisfaction, poor fit, abusive supervisor, etc.); therefore, it is expected that enthusiastic leavers may have the motivation to participate in such behavior. However, it is not expected that the enthusiastic leaver will participate in CWBs to the same degree of the reluctant stayer due to the perceived control the enthusiastic leaver has in escaping an undesirable work situation (Spector & Fox, 2002). In other words, the perceived control enjoyed by the enthusiastic leaver may attenuate the extent to which these individuals participate in CWBs. Additionally, enthusiastic leavers may be less likely to act on their frustrations with CWB as they may not wish to leave the organization on bad terms (Hom & Griffeth, 2001).
Hypothesis 6: Enthusiastic leavers will participate in more CWBs than enthusiastic stayers and less CWB than reluctant stayers.

Reluctant Leavers

Reluctant leavers possess a desire to remain with the organization, but do not hold the control to do so. This group has a motivation to remain similar to the enthusiastic stayer from preference antecedents such as positive affective forces, favorable calculative forces, and strong constituent forces (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004). However, unlike enthusiastic stayers, reluctant leavers are faced with constraint antecedents that obstruct their preference to stay, such as legal forces including justified termination or layoffs and normative forces, such as external pressure to leave (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004). According to Hom et al., (2012) employees identify with the reluctant leaver mindset when they foresee a forced departure, such as upcoming layoffs, expected termination (Trevor & Nyberg, 2008).

Quite often reluctant leavers do not even have an alternative employment option. For this group, the lack of control in the desire to remain is the result of involuntary departure prescribed by the organization such as termination for poor performance or layoffs (Lieber, 2009). Involuntary departure can also be prescribed by the employee, such as leaving to take care of a sick family member, or following a spouse who must relocate (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). The inclusion of this typically disregarded group provides more thorough insight regarding turnover behavior and addresses a gap in turnover research, given this group can account for as much as one third of the U.S. workforce (Mercer Workplace Survey, 2010).
Reluctant leavers would like to keep their current employment situation but are unable to do so. Unlike the other three PWS groups, reluctant leavers have a diverse range of situational variety in their journey to leaving (e.g., termination due to poor performance, layoffs, unexpected pregnancy, spousal relocation, etc.) making it difficult to predict a particular level of OCB. The reluctant leaver’s desire to stay suggests that they would continue participation in the workplace, including performing OCBs (Chen et al., 1999). Social exchange theory would posit that a satisfied employee who has to involuntarily depart (i.e., departing due to family relocation or other non-organization mandated reasons; Lee & Mitchell, 1994) would likely continue to participate in OCBs leading up to the end of their employment as reciprocation for a positive job evaluation (Emerson, 1976; Organ, 1997). However, such reactions are not expected when employees are forced out by the organization.

Often employees are not surprised when layoffs are announced (Trevor & Nyberg, 2008). Entering the reluctant stayer mindset with the potential of being terminated or laid off may have a different influence on OCBs than making the “choice” to leave for a non-work related reason. These two groups of reluctant leavers are dissimilar as the former truly lacks choice, while the latter may perceive little control, but possess a level of choice (Maertz, 2012). An employee who suspects layoffs in the future may participate in more OCBs as a means to proving their value to the organization in hopes to remain on the job (Brockner et al., 1992). On the other hand, research in the termination and layoff literature suggests that threats to continuing employment
detrimentally influence job attitudes and behaviors such as job satisfaction, commitment, and participation (Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). Therefore, a reluctant leaver’s lack of control in staying may impede the social exchange process, resulting in decreased discretionary behavior (i.e., decreased OCB from being forced out of the organization).

Due to the wide range of situations, it is difficult to make specific predictions regarding OCB for the reluctant stayer. However, the situational variety of the reluctant leaver may indicate that reluctant leavers would have the most variability in OCB. Some may react to the reluctant leaving mindset by continuing or increasing pro-social behavior, while others may decrease participation. Employing statistical procedures to empirically compare variability (Afrassa & Keeves, 1999; Bland, 2000), this study will analyze the standard deviation of OCB for the reluctant leaver compared to the three other PWS groups. To encourage the development of future research for the behavioral ambiguities of the reluctant stayer, a research question is offered to guide the direction of future PWSD investigations.

*Hypothesis 7:* Reluctant leavers will have the most variability in OCB when compared to enthusiastic stayers, reluctant stayers, and enthusiastic leavers.

*Research Question 1:* Do specific situational conditions differentially affect OCB for the reluctant leaver? Existing research (Brockner et al., 1992; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Organ, 1997; Sverke, et al., 2002) would suggest that reluctant leavers who depart due to non-work related reasons (i.e., family, relocation) would be more likely to engage in OCB than reluctant leavers who are forced out of the organization (i.e., layoffs, terminations).
CWB for Reluctant Leavers

As mentioned, predicting behavior for the reluctant leave may be difficult due to the situational variety the reluctant stayer may experience. The reluctant leaver possesses preference antecedents similar to the enthusiastic stayer such as satisfaction, commitment, and fit. Similar to the enthusiastic stayer, the reluctant leaver may be faced with little situational frustration in achieving their personal work goals, suggesting low participation in CWB (Spector & Fox, 2002). This is particularly true for reluctant leavers that leave due to non-work factors (i.e., spousal relocation, or leaving to take care of a family member) as their reasons for leaving are typically not driven by poor job evaluations (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). However, the layoff and termination literature suggests that CWB may vary for individuals who are forced out of the organization (i.e., lack control).

For example, research provides evidence that when job insecurity is high (i.e., rumors of layoffs, or perceptions of upcoming terminations) employees are more likely to engage in dysfunctional job behaviors (Lim, 1996). This lack of control in desire to stay may instigate frustration, influencing CWBs as a means for coping, retaliating, or gaining control (Allen & Greenberger, 1980; Fox & Spector, 1999; Spector & Fox, 2002). Therefore, it would be expected that reluctant stayers who are forced out of the organization may be more likely to commit CWBs than reluctant leavers who have a sense of choice in leaving (i.e., resigning to relocate). Interestingly, there is also evidence that situations of high insecurity may diminish CWB. Research has by Probst, Stewart, Gruys, and Tierney (2007) has suggested employees who fear layoffs or termination
avoid CWBs as such behaviors may increase the likelihood of losing a job. Their study found support for this claim using experimental design, concluding work situations with high job insecurity decreased participation in CWBs.

Theory and research do not agree on a unanimous prediction of CWBs for the reluctant leaver. However, the situational variety of this group may indicate that perhaps reluctant leavers would have the most variability in CWB as some members possessing this mindset may have more obvious reason to engage in such behaviors, while others may not. Once again, a research question is offered to guide the direction of research on this group for future PWSD investigations.

_Hypothesis 8:_ Reluctant leavers will have the most variability in CWBs when compared to enthusiastic stayers, reluctant stayers, and enthusiastic leavers.

_Research Question 2:_ Do specific situational conditions differentially affect CWB for the reluctant leaver? Existing research (Lim, 1996; Probst et al., 2007; Spector & Fox, 2002) would suggest that reluctant leavers who are forced out of the organization may be more likely to participate in CWB than those who depart for non-work related reasons.

The latter hypotheses seek to provide evidence for a component of the PWSD model by utilizing the PWS to predict behavior. Another way to provide further evidence for the PWS would be to show how they may affect empirically established relationships. Although much of the research on OCB and CWB focuses on the role of attitudes and cognitive evaluations in influencing behavior, personality has also been identified as a consistent predictor of such behavior (Kaplan, et al. 2009; Miles, Borman, Spector, &
Fox, 2002; Organ et al., 2011; Spector & Fox, 2002). The following section investigates the role of disposition and its ability to predict OCB and CWB in the context of the PWS.
DISPOSITION PREDICTING BEHAVIOR IN THE PWS

Research has also emphasized the importance of dispositional variables (i.e., personality) as predictors of OCB and CWB (e.g., Kamar & Van Dyne, 2007; Kaplan et al., 2009; Organ, 1997). Positive and negative affectivity are two personality constructs that indicate a person’s general affective disposition and have been able to predict attitudes and behavior more strongly than common personality indicators such as the Five Factor model (Kaplan, et al. 2009; Watson & Tellegen, 1985). Positive affect reflects the degree that an individual is naturally enthusiastic, energized, and attentive. States of high positive affectivity promote energy, concentration, and engagement (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Negative affect refers to a “general dimension of subjective distress and unpleasant engagement” (Watson et al., 1988, p. 1063). Those who have high negative affect are subject to aversive mood states such as anger, aggression, and disgust (Watson et al., 1988). Incorporating this dichotomous conceptualization of personality is particularly useful for this study as positive and negative affect have been respectively studied with OCB and CWB (Dalal, 2005; Kaplan et al., 2009; Miles et al., 2002; Spector & Fox, 2002). In fact, research has suggested that positive and negative affectivity can directly affect constructive and destructive workplace behavior (Dalal, 2005; Spector & Fox, 2002).

Research has highlighted the role of personality and its influence on OCB (Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, & Gardner, 2011; Kaplan et al., 2009; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Meta-analytic research by Kaplan et al. (2009) identifies positive affect as one of the most consistent and robust personality predictors of OCB (ρ = .30). Generally speaking,
those who possess a natural inclination to be enthusiastic and engaged are predisposed to participate in pro-social behavior (Kaplan et al., 2009). Although a consistent link has been established between personality and OCB, Organ et al. (2011) suggest that personality may be a more useful predictor of this behavior in some contexts, and less useful in other contexts.

Research emphasizing the person-situation interaction can provide insight to why personality may be a more or less useful predictor of behavior in varying situations (Kamdar & Van Dyne, 2007; Tett & Burnett, 2003). Trait activation theory (Tett & Burnett, 2003) suggests a person’s perception of a situation can moderate the strength of the relationship between personality and behavior. Trait activation is the process where individuals express their dispositional traits when faced with situations where traits are the most relevant (Tett & Burnett, 2003). For example, a work situation that reinforces extrinsic motivators, such as high contingent rewards for performance, can weaken the strength of the relationship between disposition and performance. In this context, external rewards are the driving motive of performance, denigrating the role of personality. However, trait activation theory suggests that when such rewards are not present, dispositional factors become more relevant and emerge as stronger predictors of behavior (Kamdar & Van Dyne, 2007; Tett & Burnett, 2003).

Kamdar and Van Dyne (2007) found empirical support for trait activation theory as the relationship between personality and OCB was moderated by perceptions of quality interactions and relationships with coworkers and supervisors. In situations where employees reported high quality interactions with coworkers, conscientiousness and
agreeableness were unrelated to OCB and such behavior was attributed to social exchange and a pleasant working environment. However, personality emerged as significantly correlated to OCB when such interactions were perceived to be of low quality. Kander and Van Dyne’s (2007) examination of personality and context provided evidence that dispositional differences influence OCB “when they are most needed” (Organ et al., 2011, p. 289-290). In other words, when people are faced with unsatisfying or unfavorable conditions, dispositional factors are likely to be a primary driver of pro-social behavior (Kander & Van Dyne, 2007). Kander and Van Dyne (2007) encouraged future researchers to continue to examine the joint effects of personality and situational perceptions on behavior.

Tett and Burnett (2003) suggest if researchers want to assess the influence of a personality trait, they must study it in a situation where such the trait would be most likely exhibited. The PWSD model specifies distinct mindsets in an employment situation that may be more or less conducive to the influence of personality. As the previous hypotheses suggest, particular PWS mindsets energize OCB, while others lack strong non-dispositional influences of such behavior (e.g., positive job attitudes/evaluations). For example, situations where employees experience poor attitudes with a desire to leave the organization (i.e., reluctant stayers and enthusiastic leavers) may be less likely to promote pro-social behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2009). In this context, personality may play a more important role in influencing such behavior than in a context that promotes OCB (i.e., enthusiastic stayers). The following paragraphs propose that PWS membership
moderates the relationships between positive affect and OCB and negative affect and CWB.

Enthusiastic stayers perceive a positive and fulfilling job that energizes pro-social behavior from social exchange and satisfaction (Organ, 1990; Organ et al., 2011; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Trait activation theory would suggest that personality would be less likely to influence OCB given the context of a positive job evaluation that promotes pro-social behavior. Therefore, it is expected that the relationship between positive affect and OCB will be the weakest for enthusiastic stayers when compared to the other PWS mindsets. Reluctant stayers, however, are trapped in a less than ideal job which they seek to escape, but lack the control to do so; thus, participation in OCBs are unlikely to be driven by reciprocation for a satisfying job situation or positive attitudes. Trait activation theory would suggest that in this context, the dispositional trait of positive affect would emerge as a primary motive of exhibited OCB. As such, it is predicted that the relationship between positive affect and OCB will be the strongest for the reluctant stayer. Finally, enthusiastic leavers share a similar leaving mindset to the reluctant stayer; however, although enthusiastic leavers lack a positive job evaluation, their perception of control and desire to exit on good terms with the organization may influence pro-social behavior (Gagne & Deci, 2005; Griffeth & Hom, 2001). In this context, trait activation theory would expect a modest relationship between positive affect and OCB. The situational variety of reluctant leavers (i.e., leaving for non-work related reasons, being forced out of the organization, etc.) makes it difficult to incorporate the role of
personality for this group, so predictions for the reluctant leaver will be excluded from this hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 9:* PWS membership will moderate the relationship between PA and OCB. Specifically, this relationship will be the strongest for reluctant stayers, modest for enthusiastic leavers, and the weakest for enthusiastic stayers. Figure 3 depicts the expected relationships.

![Figure 3. PWS as a Moderator in the Relationship between Positive Affect and OCB](image)

Just as positive affect can influence pro-social behavior, negative affect can influence behavior that is counterproductive (Barclay & Aquino, 2011; Cullen & Sackett, 2003; Dalal, 2004; Miles et al., 2003; Spector, 2011; Spector & Fox, 2002). The previous hypothesis highlights how personality may become a stronger predictor of behavior in the context of unfavorable conditions (i.e., reluctant stayer and enthusiastic leaver mindsets). However, to fully study personality’s role, it would be of use to also identify circumstances where personality emerges as an influential predictor in the context of favorable situations (i.e., enthusiastic stayers).
Negative affect has been a component to many models developed to understand CWB (Cullen & Sackett, 2003; Martinko et al., 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Spector, 2011; Spector & Fox, 2002). Such models posit that negative affectivity is associated with negative emotion including anger, aggression, and anxiety, leading to CWBs (Hershcovis, et al., 2007; Miles et al., 2002; Spector, 2011; Spector & Fox, 2010; Watson et al., 1988). Cullen and Sackett (2003) have referred to personality traits such as negative affect as a source of “initiated CWB”. Initiated CWB differs from “reactive CWB” (i.e., CWB as a response to frustration, dissatisfaction, etc.) as there are no organizational situations or events that instigate the negative behavior. Instead, CWB is initiated to “satisfy a motive such as pleasure, greed, thrill seeking, risk taking, or attention seeking” (Cullen & Sackett, 2003, p. 154). Meta-analytic research supports the notion that disposition can influence CWB as negative affect maintains a consistent positive relationship with the behavior, with correlations ranging from .30 to .41 (Dalal, 2005; Kaplan et al., 2009). However, similar to OCB, the role of context and perceptions may affect personality’s influence on negative behavior (Spector & Fox, 2002).

Trait activation theory would suggest that negative affectivity may be a stronger predictor of CWBs in situations or conditions that are favorable. In this context, dispositional factors are more likely to influence CWBs as individuals experience less dissatisfaction or frustration to instigate negative behavior. Therefore, it is expected that the relationship between negative affectivity and CWBs will be the strongest for enthusiastic stayers as this group enjoys satisfying work circumstances with little frustrations impeding with achievement. Reluctant stayers, however, are likely to turn to
CWBs as a response to poor attitudes or frustration (Fox & Spector, 1999; Spector, 1975; Sackett, 2002). As a result, it is expected that the relationship between negative affectivity and CWBs will be the weakest for reluctant stayers. Finally, it is predicted that this relationship will be modest for enthusiastic leavers as they likely experience negative attitudes and evaluations, but have an escape in sight to leaving. In this context, both poor attitudes and negative disposition are likely to influence CWB, resulting in a modest relationship between negative affect and CWB. Once again, the reluctant leaver is excluded from this hypothesis due to the situational variety of this group.

*Hypothesis 10:* PWS membership will moderate the relationship between NA and CWB. Specifically, this relationship will be the strongest for enthusiastic stayers, modest for enthusiastic leavers, and the weakest for reluctant stayers. Figure 4 depicts the expected relationships.
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Figure 4. *PWS as a Moderator in the Relationship between Negative Affect and CWB*

In conclusion, this study empirically investigates the PWS component of the PWSD model. Specifically, it seeks to provide evidence for distinct psychological
mindsets by proposing hypotheses that use the PWS to predict levels of constructive (OCB) and destructive (CWB) employee participation. It further highlights how these distinctive mindsets may affect personality’s ability to predict behavior. Table 1 summarizes the study hypotheses.

Table 1. Summary of Study Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</th>
<th>Counterproductive Work Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses 1, 3, 5, Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>Hypotheses 2, 4, 6, Hypothesis 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES &gt; EL &gt; RS RL have more variability in OCB than ES, EL, RL</td>
<td>RS &gt; EL &gt; ES RL have more variability in CWB than ES, EL, RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWS membership moderates the relationship between PA and OCB. Specifically, this relationship will be the strongest for reluctant stayers, modest for enthusiastic leavers, and the weakest for enthusiastic stayers.</td>
<td>PWS membership moderates the relationship between NA and OCB. Specifically, this relationship will be the strongest for enthusiastic stayers, modest for enthusiastic leavers, and the weakest for reluctant stayers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ES=Enthusiastic Stayer, EL=Enthusiastic Leaver, RS=Reluctant Stayer, RL= Reluctant Leaver, PA: Positive Affect, NA=Negative Affect.
METHOD

Participants and Procedures

The total sample for this study was 3,742 full-time, classified employees from a large hospital complex in South Central United States. From this sample, 607 participants completed the survey with an average tenure of 11.65 years ($SD = 8.75$). The participant sample contained 24% males and 76% females with an average age of 46 ($SD = 9.79$). Regarding race, 64% of the sample was Caucasian, 15% was African American, 17% was Hispanic, and 4% identified as Other. Table 2 provides a more detailed demographic breakdown within each of the PWS groups.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Breakdown of Proximal Withdrawal Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demo. Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (average in years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I coordinated the data collection process, working closely with the organization’s Human Resources Department. An invitation e-mail from the Chief Human Resource Officer was distributed to all participants containing a link to an electronic survey. This e-mail encouraged employees to complete a voluntary self-reported survey about their work life. Brief details were also provided about the content of the survey. A confidentiality statement assured participants their organization did not have access to individual responses and that data would not be used to make any personnel decisions. Before beginning the survey, participants were required to agree to participate and informed that they could withdrawal from the survey at any time with no penalty.

Measures

*Organizational Citizenship Behavior:* OCB was measured using Podsakoff, Podsakoff, Whiting, and Mishra’s (2011) approach to OCB measurement, calculating an OCB score for three unique dimensions that have been well-established in the literature: helping behavior (helping others with work-related problems), voice behavior (constructively challenging the status quo and recommending improvement), and loyalty behavior (faithfulness to the organization as a whole). Helping behavior and voice behavior were measured using Van Dyne and LePine’s (1998) 7-item helping behavior scale ($\alpha = .87$) and 6-item voice scale ($\alpha = .83$). Organizational loyalty was measured using Moorman and Blakely’s (1995) 5-item loyal boosterism scale ($\alpha = .92$). OCB was measured as self-report on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”. Section D of Appendix A contains the OCB items.
**Counterproductive Work Behavior:** CWB was measured using Spector et al.’s (2006) 33-item self-reported counterproductive work behavior checklist. This measure was developed from a comprehensive review of the CWB literature and includes the five major categories of CWB that range from minor to serious offenses: abuse toward others, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal (Spector et al., 2006). Assessing a range of CWBs that vary in severity can address restricted base rates. Broad CWB scores were aggregated across these dimensions to compute CWBs that are directed toward the organization (α = .68), and CWBs that are directed toward the person (α = .72) (Bennett & Robinson, 1995; Dalal, 2005; Spector et al., 2006). Respondents evaluated how often they have participated in each behavior on their present job on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = “never” to 5 = “every day”. Section B of Appendix A contains the CWB items.

**Positive and Negative Affectivity:** Positive and negative affectivity were measured using the positive and negative affectivity scales taken from Agho, Price, and Mueller’s (1992) study of discriminant validity. This scale was chosen as it was developed to maximize discriminant validity of affectivity and addresses concerns of earlier measures being confounded with satisfaction. Each affectivity scale consists of 11 items (22 total) assessing the traits of positive and negative affect. Coefficient alphas for the scales are .80 and .79, respectively. Section E of Appendix A contains the positive and negative affectivity items.

**Proximal Withdrawal States:** Proximal withdrawal state membership was measured using an item that required the participant to choose one of four personal
employment situations. Each situation provided a description of desired employment and control of desired employment for each of the withdrawal states. For example, the item “I want to stay and can stay” represents an enthusiastic stayer, “I want to stay but have to leave” represents a reluctant leaver, “I want to leave and can leave” represents an enthusiastic leaver, and “I want to leave but cannot leave” represents a reluctant stayer. Mean levels of intent to leave and control in staying or leaving from independent scales validate the use of this PWS classification item (see Table 2 in the Results section).

Data Analysis

Hypotheses 1 - 6 were evaluated using a one-way MANOVA to assess PWS mean group differences in OCB and CWB. Post-hoc comparisons were analyzed using the Bonferroni method to control for family-wise Type-I errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Hypotheses 7 and 8 were analyzed using the comparison of standard deviation F-test (Bland, 2000) to compare the standard deviation of the reluctant leaver to the remaining PWS groups. Hypotheses 9 and 10 were analyzed using moderated linear regression to test the moderating effects of PWS group on the relationship between positive affect and OCB and negative affect and CWB. For these analyses, the first block entered the main effect variables (PWS and PA or NA). Three dummy coded variables were computed for the three PWS groups of interest (enthusiastic stayers, enthusiastic leavers, and reluctant stayers). Dummy 1 compared enthusiastic stayers to enthusiastic leavers, Dummy 2 compared enthusiastic stayers to reluctant stayers, and Dummy 3 compared enthusiastic leavers to reluctant stayers. For Dummy 1 and Dummy 2, enthusiastic stayer represented the reference group. For Dummy 3, enthusiastic leavers
represented the reference group. In the second step, an interaction term was computed by multiplying each of the three dummy coded variables by the affectivity variable in the presence of the main effects. Significant interactions were examined by plotting values of the dependent variable one standard deviation above and below mean affectivity for each PWS.
RESULTS

Frequencies of proximal withdrawal state groups are summarized in Table 2. Much of the sample classified themselves as enthusiastic stayers (81%) followed by those who identified as reluctant stayers (9.1%). A smaller portion of the sample identified as enthusiastic leavers (5.4%) and reluctant leavers (4.5%). Mean levels of intent to leave and control in staying or leaving are consistent with PWS classification. For example, enthusiastic stayers and reluctant leavers reported lower levels of intent to leave ($M = 1.33$ and $M = 2.11$, respectively) than reluctant stayers and enthusiastic leavers ($M = 3.73$ and $M = 3.27$, respectively). Additionally, enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers reported higher levels of control for their respective desired employment status ($M = 3.60$ and $M = 4.03$, respectively) than reluctant leavers and reluctant stayers ($M = 2.86$ and $M = 2.71$, respectively).

Table 3.

*Frequency of Proximal Withdrawal State Membership (N=595)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PWS Group</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Intent to Leave</th>
<th>Control in Staying</th>
<th>Control in Leaving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic Stayer</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant Leaver</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant Stayer</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic Leaver</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: bold numbers highlight the relevant control over the group’s desired employment status (i.e., enthusiastic stayers and reluctant leavers control over their desire to stay, and reluctant stayers and enthusiastic leavers control over their desire to leave)
Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliability estimates for study variables. The two dimensions that define PWS membership were analyzed independently. Intent to leave was negatively related to all three facets of OCB (helping: $r = -.26$, voice: $r = -.27$, and loyalty: $r = -.55, p < .01$), and positively related to both facets of CWB (CWB-I: $r = .14$, CWB-O: $r = .19, p < .01$). For control, those who perceived control over their desired employment situation tended to engage in more constructive work behavior. Specifically, control in staying was positively related to all OCB facets (helping: $r = .19$, voice: $r = .21$, and loyalty: $r = .20, p < .01$) but was not related to any form of CWB. Likewise, control in leaving was positively related to all OCB facets (helping: $r = .14$, voice: $r = .19$, and loyalty: $r = .28, p < .01$) and was also not related to CWB. Reliability of study measures were all above the appropriate level, although the coefficient alpha for CWB toward the organization ($\alpha = .68$) was slightly below the desired .70 level (Cronbach, 1977).
Table 4.
*Correlations and Descriptive Statistics (N=547 to 605)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Helping Behavior</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voice Behavior</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Loyalty Behavior</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CWB Person</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CWB Organization</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>(.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Positive Affectivity</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intent to Leave</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Control in Staying</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Control in Leaving</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gender</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Age</td>
<td>46.14</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tenure</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Coefficient alphas are displayed in parentheses, Gender coded 1=male, 2=female

**p < .01 *p < .05.
Table 4: continued

*Correlations and Descriptive Statistics (N=547 to 605)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Helping Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voice Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Loyalty Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CWB Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CWB Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Positive Affectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Negative Affectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intent to Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Control in Staying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Control in Leaving</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.70)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gender</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tenure</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Coefficient alphas are displayed in parentheses, Gender coded 1=male, 2=female

**p < .01 *p < .05.
OCB Hypotheses

A one-way MANOVA was used to analyze mean differences in OCB among enthusiastic stayers, reluctant stayers, and enthusiastic leavers (Hypotheses 1, 3, and 5 combined). Specifically, this analysis evaluated differences in OCB for three OCB facets: helping behavior, voice behavior, and loyalty behavior. Results indicate a significant multivariate effect for PWS group, Pillai’s Trace = .17, $F(6, 1058) = 16.37, p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$. PWS group accounted for 9% of the variance in OCB. Table 5 summarizes the findings of this analysis and Table 6 presents OCB means and standard deviations for each PWS group.

Table 5.

Multivariate Results for Hypotheses 1, 3, and 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df hypothesis</th>
<th>df error</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWS</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pillai’s Trace criterion was used instead of Wilks’ lambda to address the violation of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices assumption (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2001).

Table 6.

Descriptive Statistics for OCB Facets (N=533)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PWS Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Helping Behavior</th>
<th>Voice Behavior</th>
<th>Loyalty Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic Stayer</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic Leaver</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant Stayer</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To examine the hypothesized OCB level predictions, Bonferroni post-hoc tests were used to dissect the mean differences in OCB between the PWS. Table 7 summarizes the pair-wise mean differences. For helping behavior, enthusiastic stayers reported significantly higher levels ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 0.52$) than reluctant stayers ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 0.58$, $p < .01$). There were no other significant differences reported between the remaining groups. For voice behavior, enthusiastic stayers reported significantly higher levels ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.59$) than enthusiastic leavers ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 0.74$, $p < .01$) and reluctant stayers ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.90$, $p < .01$). However, there were no significant differences between enthusiastic leavers and reluctant leavers. Finally, for loyalty behavior, every PWS group reported significantly different levels of OCB than each other. Specifically, enthusiastic stayers’ loyalty behavior ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 0.67$) was the highest, and significantly higher than both enthusiastic leavers ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.96$, $p < .01$) and reluctant stayers ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.01$, $p < .01$). Additionally, enthusiastic leaver’s loyalty behavior ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.96$) was significantly higher than reluctant stayers ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.01$, $p < .01$).

Given these results, there is varying evidence to support the combined hypotheses that enthusiastic stayers have the highest levels of OCB, reluctant stayers have the lowest levels of OCB, and enthusiastic leavers OCB falls between these two groups (Hypotheses 1, 3, and 5). When analyzing helping behavior, enthusiastic stayers have significantly higher levels than reluctant stayers, providing partial support for the combined hypotheses. For voice behavior, enthusiastic stayers have significantly higher levels than enthusiastic leavers and reluctant stayers, also providing partial support for the combined
hypotheses. Finally, when evaluating loyalty behavior, there is full support for the combined hypotheses; enthusiastic stayers have significantly higher levels than enthusiastic leavers and reluctant stayers, and enthusiastic leavers have significantly higher levels than reluctant stayers.

Table 7.

*Bonferroni Post-Hoc Comparisons for OCB Facets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCB Facet</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Mean Differences</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>ES vs. EL</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>ES vs. RS</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL vs. RS</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>ES vs. EL</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviora</td>
<td>ES vs. RS</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL vs. RS</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>ES vs. EL</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviora</td>
<td>ES vs. RS</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL vs. RS</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To address homogeneity of variance violations for the Voice Behavior and Loyalty Behavior DV’s, non-parametric ANOVA’s were also conducted. Results are consistent with MANOVA results.
ES=Enthusiastic Stayer, EL=Enthusiastic Leaver, RS=Reluctant Stayer
** p < .01  * p < .05

Comparison of standard deviation F-tests were conducted to evaluate if Reluctant Leavers had significantly more variability in OCB than the remaining PWS groups (Hypothesis 7). Results indicate that Reluctant Leavers do not have significantly more
variability in OCB than the remaining PWS groups, failing to support Hypothesis 7 (see Table 8).

Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>OCB Facet</th>
<th>RL SD</th>
<th>Comparison SD</th>
<th>RL Variance</th>
<th>Comparison Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RL vs ES</td>
<td>Helping Behavior</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voice Behavior</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty Behavior</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL vs RS</td>
<td>Helping Behavior</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voice Behavior</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty Behavior</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL vs EL</td>
<td>Helping Behavior</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voice Behavior</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty Behavior</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES=Enthusiastic Stayer, RL=Reluctant Leaver, EL=Enthusiastic Leaver, RS=Reluctant Stayer

*p-values were only reported when standard deviation comparisons were in the hypothesized direction

CWB Hypotheses

A one-way MANOVA was used to analyze mean differences in levels of CWB among enthusiastic stayers, reluctant stayers, and enthusiastic leavers (Hypotheses 2, 4, and 6 combined). Specifically, this analysis evaluated differences in levels of CWB toward the person and CWB directed toward the organization. Results indicate a significant multivariate effect for PWS group, Wilks’ Lambda = .96, F (4, 1124) = 5.39, p < .01, partial η² = .02. PWS group accounted for 2% of the variance in CWB. Table 9
summarizes the findings of this analysis and Table 10 presents CWB means and standard deviations for each PWS group.

Table 9.

*Multivariate Results for Hypotheses 2, 4, and 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df hypothesis</th>
<th>df error</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWS</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.

*Descriptive Statistics for CWB Facets (N=566)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PWS Group</th>
<th>CWB-P</th>
<th></th>
<th>CWB-O</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic Stayer</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic Leaver</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant Stayer</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To examine the hypothesized CWB levels, Bonferroni post-hoc tests were used to dissect the mean differences in CWB between the PWS. Table 11 summarizes the pairwise mean differences. For CWB-P, there were no significant mean differences between the three PWS groups. However, a difference did exist with CWB-O as enthusiastic stayers reported significantly lower levels ($M = 1.11, SD = 0.15$) of CWB-O than reluctant stayers ($M = 1.20, SD = 0.18, p < .01$).

Given these results, there is limited support for the combined hypotheses that enthusiastic stayers have the lowest levels of CWB, reluctant leavers have the highest
levels of CWB, and enthusiastic leavers CWB falls between these two (Hypotheses 2, 4, and 6). The results show that enthusiastic stayers have significantly lower levels of CWB-O than reluctant stayers, providing partial support for these hypotheses.

Table 11.

*Bonferroni Post-Hoc Comparisons for CWB Facets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWB Facet</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Mean Differences</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% CI Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% CI Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-P</td>
<td>ES vs. EL</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES vs. RS</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL vs. RS</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>ES vs. EL</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES vs. RS</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL vs. RS</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES=Enthusiastic Stayer, EL=Enthusiastic Leaver, RS=Reluctant Stayer

** p < .01 * p < .05

Comparison of standard deviation F-tests were conducted to evaluate if Reluctant Leavers had significantly more variability in CWB than the remaining PWS groups (Hypothesis 8). Results indicate that Reluctant Leavers have significantly more variability in CWB-O than the remaining PWS groups, RL vs ES: $F(26, 479) = 14.88, p < .01$, RL vs RS $F(26, 53) = 10.26, p < .01$, and RL vs EL: $F(26, 31) = 20.58, p < .01$. Therefore, results provide partial support for Hypothesis 8 (see Table 12).
Table 12.

Comparison of Standard Deviation F-Test for CWB Facets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>CWB Facet</th>
<th>RL SD</th>
<th>Comparison SD</th>
<th>RL Variance</th>
<th>Comparison Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RL vs ES</td>
<td>CWB-P</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL vs RS</td>
<td>CWB-P</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL vs EL</td>
<td>CWB-P</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES=Enthusiastic Stayer, EL=Enthusiastic Leaver, RS=Reluctant Stayer

*p-values were only reported when comparisons were in the hypothesized direction

PWS Moderation Hypotheses: OCB

Hierarchical regression was used to evaluate if PWS membership moderated the relationship between positive affectivity and OCB (Hypothesis 9). For this procedure, each of the three OCB outcome variables were independently regressed onto PWS group, positive affectivity, and their interaction term. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 13. For helping behavior, the omnibus test of the full regression model was significant, $F(5, 528) = 5.71, p < .01, R^2 = .05$. In the first step, PWS group and positive affectivity jointly predicted helping behavior, $F(3, 530) = 8.17, p < .01, R^2 = .04$. Specifically, each variable uniquely predicted helping behavior ($\beta = -.12, p < .01, \beta = .14, p < .01$, respectively).

In the second step, there was not a significant increase in explained OCB variance, $\Delta F(2, 528) = 1.99, p = .14, \Delta R^2 = .01$. However, there was marginally significant
interaction between PWS and PA in predicting helping behavior. Specifically, the interaction term comparing enthusiastic stayers to reluctant stayers (Dummy $2 \times PA$) was marginally significant ($\beta = -.22, p = .06$) and the interaction term comparing enthusiastic leavers to reluctant stayers (Dummy $3 \times PA$) was marginally significant ($\beta = -.29, p = .09$). The interaction term comparing enthusiastic leavers to enthusiastic stayers (Dummy $1 \times PA$) was not significant. Figure 5 depicts the nature of this relationship. The plots show the relationship between PA and helping behavior is weakest for reluctant stayers compared to enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers. Simple slopes tests show that the slope of the interaction plots are significantly different than zero for enthusiastic stayers ($t = 3.35, p < .01$) and marginally significantly different for enthusiastic leavers ($t = 1.72, p < .10$).
Table 13.

**OCB Moderated Regression Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Helping Behavior</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Voice Behavior</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Loyalty Behavior</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>β Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>β Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>β Step 2</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>β Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWS&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affectivity</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWS × PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1×PA</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2×PA</td>
<td>-.22†</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.29†</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 3×PA</td>
<td>-.29†</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>For table, PWS was coded with Enthusiastic Stayer as the reference group (0) comparing to Reluctant Stayer (1). Dummy 1 = Enthusiastic Stayer vs Enthusiastic Leaver, Dummy 2 = Enthusiastic Stayer vs Reluctant Stayer, Dummy 3 = Enthusiastic Leavers vs. Reluctant Stayers

**p < .01  *p < .05  † < .10**

*Figure 5.* PWS moderating the relationship between PA and Helping Behavior
In predicting voice behavior, the omnibus test of the full regression model was significant, $F (5, 529) = 9.86, p < .01, R^2 = .08$. In the first step, PWS group and positive affectivity jointly predicted voice behavior, $F (3, 53) = 15.57, p < .01, R^2 = .08$. Specifically, each variable uniquely predicted voice behavior ($\beta = -.18, p < .01, \beta = .17, p < .01$, respectively). However, in the second step, there was not a significant increase in explained OCB variance, $\Delta F (2, 529) = .00, p = .28, \Delta R^2 = .00$ and none of the PWS-PA interaction terms were significant.

Finally, in predicting loyalty behavior, the omnibus test of the full regression model was significant, $F (5, 526) = 27.83, p < .01, R^2 = .21$. In the first step, PWS group and positive affectivity jointly predicted loyalty behavior, $F (3, 528) = 44.25, p < .01, R^2 = .20$. Specifically, each variable uniquely predicted loyalty behavior ($\beta = -.31, p < .01, \beta = .24, p < .01$, respectively). In the second step, there was a marginally significant increase in explained variance, $\Delta F (2, 526) = 2.75, p < .10, \Delta R^2 = .01$. Although the interaction term comparing enthusiastic stayers to enthusiastic leavers (Dummy 1 $\times$ PA) was not significant, the interaction term comparing enthusiastic stayers to reluctant stayers (Dummy 2 $\times$ PA) was marginally significant ($\beta = -.19, p = .05$), and the interaction term comparing enthusiastic leavers to reluctant leavers was significant ($\beta = -.33, p < .05$). Figure 6 depicts the nature of this relationship. The relationship between PA and loyalty behavior is weakest for reluctant stayers compared to enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers. Simple slopes tests show that the slope of the interaction plots are significantly different than zero for enthusiastic stayers ($t = 5.67, p < .01$) and enthusiastic leavers ($t = 2.98, p < .01$).
Figure 6. PWS moderating the relationship between PA and Loyalty Behavior

Given these results, there is partial support for Hypothesis 9. In predicting helping behavior and loyalty behavior, PWS moderated the relationship between PA and OCB. Results consistently showed that the relationship between PA and OCB is weaker for reluctant stayers than it is for enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers. However, although a significant moderation was detected, these results are contrary to the hypothesis prediction that enthusiastic stayers have the weakest relationship between PA and OCB.

PWS Moderation Hypotheses: CWB

The same hierarchical regression procedure was used to evaluate if PWS membership moderated the relationship between negative affectivity and CWB (Hypothesis 10). Each of the two CWB outcome variables were regressed onto PWS group, negative affectivity, and their interaction term. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 14.
For CWB toward the person, the omnibus test of the full regression model was significant, $F(5, 543) = 5.89$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .05$. In the first step, PWS group and negative affectivity jointly predicted CWB-P, $F(3, 543) = 9.57$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .05$. However, only negative affectivity uniquely predicted CWB-P ($\beta = .23$, $p < .01$). In the second step, there was not a significant increase in explained variance, $\Delta F(2, 541) = .41$, $p = .66$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$ and none of the PWS-NA interaction terms were significant.

Table 14.

**CWB Moderated Regression Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>CWB-P</th>
<th></th>
<th>CWB-O</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ Step 1</td>
<td>$\beta$ Step 2</td>
<td>$\beta$ Step 1</td>
<td>$\beta$ Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWS$^a$</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWS × NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 × NA</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 × NA</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 3 × NA</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$For table, PWS was coded with Enthusiastic Stayer as the reference group (0) comparing to Reluctant Stayer (1). Dummy 1 = Enthusiastic Stayer vs Enthusiastic Leaver, Dummy 2 = Enthusiastic Stayer vs Reluctant Stayer, Dummy 3 = Enthusiastic Leavers vs. Reluctant Stayers

** p < .01  * p < .05 † p < .10

In predicting CWB toward the organization, the omnibus test of the full regression model was significant $F(5, 541) = 9.51$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .08$. In the first step, PWS
group and negative affectivity jointly predicted CWB-O, \( F(3, 543) = 13.97, p < .01, \ R^2 = .07 \). Specifically, each variable uniquely predicted CWB-O (\( \beta = .15, p < .01, \beta = .19, p < .01 \), respectively). In the second step, there was a marginally significant increase in explained variance, \( \Delta F(2, 541) = 2.69, p < .10, \Delta R^2 = .01 \). Specifically, the interaction term comparing enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers (Dummy 1×NA) was significant (\( \beta = -.13, p < .05 \)). However, the remaining interaction terms were not significant. Figure 7 depicts the nature of this relationship. The relationship between NA and CWB-O is strongest for enthusiastic stayers compared to reluctant stayers and enthusiastic leavers. Simple slopes tests show that the slope of the interaction plots are significantly different than zero for enthusiastic stayers (\( t = 4.98, p < .01 \)).

*Figure 7. PWS moderating the relationship between NA and CWB toward the Organization*
Given these results, there is partial support for Hypothesis 10. In predicting CWB toward the organization, PWS moderated the relationship between NA and OCB. Interaction plots showed that the relationship between NA and CWB-O is strongest for enthusiastic stayers compared to enthusiastic leavers and reluctant stayers. This finding is consistent to the hypothesis prediction that enthusiastic stayers have the strongest relationship between NA and CWB. Table 15 summarizes the results of the present study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 3, 5 (combined)</td>
<td>ES &gt; EL &gt; RS</td>
<td>Helping Behavior: Partially Supported: ES &gt; RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Behavior</td>
<td>ES &gt; EL</td>
<td>ES &gt; RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty Behavior</td>
<td>Supported: ES &gt; EL &gt; RS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RL have more variability in OCB than ES, EL, RL</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PWS membership moderates the relationship between PA and OCB. Specifically, this relationship will be the strongest for RS, modest for EL, and the weakest for ES.</td>
<td>Helping Behavior: Partially Supported: Marginally significant interactions; the relationship between PA and helping behavior was weakest for RS compared to ES and EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Behavior</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty Behavior</td>
<td>Partially Supported: Significant and marginally significant interaction; the relationship between PA and loyalty behavior was the weakest for RS compared to ES and EL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2, 4, 6 (combined)</td>
<td>RS &gt; EL &gt; ES</td>
<td>CWB-P: Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O: Partially Supported: RS &gt; ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RL have more variability in CWB than ES, EL, RL</td>
<td>CWB-P: Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O: Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PWS membership moderates the relationship between NA and OCB. Specifically, this relationship will be the strongest for ES, modest for EL, and the weakest for RS.</td>
<td>Partially Supported: Significant interaction; the relationship between NA and CWB-O behavior was the strongest for ES compared to EL and RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ES=Enthusiastic Stayer, EL=Enthusiastic Leaver, RS=Reluctant Stayer, RL= Reluctant Leaver, PA: Positive Affect, NA=Negative Affect
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to empirically evaluate the PWS and their ability to predict constructive and destructive participation. Results provide preliminary evidence for the existence of distinct pre-departure mindsets and their usefulness in predicting organizational participation where the PWS seem to be the most predictive of participation directed at the organization. This study also shows that the PWS can act as a contextual moderator in the relationship between disposition and behavior. In the following paragraphs, I will discuss these results in detail.

PWS Predicting Constructive Participation

The PWS accounted for a significant amount of variance in OCB. However, results show this variable may be more useful at predicting certain forms of OCB than others. For example, the PWS were not as useful at predicting helping behavior compared to voice behavior and loyalty behavior. For helping behavior, the only significant difference was enthusiastic stayers reported higher levels than reluctant stayers. Turning to the conceptualization of helping behavior provides insights to why minimal differences may exist. Van Dyne and LePine (1998) characterize helping behavior as social behavior that emphasizes small acts of consideration to others and important to interpersonal relationships. Of the three facets of OCB studied, helping behavior is the only OCB that is primarily directed at, and immediately benefits specific individuals.

Research shows that individuals engage in helping behavior for interpersonal reasons, such as the norm of reciprocity to helping someone who helped you (Gouldner, 1960), feelings of interpersonal cohesion, social responsibility (Berkowitz & Daniels,
1963), or co-worker support (Kim, Van Dyne, Kamdar, & Johnson, 2013). Likewise, interpersonal relationships are more proximal and visible to the employee and can be a stronger motive of helping behavior than organizational variables (Kim et al., 2013). Therefore, regardless of one’s evaluation of their job or their organization, an individual may still be willing to engage in pro-social behavior that benefits another person. This may explain why significant differences do not exist between enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers. However, consistent with previous research, the reluctant stayer’s lack of control can undermine their willingness to participate in constructive behavior toward other people (Spector & Fox, 2002).

The PWS were more useful at predicting voice behavior. In this study, enthusiastic stayers reported higher levels of voice behavior than both enthusiastic leavers and reluctant stayers. Voice behavior represents one’s concern and effort in improving organizational policies, practices and procedures (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Of the three facets of OCB studied, voice behavior is the only facet that is future oriented. It is promotive behavior that constructively challenges the status quo with a commitment to future action and change. Given this conceptualization, it is clear why enthusiastic stayers have elevated voice behavior as they foresee a future with the organization that they can shape. Enthusiastic leavers, however, are nearly out the door and have very little to gain participating in discretionary behavior to improve the organization. Likewise, reluctant stayers may lack voice behavior as they are trapped, psychologically withdrawn, and unlikely to provide effort and input to improving the organization, especially when it is discretionary (Burris et al., 2008; Hulin, et al., 1985; Meyer et al., 2004).
The PWS were most useful at predicting loyalty behavior. Loyalty behavior represents a strong identification and allegiance to the organization as a whole. Those who are actively loyal represent the organization positively and proactively defend it to co-workers and outsiders (Van Dyne et al., 1994). Of the three OCB facets studied, loyalty behavior is the only facet directed at the organization and is based on the mutuality of an employee’s relationship with it (Graham & Organ, 1993). Therefore, when one has a positive relationship with the organization they are more likely to exhibit loyalty behavior than someone who has a poor relationship.

The results of this study support this claim as loyalty behavior was significantly different for each of the PWS: enthusiastic stayers had the highest, followed by enthusiastic leavers, and reluctant stayers had the lowest. It is obvious why enthusiastic stayers would exhibit the most loyalty behavior as individuals who have a strong connection and commitment to the organization are the most likely to promote and defend it (Van Dyne et al., 1994). Enthusiastic leaver’s possessed decreased levels of loyalty behavior given they are close to cutting ties with the organization in which they desire to leave (Farrell & Rusbult, 1992). Reluctant stayers reported especially low levels of loyalty behavior ($M = 3.00$) – substantially lower than their reported levels of helping behavior ($M = 4.04$) and voice behavior ($M = 3.61$). Perhaps this is because of all the OCB facets studied, reluctant stayers have very little to gain by exhibiting loyalty.

For example, those trapped in a poor job situation may engage in helping behavior for social reciprocation (Bommer, Miles, & Grover, 2003) and they may engage in voice behavior as a means to improving components of their dissatisfaction (LePine & Van
Dyne, 1998). However, there is no benefit to an individual for participating in loyalty behavior as it is not required for the job and there is no individual or interpersonal reward associated with participation; in this case there is no value and reciprocation is halted (Emerson, 1976). Consistent with research by Deci and Ryan (2000), when one is trapped in their job, it is extrinsic rewards that will motivate participation. With loyalty behavior, there are no extrinsic gains with participation and therefore, very little reason to engage in this behavior. Given there is no personal return for displaying allegiance to an organization one is trapped in, loyalty behavior may be the purest behavioral indications of one’s willingness to participate.

PWS Predicting Destructive Participation

Results also showed that the PWS accounted for significant variability in destructive behavior. Once again, these results were mixed depending on the target the behavior was directed at. No significant differences in CWB existed when the behavior was directed at the individual; however, reluctant stayers reported significantly higher levels of CWB than enthusiastic stayers when the behavior was directed at the organization. This indicates that reluctant stayers may resort to destructive behavior toward the organization as a way to mitigate their frustration or as a means to gaining a sense of control over their environment (Allen & Greenberger, 1980; Crossley, Bennett, Jex, & Burnfield., 2007). This reaction is consistent with previous research that reports those who experience roadblocks to goal attainment (i.e., want to leave but cannot) respond by engaging in CWB (Spector, 1978).
Interestingly, enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers reported similar levels of CWB toward the organization. This result is noteworthy as it is contrary to research that suggests those who lack satisfaction and commitment (i.e., enthusiastic leavers) are more likely to participate in CWB (Magione & Quinn, 1975; Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006). This finding further emphasizes the importance of control when it comes to actually committing destructive behavior (Chen & Spector, 1992; Spector & Fox, 2002). The perception of control enjoyed by the enthusiastic leaver may ease their desire to act upon their negative employment situation with CWB. However, reluctant stayers lack this control, and therefore, are more prone to respond with destructive participation.

Given these results, the question may arise as to why a PWS effect was observed with CWB toward the organization, but not CWB toward the individual. It may be that CWB toward the individual is not as relevant to typical frustrations that determine PWS membership. For instance, the motivation to engage in CWB toward the individual often stems from personal disposition or an isolated interpersonal conflict (Dalal, 2005; Vardi & Weitz 2004). Although an individual may experience a strong desire to leave the organization because of a specific interpersonal issue, such as a hostile co-worker (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), it is likely that one enters and identifies with a particular PWS due to a more general positive or negative evaluation as a whole. For example, common preference antecedents such as negative job attitudes, poor fit, job pressures, and injustice are grander, organizationally-rooted frustrations that lead to a poor job evaluation. Therefore, when responding to a negative job situation, negative behavior toward the organization may be a more appropriate outlet than other individuals. After
all, Hom et al. (2012) refer to the PWS as mental states that energize participation with the organization.

PWS Moderation Hypotheses

This study also provides some evidence that the PWS can serve as a contextual moderator in the established relationship between disposition and behavior. Multiple PWS-PA interaction terms were significant or marginally significant predictors of constructive behavior (see Figures 5 and 6). For enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers, positive affectivity had a consistent positive relationship with helping behavior and loyalty behavior; however, these relationships were non-existent for reluctant stayers. In other words, increasing positive affectivity did not result in higher levels of predicted OCB for reluctant stayers. This result is contrary to trait activation theory that would predict the PA-OCB relationship would be the strongest for this group, given this weak situation presents an opportunity for positive disposition to emerge. Instead, findings indicate the reluctant stayer mindset actually impaired the conducive effects of positive affectivity – the strongest dispositional predictor of discretionary behavior (Dalal, 2005). This highlights the power of the reluctant stayer mindset in depressing positive behavior, even when one is naturally disposed to engage in it. Additionally, this also indicates the importance of control in permitting disposition to further promote constructive participation. In the case of the reluctant leaver, a lack of control may have undermined the effects of positive affectivity on OCB.

The PWS also served as a moderator in the relationship between negative affectivity and destructive behavior, specifically, CWB toward the organization (see
Figure 7). For enthusiastic leavers and reluctant stayers, the relationship between negative affectivity and CWB-O was nearly zero; these groups had increased levels of predicted CWB-O, regardless of negative affectivity level. This indicates the enthusiastic leaver and reluctant stayer mindsets may be energizing destructive participation for those who are not naturally inclined to engage in it (i.e., those with low negative affectivity). Increased levels of predicted CWB for those who have low NA indicates that their CWB is likely attributed to poor work evaluations.

For enthusiastic stayers, a significant positive relationship between negative affectivity and CWB emerged; increasing negative affectivity resulted in higher predicted levels of CWB-O for this group. This result is consistent with trait activation theory, which predicts that the enthusiastic stayer’s positive job situation presents an opportunity for negative disposition to emerge to influence destructive behavior. Results confirm that negative affectivity’s effect on destructive behavior is strongest when one is faced with a positive work mindset; in this situation, reported CWB is likely attributed to negative disposition rather than a poor job evaluation.

Reluctant Leavers

This study excluded reluctant leavers from hypotheses as predictions would be difficult due to the situational variety of this group. Given previous research indicates reluctant leavers forced out may react substantially different than those who have the volition to choose to leave (Chen et al., 1999; Lim, 1996; Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002), it was proposed that this group would report the highest variability in behavior. Results showed that reluctant leavers had significantly more variability in CWB toward
the organization than the remaining groups, although this did not apply to OCB or CWB toward the individual. Higher variability in CWB-O indicates that inconsistencies in behavior may exist for this group as reluctant leavers who are forced out of the organization (i.e., termination) may engage in higher levels of destructive behavior and reluctant leavers who are forced to leave on good terms (i.e., spousal relocation) may engage in lower levels of this behavior. The variability hypotheses were established to provide initial insight to inconsistencies in the reluctant leaver’s behavior; however, this result should be interpreted with caution as more thorough analyses are required before inferences are made.

Limitations & Future Research

Like all scientific research, there are limitations to this investigation that should be considered when interpreting results. First, a primary limitation is that this study does not utilize a validated measure of the PWS. The single item PWS scale used may lack the reliability and construct validity desired for sound measurement (DeVillis, 2003). Not only would a validated PWS scale reduce measurement error, it may also result in a less skewed distribution of PWS membership. In the current study, unequal PWS group sizes led to some analytical complexities that required the use of statistical modifications; additionally, increased sample sizes for two of the PWS groups (i.e., enthusiastic leavers and reluctant stayers) would augment statistical power that may provide more definite evidence for the marginally significant interactive effects reported (Shieh, 2009). Although this limitation is acknowledged, this study did provide some evidence for the construct validity of the PWS as separate measures of intention to remain and control
indicate a level of accuracy in PWS classification. Additional study measurement concerns include common method bias arising for the exclusive use of self-reported measures that may inflate reported levels of behavior (Moorman & Podsakoff, 1992). However, research shows that these concerns do not pose serious threats to the interpretation of findings (Spector, 2006; Vance, MacCallum, Coovert, & Hedge, 1988).

Another limitation of this study is that cross-sectional design limits the extent that causal inferences can be made about the PWS and their influence on behavior. Given this design, results cannot definitively conclude that a particular PWS mindset truly energizes participation. For example, although a variety of evidence has been presented that shows enthusiastic stayers are most likely to constructively participate and least likely to destructively participate, the direction of causality is uncertain and reciprocal or reverse causality cannot be ruled out; it could be that one identifies as an enthusiastic stayer because they participate in constructive behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2003). The literature would benefit greatly from studying the PWS using an approach with more control, such as experimental design.

Although this study has its limitations, results provide an initial empirical analysis of the PWS as well as directed opportunities for future research. First and foremost, future research should develop an empirically validated measure of the PWS. An established measure of the PWS variable is a crucial tool for researchers as they continue to further investigate components of the PWSD model. Another obvious starting point for future research would be to further investigate the relationship between personality and PWS. This study considers the PWS as a moderator in the personality-behavior
relationship, but it could be that disposition influences PWS membership. Hom et al (2012) discuss a variety of work and non-work related variables that impact PWS membership, but they do not overtly allude to the role of personality which may influence this process (Meyer et al., 2004). This raises the question “Is one who possesses and particular disposition more or less likely to identify with a particular PWS?” Ad hoc analyses indicate this may be a possibility as enthusiastic stayers reported the highest levels of PA ($M=8.92$) and lowest levels of NA ($M=2.33$) and reluctant stayers reported the lowest levels of PA ($M=7.13$) and the highest levels of NA ($M=4.26$). The literature would surely benefit from research investigating the independence (or lack thereof) of personality and PWS mindsets. This line of research would identify significant theoretical implications for the PWSD model as personality may predispose one to identify with a particular PWS mindset.

Future research should also provide a more thorough evaluation of the reluctant leaver mindset. This area warrants a more focused analysis as there are likely very different mindsets within the reluctant leaver classification. For example, Hom et al (2012) identify four subtypes of reluctant leavers: involuntary leavers (satisfied but suspicious of pending termination or layoff), resistant leavers (feel pressure from employer to leave satisfying job), prospective retirees (satisfied but reach retirement age), and coerced leavers (satisfied but non-work related circumstance requires departure). As involuntary leavers and resistant leavers are forced out and lack volition in staying with the organization, they may react by engaging in destructive participation. Conversely, as prospective retirees and coerced leavers are typically satisfied and have a sense of
volition in leaving, they may be more prone to positively participate. Future research should take a closer look at the motivations and behavior of the different reluctant leavers as this group seems to be the most elusive of all the PWS.

Finally, this study indicated that there are some complexities regarding the PWS ability to predict a category of behavior. For example, results showed that the PWS did not predict all forms of OCB equally as predictions were most accurate for loyalty behavior and least accurate for helping behavior. Likewise, the PWS were unable to predict any differences in CWB toward the individual. Future research should emphasize a more granular analysis of how the PWS influence outcome variables. Rather than assuming the PWS equally energize general behavior such as OCB, future research should emphasize more specific predictions of facet outcomes that are informed by theory.

Implications for Turnover Research

This study provides implications for turnover research as evidence is presented that the withdrawal process is more complex than previous turnover models have considered. Rather than simply taking a dichotomous approach and analyzing attitudes and behaviors of those who stay and those who leave the organization (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Mobley, 1977; Mitchell et al., 2001), a deeper understanding of withdrawal can be obtained by considering multiple mindsets that may influence a spectrum of behavior prior to departure. This study provides empirical confirmation that different behaviors can exist within a leaving mindset.
For example, in the traditional approach, enthusiastic leavers and reluctant stayers would be classified in a “leaving mindset”, given their intention to leave the organization. However, the current study shows the behaviors within this leaving mindset were not the same. Reluctant stayers engaged in the most destructive participation while withholding the most constructive participation; enthusiastic leavers, on the other hand, exhibited lower levels of destructive participation similar to those exhibited by enthusiastic stayers and more constructive participation than reluctant stayers who are also in the leaving mindset. In other words, not all individuals in the “leaver” mindset should be viewed the same and their reactions to a poor job evaluation are not equivalent; by taking a “staying” or “leaving” approach, researchers are overlooking the complexities within these groups and the role that the perception of control can play in influencing participation. Likewise, this study shows the extent that withdrawal can affect the organization leading up to departure. Enthusiastic leavers may leave on positive terms with a pleasant farewell and minimal disruptions to the organization, while reluctant stayers may be more prone to cause problems for the organization on their journey out of the organization.

This study also highlights how distinct pre-departure mindsets can affect one’s natural inclination to engage in behavior on the journey to leaving. Results indicate having a sense of control over desired employment status (i.e., enthusiastic stayers and enthusiastic leavers) provides the context for positive disposition to influence constructive participation. However, a lack of control (i.e., reluctant stayers) undermined this effect. Likewise, the enthusiastic leaver and reluctant stayer mindsets promoted destructive participation, even when one lacks negative disposition. These results display
the power of the PWS to potentially alter dispositional tendencies as they can suppress constructive participation for those who are naturally inclined to engage in it, and energize destructive participation for those who may not otherwise engage in it.

When using the PWS to study the turnover process, analyzing behavioral outcome variables directed at the organization were more useful than behavior that is directed toward the individual. In this study, the PWS were more accurate at predicting behavior that was directed toward the organization. As the PWS are indicative of the employee’s evaluation of their employment with the organization, PWS mindsets may be more likely to be manifested through organizationally directed outcome variables. Therefore, such outcome variables may be the most appropriate to study in the context of PWS investigations.

Finally, the PWS provide a monumental shift in the paradigm of studying turnover behavior, acknowledging that everyone will eventually leave. The path to departure can be vastly different and the PWS can provide an avenue to gaining insights into this journey and how it affects the individual and the organization. The shift from focusing primarily on actual turnover behavior to an analysis of pre-departure mindsets acknowledges that different psychological processes exist that can influence motivation, attitudes and behavior. Simply looking at turnover behavior overlooks distinct mindsets and how they affect employee participation on one’s path to leaving. Failing to consider this reality erroneously simplifies the complexity of employee turnover.
Conclusion

This study provided one of the first empirical investigations of Hom et al’s (2012) PWSD model. Although there is still much work to be done, the results indicate a level of support for the PWS component of the PWSD model. This study provides evidence that the PWS may energize the extent that one engages in constructive participation, although study predictions were the most accurate when participation was purely discretionary and directed at the organization. The PWS also provided insight to engaging in destructive participation, highlighting the importance of control in influencing CWB toward the organization. Finally, the PWS served as a contextual moderator in the relationship between disposition and behavior, as certain mindsets depressed dispositional effects on constructive participation and strengthened these effects on destructive participation. Although this investigation provided a broad examination of the PWS and its role in predicting employee participation, it empirically established the value of the construct’s ability to provide a more complex analysis of the process preceding an employee’s inevitable departure.
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APPENDIX: SURVEY INFORMATION

University of Texas Medical Branch Employee Survey

Please read the following information completely before beginning the online questionnaire.

Dear UTMC RN:

We are asking you to participate in a survey designed to learn what employees at UTMB think and feel about their jobs, their work, and their organization. This survey was developed by organizational researchers at Ohio University based on a series of focus groups with UTMB personnel. The information obtained from this survey will enable UTMC management to improve employee retention and working conditions.

This is not a test. There are no right answers. The only right answers are your honest and thoughtful replies. The information obtained will be used to better understand employee retention in this organization. Although this survey is being conducted with cooperation of management, the responsibility for the focus of the survey rests with the research group from Ohio University. You will notice that there is repetition of items throughout the survey. Although we apologize for this, it is necessary in order to assess the reliability of our measures.

PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

The following is furnished to explain why the information is requested and the general uses that the information may be put:

The purpose of this survey is to better understand employees’ perceptions, attitudes, and to ultimately improve the quality of work life for employees. The survey data will be used for research purposes only. Your individual responses are COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL. Summarized data, which do NOT contain individual identifiers, may be provided to management for uses related to improving policies and practices. Participation in the survey is completely voluntary. No penalty will be imposed for failure to respond to the survey or any particular question. However, in order to obtain an accurate picture of the working environment at UTMB, your participation in this survey is important, encouraged, and greatly appreciated. This is your turn to “tell it like you really see it.”

We are requesting that you provide us your name and employee I.D. number in the beginning of the survey. We need this information in order to match your survey responses to the other information about you (e.g., if you leave UTMB within the next six months). Although we are asking you to provide this identifying information, please be assured that your answers will be COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL, and used only as we have stated above. NO ONE from your organization or any person other than our research team will see your individual answers. All reports will be summaries (e.g., averages, percentages) of a large number of individuals. YOUR COOPERATION IS SINCERELY APPRECIATED. When you finish, please check through the survey to see that you have answered all the questions. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to call me at (440) 479-9073 or e-mail me at sr204008@ohio.edu.

Sincerely yours,

Sean Robinson
Doctoral Candidate, Ohio University

Rodger W. Griffeth, Ph.D.
PARTICIPANT SURVEY

This instrument asks questions about your current job and organization. Please read the items and select one answer per question. If not available answer exactly expresses your feeling, use the best answer available. It is important that you respond to every item even though many may seem similar to others.

A. Please enter your Employee ID Number:
   1. Employee ID Number: _______________________

B. Reflecting on your personal behavior at work, please evaluate how often you participate in each of the following behaviors in your present job. Please be assured that this data is confidential and will NOT be shared with your organization. Use the following response scale:

   1 = Never
   2 = Once or twice
   3 = Once or twice per month
   4 = Once or twice per week
   5 = Every day

1. Told people outside the job what a lousy place you work for
2. Started or continued a damaging or harmful rumor at work
3. Been nasty or rude to a client or customer
4. Insulted someone about their job performance
5. Made fun of someone’s personal life
6. Ignored someone at work
7. Blamed someone at work for error you made
8. Started an argument with someone at work
9. Verbally abused someone at work
10. Made an obscene gesture (the finger) to someone at work
11. Threatened someone at work with violence
12. Threatened someone at work, but not physically
13. Said something obscene to someone at work to make them feel bad
14. Did something to make someone at work look bad
15. Played a mean prank to embarrass someone at work
16. Looked at someone at work’s private mail/property without permission
17. Hit or pushed someone at work
18. Insulted or made fun of someone at work
19. Purposely did your work incorrectly
20. Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done
21. Purposely failed to follow instructions
22. Purposely wasted your employers materials/supplies
23. Purposely damaged a piece of equipment or property
24. Purposely dirty or littered your workplace
25. Stolen something belonging to your employer
26. Took supplies or tools home without permission
27. Put in to be paid for more hours than you worked
28. Took money from your employer without permission
29. Stole something belonging to someone at work
30. Came to work late without permission
31. Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you were not
32. Taken a longer break than you were allowed to take
33. Left work earlier than you were allowed to

**C1. For the following questions, please choose the response that best describes your work situation. Please be assured that this data is confidential and will NOT be shared with your organization.**

Which employment situation most accurately describes your current beliefs about working here?
- a. I want to stay and can stay
- b. I want to stay but have to leave
- c. I want leave and can leave
- d. I want to leave but cannot leave

**C2. Using the following scale to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.**

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

1. I would like to leave this organization.
2. I would prefer to work somewhere other than this organization.
3. I would like to remain in this organization.
4. It is mostly up to me whether or not I am able to stay in my current organization
5. It is mostly up to me whether or not I am able to leave my current organization

*Using the following scale, indicate the how much control you believe you have regarding the following questions.*

1 = A lot of control
2 = Some control
3 = Little control
4 = No control

1. How much control do you believe you have over being able to stay in your current job?
2. How much control do you believe you have over being able to leave your current job?

**D. Reflecting on your personal behavior at work, please evaluate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. Please be assured that all your responses on this survey are completely confidential and will NOT be shared with your organization.**

1. I volunteer to do things for the work group.
2. I help orient new employees in the group.
3. I attend functions that help the work group.
4. I assist others in this group with their work for the benefit of the group.
5. I get involved to benefit the work group.
6. I help others in the group learn about their work.
7. I help others in the group with their particular work responsibilities.
8. I develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect the work group.
9. I speak up and encourage others in the group to get involved in issues that affect the group.
10. I communicate my opinions about work issues to others in the group even if he/her opinion is different and others in the group disagree with him/her.
11. I keep well informed about issues where my opinions might be useful to the work group.
12. I get involved in issues that affect the quality of work life here in the group.
13. I speak up in the group with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures.
14. I defend the organization when other employees criticize it.
15. I encourage friends and family to utilize organization products.
16. I defend the organization when outsiders criticize it.
17. I show pride when representing the organization in public.
18. I promote the organization’s products and services to potential users.

E. Rate if each statement is true or false regarding you as a person:

1. It is easy for me to become enthusiastic about things I am doing.
2. I often feel happy and satisfied for no particular reason.
3. I live a very interesting life.
4. Every day I do things that are fun.
5. I usually find ways to liven up my day.
6. Most days I have moments of real fun or joy.
7. I often feel sort of lucky for no special reason.
8. Every day interesting things happen to me.
9. In my spare time I usually find something interesting to do.
10. For me life is a great adventure.
11. I always seem to have something pleasant to look forward to.
12. I often find myself worrying about something.
13. My feelings are hurt rather easily.
14. Often I get irritated at little annoyances.
15. I suffer from nervousness.
16. My mood often goes up and down.
17. I sometimes feel ‘just miserable’ for no good reason.
18. I am easily startled by things that happen unexpectedly.
19. I often lose sleep over my worries.
20. Minor setbacks sometimes irritate me too much.
21. There are days when I’m ‘on edge’ all of the time.
22. I am too sensitive for my own good.

F. Demographic Questions

1. What is your age (in years)? ____
2. Indicate your gender:
   a. Male
   b. Female
3. What is your racial or ethnic group membership?
   a. African-American
   b. Hispanic
   c. Caucasian (white)
   d. Asian or Pacific Islander
   e. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   f. Middle Eastern
4. What is your marital status?
   a. Single (never married)
   b. Married
   c. Separated
   d. Divorced
   e. Widowed

g. Other

5. How many dependents (e.g., spouse, children, etc.) live with you?
   a. One
   b. Two
   c. Three
   d. Four of more
   e. None

6. How many of your (or your spouse’s) relatives live within easy driving distance?
   a. Zero
   b. One
   c. Two
   d. Three
   e. Four of more

7. What is your current job title? _____________________

8. Are you a full- or part-time employee?
   a. full-time
   b. part-time

9. How long have you been employed with UTMB?
   ____ years and ____ months

10. Roughly, what is your total real income at the present time from DFACS before taxes and other deductions are made? (Round to the nearest thousand; e.g., $24,400 = $24,000; $24,500 = $25,000)
   ___________

11. How much formal education have you completed?
   a. 8 years or less
   b. 9 to 11 years (some high school)
   c. High school graduate
   d. 1 to 2 years of college or technical school
   e. 3 years of college
   f. College graduate
   g. Some graduate education
   h. Masters degree
   i. Ph.D. or M.D.