Work-Family Conflict and Withdrawal: Exploring the Influence of Occupation-Specific

Labor Market Characteristics

A thesis presented to

the faculty of

the College of Arts and Sciences of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Science

Mohsin A. Sultan

December 2019

© 2019 Mohsin A. Sultan. All Rights Reserved.

This thesis titled

Work-Family Conflict and Withdrawal: Exploring the Influence of Occupation-Specific

Labor Market Characteristics

by

MOHSIN A. SULTAN

has been approved for

the Department of Psychology

and the College of Arts and Sciences by

Ryan C. Johnson

Assistant Professor of Psychology

Florenz Plassmann

Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

ABSTRACT

SULTAN, MOHSIN A., M.S., December 2019, Psychology

Work-Family Conflict and Withdrawal: Exploring the Influence of Occupation-Specific Labor Market Characteristics

Director of Thesis: Ryan C. Johnson

The present study explores relationships between work-family conflict and turnover via affective mechanisms, expanding beyond organizational turnover to also examine occupational turnover. Extant theories of turnover also highlight the importance of the labor market in both organizational and occupational turnover processes, such as alternative opportunities that are available to the individual (e.g., Mobley et al. 1979), yet the labor market is often not included in empirical tests of turnover theory. The present study expands this literature by examining occupation-specific unemployment (N=328) and projected occupation growth (N=347) in both the organizational and occupational turnover processes. Results indicate that occupation-specific unemployment rates may play a role in both forms of turnover, providing evidence that researchers and practitioners should measure and assess labor market characteristics in future practical, empirical, and theoretical endeavors. Theoretical and practical implications, as well as future research directions, are also discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my advisor Dr. Ryan Johnson for his guidance throughout the entire thesis process. I would also like to thank my committee Dr. Jeffrey Vancouver and Dr. Lindsay Dhanani for all of their help throughout the entire process as well. In addition, I would like to thank my colleagues who are more so friends for all of their support. I would also like to thank my parents and siblings for always being there. I would also like to thank my wife for all of her patience, encouragement, and unconditional love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	3
Acknowledgments	4
List of Tables	6
List of Figures	7
Work-Family Conflict and Withdrawal: Exploring the Influence of Occupati- Labor Market Characteristics	on-Specific
Employee Turnover	14
Work-Family Conflict	19
Occupational Turnover	23
Moderating Role of Labor Market Characteristics	26
Methods	
Participants	
Measures	
Procedure	
Analytical Strategy	
Results	41
Tests of Simple Mediation	43
Tests of Moderated Mediation	47
Supplemental Analyses	66
Discussion	72
Organizational Turnover Intentions	73
Occupational Turnover Intentions	78
Supplemental Occupational Turnover Intentions Analyses	
Implications	
Limitations and Future Directions	85
Conclusion	91
References	92
Appendix	115

Page

LIST OF TABLES

6

Table 1 Intercorrelations between study variables	42
Table 2a Simple Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions Model	44
Table 2b Simple Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions Model	46
Table 3a Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions Model (Projected Growth)	48
Table 3b Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions Model (Projected Growth)	.49
Table 3c Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions Model (Projected Growth)	.50
Table 4a Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)	55
Table 4b Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)	56
Table 4c Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)	57
Table 5a Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Projected Growth).	59
Table 5b Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Projected Growth) .	60
Table 5c Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Projected Growth) .	61
Table 6a Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)	63
Table 6b Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)	64
Table 6c Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)	65
Table 7a Moderated Mediation Supplemental Analyses Occupational Turnover Intentio	ons 69
Table 7b Moderated Mediation Supplemental Analyses Occupational Turnover Intentic	ons
······	70
Table 7c Moderated Mediation Supplemental Analyses Occupational Turnover Intentio	ons
	71

LIST OF FIGURES

7

Figure 1. Organizational Turnover Intentions Model	39
Figure 2. Occupational Turnover Intentions Model	39
Figure 3. Organizational Turnover Intentions Moderated Mediation	52
Figure 4. Organizational Turnover Intentions Moderated Mediation	54

WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT AND WITHDRAWAL:EXPLORING THE INFLUENCE OF OCCUPATION-SPECIFIC LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS

A continuous obstacle that organizations encounter is employee turnover. The United States Department of Labor reported that in 2016 there were over 36.1 million employees who left their job, which does not include employees who were laid off or discharged (Thibaud, 2017). That year, the number of employees who left their job increased by seven percent from the previous year, which led to the overall number of vacated positions to exceed pre-recession levels (Thibaud, 2017). Employee turnover can also be further examined by industry, as some industries are more prone to higher levels of turnover than others (e.g., arts, entertainment, and recreation; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017).

As a result of employee turnover, there are severe financial ramifications that organizations incur, such as the separation, replacement, and training costs for each individual that leaves the organization and needs to be replaced (Cascio, 2000). These various costs have been estimated to be 50% of the exiting individual's annual salary (Gemignani, 1998). The consequences of turnover have led to interest in uncovering potential antecedents of this epidemic. When exploring the antecedents of employee turnover, it is important to differentiate between occupational turnover (e.g., leaving an occupation) and organizational turnover (e.g., leaving an organization but remaining in the same occupation), with occupational turnover being far less common. This is partially due to the "investment" an individual has in their occupation and, as a result, it is more difficult for an individual to change occupations entirely compared to changing organizations within an occupation (Neapolitan, 1980; Blau, 2000).

Numerous antecedents of turnover have been explored (e.g., compensation, job insecurity, and procedural justice; Griffeth & Hom, 2000). One such antecedent, work-family conflict, is defined as "a form of inter role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect" (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p.77). In a review of work-family conflict, it was revealed that the work domain variable most closely related to work-family conflict was turnover intentions, yet this antecedent of turnover is relatively understudied compared to other antecedents (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000). Work-family conflict has been demonstrated to have a positive relationship with occupational withdrawal cognitions (Ryan & Sagas, 2009) as well as organizational turnover intentions (e.g., Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Blomme, Van Rheede, & Tromp, 2010; Lu et al., 2017), such that increases in work-family conflict are related to increases in an individual's thoughts to change occupations or organizations respectively.

Due in part to relatively few primary studies examining work-family conflict and turnover, the specific mechanism(s) linking work-family conflict and turnover are not well understood (Haar & Roche, 2012). The present study will examine the relationship between work-family conflict and turnover through an affective mechanism, such that an individual's satisfaction with their job and career may link their perceptions of work-family conflict and turnover intentions. For example, when work demands interfere with competing family obligations, dissatisfaction with the job (career) may result as the job

(career) is the root cause of the conflict, thus leading to thoughts of leaving a job to better meet family obligations (Boyar, Maertz, Pearson, & Keough, 2003). Elements of this process have been demonstrated empirically at both an organization and occupational level as work-family conflict has been demonstrated as an antecedent of job satisfaction (e.g., Judge, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1994; Thomas & Ganster, 1995; Bruck, Allen, & Spector, 2002) and job satisfaction has been demonstrated as an antecedent of organizational turnover (e.g., Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Maertz & Campion, 1998) as well as occupational turnover (e.g., Rhodes & Doering, 1993; Blau & Lunz, 1998). Likewise, work-family conflict has been demonstrated as an antecedent of career satisfaction (e.g., Martins, Eddleston, & Viega, 2002; Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011) and career satisfaction has been demonstrated as antecedent of organizational turnover (Joo & Park, 2010) as well as occupational turnover (e.g., Rhodes & Doering, 1983; Blau, 2007). Given the negative relationship between work-family conflict and job (career) satisfaction, as well as the negative relationship between job (career) satisfaction and turnover, it is important to further explore what additional external factors may influence these relationships.

Throughout the turnover literature, researchers have noted the importance of incorporating labor market effects (e.g., Hom & Griffeth, 1995; Hom & Kinicki, 2001), yet they are not often incorporated in empirical studies. Studies that have included labor market characteristics and their effects on employee turnover have often used general characteristics such as the national unemployment rate. For example, Carsten and Spector's (1987) meta-analysis revealed that the relationship between job satisfaction and

turnover was lower during times of high national unemployment, and higher during times of low national unemployment. This is indicative that the labor market, in general, may influence the relationships between turnover and its antecedents. General measures of the labor market, such as the unemployment rate at the national level, are broad, and ignore occupation-level differences. Indeed, job opportunities and growth within an occupation vary between occupations regardless of the national unemployment rate. Further, Steel and Griffeth (1989) argue that differences between occupations in terms of potential mobility are an important consideration when predicting employee turnover, also noting that the occupation-level approach is rarely taken. In sum, it is important to incorporate a labor market effect that is occupation-specific, since individuals' turnover related thoughts and behaviors, based on alternative employment opportunities, are likely most influenced by the growth (or lack thereof) in their own occupation rather than the national unemployment rate (Thatcher, Stepina, & Boyle, 2014). The present study incorporates projected occupational growth and occupation-specific unemployment as occupationspecific labor market characteristic which may explain differential turnover outcomes related to work-family conflict. For example, in occupations with a high projected growth or a low occupation-specific unemployment rate, occupational turnover may be low, but organizational turnover may be high. On the contrary, in occupations with low or negative projected growth or a high occupation-specific unemployment rate, occupational turnover may be higher.

The present study makes several important contributions to the literature. First, the relationship between work-family conflict and both organizational and occupational turnover is examined. Many studies that have examined work-family conflict and turnover have only focused on one form of turnover, with organizational turnover being more frequently examined (e.g., Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999; Wang, Lee, & Wu, 2017). By including both forms of turnover, the present study is able to examine potential differential relationships (e.g., strength) and processes linking work-family conflict and each form of turnover.

An additional contribution of the study is the incorporation of occupation-specific labor market characteristics. Previous studies have used general labor market characteristics such as the nationwide unemployment rate (e.g. Carsten & Spector, 1987; Hom & Kinicki, 2001), which ignores differences between occupations. This is a critical limitation of general measures as there are several job market parameters beyond the nationwide unemployment rate, such as job alternatives within an occupation which are a result of occupation growth, that create various employment opportunity for individuals based on their occupation (Steel & Griffeth, 1989). Incorporating occupation-specific characteristics in this study provides a more precise measure of the labor market's relationship with turnover.

A third contribution of this study is its methodologically rigorous design. Turnover studies are often criticized for including single-organization or singleoccupation samples (Blau, 2000), and thus ignoring occupation-level variables and effects (Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000). Research on work-family conflict is similarly criticized, as many studies that have examined work-family conflict and turnover have used only homogeneous samples (e.g., Harr, 2004; Ryan & Sagas, 2009; Blomme, Van Rheede, & Tromp, 2010). The limited variability of experiences within a single occupation or single organization, specifically regarding alternative employment opportunities, likely impacts the relationships between these job market variables and both work-family conflict and turnover (Schmidt, Hunter, & Urry, 1997). The present study's sample consists of employees from a wide variety of occupations and organizations, permitting examination of occupation-specific labor market explanations in the link between work-family conflict and both forms of turnover. Further, many previous studies of turnover and work-family conflict rely on single source self-report data and are thus potentially prone to common-method bias. The present study supplements self-report data with objective occupation-level data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

In the sections below, a brief overview of turnover is presented with a focus on organizational turnover, including its antecedents, followed by a focus on work-family conflict as an antecedent of both forms of turnover. Then, the role of an individual's satisfaction with both their job and career as mechanisms linking work-family conflict and both forms of turnover are described, followed by a brief section describing occupational turnover more in detail. Lastly, the influence of occupation-specific labor market characteristics on the relationship between both forms of satisfaction (career and job) and both forms of turnover (organizational and occupational) is discussed, followed by a detailed description of the current study methods and analytical strategy.

Employee Turnover

Employee turnover is a prevalent problem for organizations, and leaving a job or occupation is a major event in an employee's life. Although turnover can be involuntary (e.g., employees being fired or laid off without choice), the majority of employee turnover research has focused on voluntary turnover, or turnover that is employeeinitiated, typically unexpected by the organization, and largely outside of the organization's control. By predicting and/or reducing voluntary turnover, organizations can better manage their human resources and attenuate the various consequences associated with employees leaving the organization.

Voluntary turnover can exist at either the organization or occupation level. Organizational turnover, which is "the termination of a membership in an organization by an individual who receives monetary compensation for participation in that organization" (Hom & Griffeth, 1995, p.5), is one of the most prevalently studied employment related constructs. Voluntary turnover can also occur at the occupation level, representing an individual willfully leaving their occupation or profession rather than simply leaving their current organization (Blau, 2003). It is also important to acknowledge that occupational turnover is typically also a form of organizational turnover, as when an individual leaves their occupation they are also likely leaving their current organization. As such, studies that primarily focus on occupational turnover, also often explore organizational turnover (Blau, 2003, 2007), but the opposite rarely occurs. In general, occupational turnover is less frequent than organizational turnover within an occupation, due to various obstacles individuals face such as lost income, greater accumulated costs due to investments within an occupation (e.g., financial, educational, emotional, and social), and limited occupational alternatives (Neapolitan, 1983; Carson, Carson, & Bedeian, 1995; Blau, 2003). As a result of occupational turnover being less common, there are also fewer theoretical models and empirical studies that have focused on occupational turnover compared to organizational turnover. The remaining portion of this section will focus on organizational turnover, and occupational turnover will be revisited below.

Given the important consequences voluntary organizational turnover has for organizations, several theoretical models have been proposed. A prominent early model of organizational turnover is March and Simon's (1958) model, which consists of an individual's perceived desirability of quitting, or "push" factors, and the individual's perceived ease of movement, referred to as "pull" factors. In addition to March and Simon's (1958) model, the majority of the traditional models of turnover (e.g., Mobley, 1977; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Price & Mueller, 1981) include two major categories of predictor variables, one emphasizing job attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction), and the other emphasizing ease of movement (e.g., perceived alternatives) (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001; Trevor, 2001; Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008). Over time, models of turnover increased in complexity by examining more predictors of turnover beyond job satisfaction and alternative employment opportunities (e.g., Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Hom & Kinicki, 2001).

Throughout the turnover literature, each model of organizational turnover proposes various processes that lead an individual to leave their organization. A critical common element among these models is the incorporation of withdrawal cognitions, which are any thoughts that reflect an individual leaving their current organization (e.g., Mobley, 1977; Price & Mueller, 1986; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012). The primary outcome of the present study, turnover intentions, are a form of withdrawal cognitions, and are the strongest and most proximal antecedent of turnover (e.g., Hom, Caranikas-Walker, Prussia, & Griffeth, 1992; Griffeth et al., 2000; Hom, Lee, & Shaw, 2017). The strong predictive ability of turnover intentions has been demonstrated across many studies, with a recent meta-analysis revealing that out of fiftyseven unique antecedents of turnover, thoughts of quitting a job such as turnover intentions had the strongest relationship with actual organizational turnover (Rubenstein, Eberly, Lee, & Mitchell, 2017).

Another shared element between some of the most prominent models of organizational turnover is job satisfaction, as the dissatisfaction with the job serves as the primary motivation to leave the job. As models of turnover have increased in complexity over time, job satisfaction at the level of the individual has consistently been proposed as the central attitudinal variable of the organizational turnover process (e.g., March & Simon, 1958; Mobley, 1977, Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, Meglino, 1979; Price & Mueller, 1986; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Hom & Kinicki, 2001). Based on the various models of turnover, a critical antecedent of turnover intentions, or thoughts to stay within the organization, is the individual's dissatisfaction with their job. (e.g., Mobley, 1977 & Mobley et al., 1979; Price & Mueller, 1981; 1986). The Mobley turnover models (Mobley, 1977 & Mobley et al., 1979) have gone under extensive evaluation with both receiving strong empirical support. Specifically, the direct negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention is consistent throughout the literature (e.g., Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978; Youngblood, Mobley, & Meglino, 1983; Lee, 1988; Egan, Yang, & Bartlett, 2004; de Moura, Abrams, Retter, Gunnarsdottir, & Ando, 2009). Likewise, both Price and Mueller models (1981, 1986) have received empirical support, specifically the negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent and the positive relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent model have also indicated a negative relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions (Griffeth et al., 2000; Tnay, Othman, Siong, & Lim, 2013).

Another prominent yet unique model of organizational turnover is Lee and Mitchell's (1994) unfolding model, which proposes that turnover decisions are not always the result of accumulated job dissatisfaction and may occur without much deliberation at all (Holtom et al., 2008). Their model consists of five unique behavioral and psychological pathways, two of which describe a traditional process driven by accumulated job dissatisfaction, and three pathways that are driven by a jarring event or "shock" that triggers quitting a job without much deliberation (Holtom et al., 2008). The unfolding model has received empirical support, yet the majority of individuals followed a more traditional pathway via job *dis*satisfaction rather than experiencing a shock (Lee, Mitchell, Wise, & Fireman, 1996; Morrell, 2005). Given the importance of job satisfaction to the overall turnover process, turnover models have also theorized about the factors related to job satisfaction, and specifically, what leads to an individual's

dissatisfaction with their job. Among the various models of organizational turnover, a perceived lack of fit between the individual's desires and the organization's values is a common antecedent of job dissatisfaction. Lee and Mitchell (1994) specified that unlike the other paths presented in their model, a shock is not needed for an individual to assess a lack of "fit" with their organization, leading an individual to become dissatisfied with their job. In addition, the Mobley et al. (1979) model includes numerous antecedents of job satisfaction, the majority of which relate to the individual's perception of their organization (e.g., organizational climate, supervisor/work group, and organizational values). Similarly, the Price and Mueller (1981) model proposes various antecedents related to fit between the individual and the organization, such as the individual's ability to participate in decision making and role clarity, both of which have been demonstrated as strong predictors of job satisfaction (Driscoll, 1978; Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Witt, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2000). Lastly, the Hom & Kinicki (2001) model includes an individual's inter-role conflict as an antecedent of job satisfaction. Based on an increase in dual-earner couples and the resulting increase in potential for conflict between work and personal life, their model proposes that the inability to successfully fulfill work demands due to the individual's personal life, and vice versa, leads an individual to be dissatisfied with their job (Hom & Kinicki, 2001). The present study will further examine work-family conflict, a pervasive form of inter-role conflict, as a critical antecedent in the turnover process.

Work-family Conflict

Work-family conflict (WFC) is "a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect" such that participation in one role is made more difficult by participation in the other (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p.77). Thus, the work role can interfere with the family role (WIF), and the family role can interfere with the work role (FIW) (Frone, 2003). Both directions of WFC not only differ conceptually but have also been empirically demonstrated to be distinct constructs (e.g., Netemeyer et al., 1996; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998).

Work-family conflict has been demonstrated to have negative relationships with outcomes related to an individual's well-being (e.g., Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Geurts, Kompier, Roxburgh, & Houtman, 2003). Both directions of work-family conflict are associated with a variety of non-work-related outcomes such as family satisfaction (e.g., Cardenas, Major, & Bernas, 2004), depression (e.g., Vinokur, Pierce, & Buck, 1999), and life satisfaction (e.g., Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003). In addition, WIF and FIW are associated with a variety of work-related outcomes including organizational commitment (e.g., Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005), burnout (e.g., Peters, Montgomery, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005, and work-related strain (e.g., Netemeyer, Brashear-Alejandro, & Boles, 2004).

Focusing on work-related outcomes, studies of withdrawal behaviors have been of increasing interest among researchers. It is believed that when employees experience work-family conflict they may withdraw from work and engage in withdrawal behaviors (Greenhaus et al., 2001). Work-related withdrawal behaviors, such as absenteeism (e.g., Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999) and lateness to work (e.g., Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003), have been empirically demonstrated as consequences of work-family conflict. Work-family conflict is also positively related to more severe forms of withdrawal, including both turnover intentions (e.g., Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Netemeyer et al., 2004; Harr, 2004; Carr, Boyar, & Gregory, 2008; Blomme, Van Rhede, & Tromp, 2010), and actual organizational turnover (e.g., Greenhaus, Collins, Singh, & Parasuraman, 1997).

In examining WFC, researchers have also identified differential relationships between WIF and FIW and various non-work and work-related outcome variables (e.g., Frone, 2000; Grandey, Cordeiro, & Crouter, 2005; Hammer, Cullen, Neal, Sinclair, & Shafiro, 2005), highlighting the importance of taking into account both directions of this form of inter-role conflict. Further, research has focused on whether the source of conflict (e.g., work in the case of WIF) matters, proposing that relationships are either stronger for outcomes in the same domain as the source (e.g., matching hypothesis) or for outcomes in the other domain (e.g., cross-domain hypothesis; Kelloway & Barling, 1991). For example, the matching hypothesis predicts that WIF will have stronger effects on work-related outcomes and FIW will have stronger effects on family-related outcomes. A meta-analysis tested the cross-domain vs. matching hypothesis and the results empirically supported the matching hypothesis, which suggests that WIF has a stronger relationship with work-related outcomes (e.g., intention to turnover) rather than consequences related to family (Amstad et al., 2011). Indeed, regarding turnover intentions, WIF is more strongly related than is FIW (e.g., Amstad et al., 2011; Nohe & Sonntag, 2014). Given the empirical support for the positive relationship between work-family conflict and organizational turnover intentions the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Work-family conflict is positively related to organizational turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 2: The positive relationship between work-family conflict and organizational turnover intentions is stronger for WIF than FIW.

Given the positive relationship between work-family conflict and organizational turnover intentions, researchers have been interested in the mechanism linking the two (e.g., Harr, 2012; Wang, 2017). Work-family researchers have primarily relied on the previously described organizational turnover models (e.g., Mobley et al., 1978; Hom & Kinicki, 2001), which focus on an affective mechanism, such that dissatisfaction with one's job as a result of work-family conflict leads an individual to engage in thoughts of leaving that job. Indeed, throughout the literature, the most widely studied correlate of work-family conflict is job satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Allen et al., 2000; Grandey, Cordeiro, & Crouter, 2005), "an internal state that is expressed by affectively and/or cognitively evaluating an experienced job with some degree of favor or disfavor" (Brief, 1998, p.86). As mentioned previously, several models of organizational turnover include inter-role conflict as an antecedent of job satisfaction. Work and family roles are of primary importance for the majority of individuals (Mortimer, Lorence, & Kumka, 1986), and perceived incompatibility is likely to create tension and negative feelings for

the individual (Grandey et al., 2005). Further, job satisfaction may depend on the extent to which the individual's job is seen as threatening to other roles (e.g., family in the case of WIF). When valued roles are threatened individuals appraise the source of the threat in a negative way (Lazarus, 1991; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Carlson & Kacmar, 2000). The negative relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction has been demonstrated empirically (e.g. Kahn et al., 1964; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Allen et al., 2000; Bruck, Allen, & Spector, 2002; Buonocore & Russo, 2013), and two separate metaanalyses revealed that WIF had a stronger relationship with job satisfaction than did FIW (e.g.; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Amstad et al., 2011) which further supports the matching hypothesis. Thus, the following hypotheses regarding work-family conflict and job satisfaction are proposed:

Hypothesis 3: Work-family conflict is negatively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4: The negative relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction is stronger for WIF than FIW.

Many of the organizational turnover models identified job satisfaction as a critical antecedent of organizational turnover intentions, with employees attempting to resolve their dissatisfaction by seeking alternative employment (e.g., Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1979; Price & Mueller, 1986; Hom & Kinicki, 2001). In the present study, job dissatisfaction as a result of work-family conflict is proposed to lead the individual to have the intention to leave their job. The mediating role of job satisfaction has been empirically supported, as job satisfaction has been demonstrated to mediate the relationship between work stress and organizational turnover intention (e.g., Kuo, Lin, &

Li, 2014; Crede, Chernyshenko, Stark, Dalal, & Bashshur, 2007). Thus, it is proposed that satisfaction is a critical mechanism linking work-family conflict to the organizational turnover process:

Hypothesis 5: Job satisfaction is negatively related to organizational turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 6: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between work-family conflict and organizational turnover intentions.

Occupational Turnover

It is important to acknowledge that occupational turnover (i.e., changing careers or occupations) is almost always a form of organizational turnover, as when an individual leaves their occupation entirely they are also likely leaving their current organization. The most prominent model of *occupational* turnover is the Rhodes and Doering's (1983) model, which is primarily based on the Mobley et al. (1978) model of *organizational* turnover. Even though an individual is leaving their occupation rather than just their organization, both processes are theoretically similar. For example, analogous to the relationships between organizational turnover intentions and actual organizational turnover, some of the best predictors of occupational turnover are thoughts of leaving one's profession (e.g., occupational withdrawal cognitions; Blau, 1989; Hom & Griffeth, 1991). Further, research has demonstrated that occupational withdrawal cognitions are related to, but are distinct from, organizational withdrawal cognitions (Blau, 1985, 2000; Carson et al., 1995), thus, the present study will examine both. Similar to the models of organizational turnover, the Rhodes and Doering (1983) model of occupational turnover includes work-related stressors such as career/family conflict as an antecedent of occupational turnover, and the positive relationship between work-family conflict and occupational withdrawal intentions has been demonstrated empirically (e.g., Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Collins, 2001; Ryan & Sagas, 2009). In addition, given that occupational turnover intentions are a work-domain outcome, (similar to organizational turnover intentions), per the matching hypothesis it is expected that WIF will have a stronger relationship with occupational turnover intentions compared to FIW:

Hypothesis 7: Work-family conflict is positively related to occupational turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 8: The positive relationship between work-family conflict and occupational turnover intentions is stronger for WIF than FIW.

Like the aforementioned organizational turnover models, the Rhodes and Doering (1983) model of occupational turnover also emphasizes the importance of satisfaction. Career satisfaction is defined as "the overall affective orientation of the individual to his or her career" (Gattiker & Larwood, 1988, p.573). Several determinants of satisfaction have been included as *p*art of the Rhodes and Doering (1983) model and empirically supported, including a lack of supervisor support and leadership, a lack of social connections through co-workers, and low-quality supervisor leadership (McPherson, Popielarz, & Drobnic, 1992; Blau, 2003a; Van der Heijden et al., 2009). In addition, similar to models of organizational turnover, working conditions and inter-role conflict are also included as determinants of satisfaction in the occupational turnover process (Phillips & Lee, 1980; Rhodes & Doering, 1983). The same process of the negative appraisal of work due to inter-role conflict can also lead to dissatisfaction with one's career just as it would with one's current job, and the negative relationship between work-family conflict and career satisfaction has been demonstrated empirically (e.g., Aryee & Luk, 1996; Martins, Eddleston, & Veiga, 2002). Similar to job satisfaction, career satisfaction is an outcome in the work-domain, therefore, in line with the matching hypothesis, it is expected that WIF will have a stronger relationship with career satisfaction than FIW:

Hypothesis 9: Work-family conflict is negatively related to career satisfaction.

Hypothesis 10: The negative relationship between work-family conflict and career satisfaction is stronger for WIF than FIW.

As mentioned previously, the models of organizational turnover propose that a direct consequence of job dissatisfaction are thoughts of changing job. Likewise, the Rhodes and Doering (1983) model of occupational turnover proposes that direct consequences of career dissatisfaction are thoughts and intentions of changing careers. The negative relationship between career satisfaction and occupational turnover has been demonstrated empirically, such that career satisfaction is negatively related to intentions to leave one's occupation (Blau, 2007) as well as actual occupational turnover (e.g., Rhodes & Doering, 1983; Rhodes & Doering, 1993; Blau, 2007). Thus, the present study examines career satisfaction as the mediating mechanism linking work-family conflict and occupational turnover intentions:

Hypothesis 11: Career satisfaction is negatively related to occupational turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 12: Career satisfaction mediates the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational turnover intentions.

Moderating Role of Labor Market Characteristics

As previously discussed, misfit between an individual's job or career and their nonwork life (e.g., work-family conflict) is related to both forms of withdrawal intentions (organizational and occupational) via the individual's job (career) satisfaction, as satisfaction has been described as the primary motivational force for an individual to leave their job (career) (e.g., March & Simon, 1958; Mobley, 1977, Mobley et al., 1979; Rhodes & Doering, 1983; Price & Mueller, 1986; Hom & Kinicki, 2001). While satisfaction is a critical antecedent of both forms of turnover, researchers have also acknowledged that labor market characteristics such as alternative opportunities available to the individual may influence the relationship between satisfaction and turnover intentions.

Throughout the literature, various labor market characteristics have been incorporated in organizational turnover studies (Nickell, 1997). For example, an individual's salary (e.g., Armknecht & Early, 1972; Coughlan & Schmidt, 1985) as well as an individual's salary relative to the salary distribution of the individual's occupation, have been used to predict turnover and further understand differences in turnover among individuals (Pfeffer & Davis-Blake, 1992; Lazear, 2012). In general, however, alternative opportunities in the labor market are among the most theorized and studied labor market characteristic. For example, a significant component of March and Simon's (1958) model was the individual's perceived ease of movement, based on the number of actual or perceived opportunities available to the individual outside of their organization (Anderson & Milkovich, 1980). Several other models of organizational turnover also include the role of alternatives (e.g., Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1979; Lee & Mitchell, 1994). A central tenant is that the perception of available alternatives can inflate intentions to turnover among dissatisfied employees. More specifically, in path 4B of Lee and Mitchell's (1994) unfolding model, once dissatisfaction occurs, the individual evaluates alternative opportunities which can lead the individual's intention to quit. In addition, the Mobley et al. (1979) model of organizational turnover proposes that the availability of alternatives is a function of the individual's labor market perceptions, including the unemployment rate, which has a direct relationship to the individual's intention to quit, and a contributing (i.e., moderating) role once dissatisfaction occurs.

The importance of alternative employment opportunities has been empirically supported. Mobley et al. (1978) found that the expectancy of finding an acceptable alternative position was positively related to the intention to quit. In addition, Schneider (1976) demonstrated that the inclusion of perceived alternatives enhanced the prediction of turnover intentions, indicating that alternative opportunities are an essential component of the turnover process. In addition, researchers have further examined how alternatives influence the relationship between satisfaction and turnover intentions. For instance, Dansereau, Cashman, and Graen (1974) demonstrated that the perceived expectancy of finding a comparable job moderated the relationship between job attitudes and organizational turnover. More specifically, job mobility, based on perceived alternative opportunities, has been shown to moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions (Wheeler, Gallagher, Brower, & Sablynski, 2007), a relationship similar to the moderating role proposed in the current study.

In addition to employees own perceptions of available opportunities, the national unemployment rate is often included in studies as a proxy representing ease of movement and available alternative opportunities (e.g., Anderson & Milkovich, 1980; Williams, 1999; Silva & Toledo, 2009). Carsten and Spector (1987) meta-analyzed the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover, demonstrating that the relationship was weaker during times of high national unemployment, and stronger during times of low national unemployment. While the Carsten and Spector (1987) meta-analysis is informative, a limitation of their approach and the primary studies they included is that the national unemployment rate ignores differences in unemployment between occupations, and thus is an imperfect proxy for an individual's alternative employment opportunities. For example, during times of low national unemployment, some occupations may still have few available jobs, and in times of high national unemployment, there may be occupations that still have many open jobs.

Similar to organizational turnover, alternative job and career opportunities are part of the occupational turnover process as well (Rhodes & Doering, 1983). In a study of occupational turnover, Blau (2007) demonstrated that alternative occupation opportunities were positively related to the individual's intent to leave their occupation as well as actual occupational turnover. Further, alternative job opportunities within their current occupation were not related to their intent to change their occupation but were positively related to the individual's intent to leave their organization (Blau, 2007). This study demonstrates that there may be differences between occupational and organizational turnover intentions based on alternatives both within and outside one's current occupation.

Steel and Griffeth (1989) highlighted that there are occupational differences in terms of alternative opportunities available to the individual based on their occupation, and in general, one is more likely to be influenced by the number of alternative opportunities in their specific occupation rather than the general nationwide unemployment rate (Thatcher, Stepina, & Boyle, 2014). Relatedly, Hulin, Roznowski, and Hachiya (1985) note that national or even local labor markets may be poorly related to the relevant labor market for the individual. Given the issue with general measures of alternative opportunities, some studies have incorporated more specific measures of unemployment such as unemployment for a specific occupation. For example, Dreher and Dougherty (1980) assigned participants an occupational opportunity score that was reflective of opportunities available given the individual's specific occupation as reported by the United States Department of Labor. This study demonstrated a positive relationship between occupational job opportunities and organizational turnover, thus better job opportunities were related to a higher tendency to leave the organization. Hulin et al. (1985) note that the positive relationship found by Dreher and Dougherty (1980) is evidence of the importance of occupation-specific labor markets, therefore, the incorporation of more specific measures of alternative opportunities rather than general

measures of alternative opportunities are recommended. More recently, Trevor (2001) incorporated an occupation-specific unemployment rate in a study of organizational turnover and demonstrated that the occupation-specific unemployment rate was more predictive of voluntary turnover than the local unemployment rate constructed by state and local labor force data. Therefore, based on both theoretical and empirical support, it is imperative to incorporate occupation-specific labor market characteristics in studies of organizational and occupational turnover. The present study will do so by examining two occupation-specific labor market characteristics: projected occupation growth and occupation-specific unemployment.

Projected occupation growth is a useful measure of future estimated alternative opportunities – in occupations with a higher projected growth, there will be more opportunities available to the individual to move between organizations within the occupation. Therefore, if an individual is dissatisfied with their job and there are many alternative opportunities available within their occupation, they may be more likely to leave their current organization for an available alternative in an attempt to resolve their dissatisfaction. In contrast, in occupations with low or negative projected growth, the few forecasted alternative opportunities within the occupation may result in less movement between organizations (Anderson & Milkovich, 1980), and lower organizational turnover intentions.

Occupation-specific unemployment rate will also be examined as another indicator of alternative employment opportunities. An individual may not be as aware of their occupation's future outlook and projected growth, thus also examining a labor market characteristic representing the employee's current context is important. Both projected occupation growth and the occupation-specific unemployment rate are incorporated as objective indicators of alternative opportunities available to the individual based on their reported occupation, and such opportunities are proposed to influence the relationship between an individual's job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 13: Projected occupation growth will moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions, such that the relationship will be stronger for those in occupations with high projected growth.

Hypothesis 14: Occupation-specific unemployment rate will moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions, such that the relationship will be stronger for those in occupations with a low unemployment rate.

A primary limitation of the few past studies incorporating occupation-specific labor market characteristics (e.g., Dreher & Dougherty, 1980; Trevor, 2001), is that only organizational turnover was examined. The present study examines the potential for a differential moderating role of labor market characteristics when examining occupational turnover versus organizational turnover. As previously hypothesized, in occupations with high projected growth or low occupation-specific unemployment rate, movement within the occupation may be high (organizational turnover), however, movement outside of the occupation (occupational turnover) should be low. In contrast, in occupations with low or negative projected growth, or high unemployment rate, an individual may consider leaving their occupation entirely due to a lack of alternative opportunities within their occupation. More specifically, if an individual is dissatisfied with their career and there are not alternative opportunities available within their occupation, they may be more likely to leave their occupation in an attempt to resolve their dissatisfaction

Hypothesis 15: Projected occupation growth will moderate the relationship between career satisfaction and occupational turnover intentions, such that this relationship will be stronger for those in occupations with low projected growth.

Hypothesis 16: Occupation-specific unemployment rate will moderate the relationship between career satisfaction and occupational turnover intentions, such that this relationship will be stronger for those in occupations with high unemployment.

METHODS

Participants

In total, 694 individuals participated in this study via an online Qualtrics Panel. Of these, 347 had complete data needed to conduct the current analyses. All participants were full-time employees who worked a minimum of 35 hours a week of paid employment, were at least 18 years old, and were able to read and write in English. The average age of the employees was 39 years (SD = 8.43), and the majority of the participants were male (n = 185). All of the participants were married or cohabitating with a partner for at least one year and/or had a child living under their care. In addition, participants reported what occupation best matched their current job (e.g., Barista) from standardized jobs defined by the United States Department of Labor through the Occupational Information Network (O*NET). Variety in occupation was critical to testing the hypotheses in the present study, thus the eligibility survey was constructed so that Qualtrics would limit each O*NET occupation to, at most, ten unique participants. All occupations that were available in the database for a participant to select from are publicly available (http://www.onetonline.org).

Measures

The data used for the present study come from a larger data collection including variables regarding the participant's personality, family life, and experiences in the workplace. The variables used in the present study are detailed below.

Demographics

Participants were asked their age, gender, gender of partner, race, sexual orientation, relationship status, weekly work hours, number of children care is provided for, and if the participant provides adult care.

Work-family Conflict

Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams' (2000) 18-item measure of work-family conflict was used to assess each individual's perceived work-family conflict. This measure consisted of both directions of work-family conflict; family interference with work (FIW) and work interference with family (WIF). The response scale for each item ranged from 1 to 5, with 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 5= "Strongly Agree". This scale provides an overall value for an individual's bi-directional work-family conflict (α = .93), as well as value for each direction of their work-family conflict (WIF α = .91, FIW α = .90).

Job Satisfaction

Fisher, Matthews, and Gibbons' (2016) measure of job satisfaction was used to assess an individual's satisfaction with their current job. The measure consisted of one item, "Overall I am satisfied with my job." The response scale ranged from 1 to 5, with 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 5= "Strongly Agree".

Career Satisfaction

Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley's (1990) scale was used to assess an individual's satisfaction with their career. The measure consisted of 5 items ($\alpha = .94$), responses ranged from 1 to 5, with 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 5= "Strongly Agree". A sample item is, "I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career."

Organizational Turnover Intentions

A one item measure was used to assess an individual's intent to leave their current job: "I plan to leave my current job within the next year." The item response scale ranged from 1 to 5, with 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 5= "Strongly Agree."

Occupational Turnover Intention

Occupational turnover intentions were measured by the Carson, Carson, Roe, Birkenmeier, and Phillips (1999) measure of career withdrawal cognitions to assess an individual's intention to leave their current occupation. The measure consisted of three items ($\alpha = .97$), an example item from this scale is, "I intend to leave this profession." Each item response ranged from 1 to 5, with 1= "Strongly Disagree" and 5= "Strongly Agree".

Projected Occupation Growth

Based on the occupation reported by the participant, the projected occupation growth for the decade following the data collection (2016 to 2026) provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics was recorded.

Occupation-specific Unemployment Rate

Based on the occupation reported by the participant, the occupation-specific unemployment rate for the year of 2016 provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics was recorded.

Procedure

After participants were recruited and screened, those who met eligibility requirements were given a link to the online survey. Participants were provided with an online consent form before beginning the survey, and were informed that the survey would take about 30 minutes to complete. Participants received compensation in an amount provided by the Qualtrics Panels service and agreed upon before the participant started the survey.

Analytical Strategy

The direct relationships which correspond to Hypotheses 1-5 (organizational turnover) and Hypotheses 7-11 (occupational turnover) respectively are assessed through bivariate correlations which indicate the magnitude and strength of these relationships. Further, Hypotheses, 2, 4, 8, and 10 proposed differences in magnitude among the direct relationships between WIF and FIW, and the various outcomes. With the use of the Fisher r-to-z transformation, a z-test is used to compare the bivariate correlations between WIF and FIW to determine if the difference is statistically significant. In addition, Hypothesis 6 (organizational turnover) and Hypothesis 12 (occupational turnover) proposed mediating relationships. The mediation analyses are based on the formal significance test of the indirect effect *ab* (the product of path a and path b), as this approach is more powerful than the traditional stepwise procedure (e.g., Baron & Kenny, 1986) as the test of *ab* more directly address mediation (Preacher & Hayes, 2004; Hayes, 2018). The formal significance of *ab* will be based on the bootstrapping procedure, this procedure is widely preferred over the normal theory approach (e.g., Sobel test) as the normal theory approach assumes that the indirect effect *ab* is normally distributed (Hayes, 2018). This assumption is not robust, as the distribution of *ab* has been demonstrated to not have a normal distribution (Edwards & Lambert, 2007). The
bootstrapped procedure does not consist of any assumptions regarding the indirect effect, and in general generates more accurate confidence intervals as well as being a more powerful test than the normal theory approach (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004).

To test moderated mediation (Hypotheses 13-16), two unique moderators were examined which resulted in multiple moderated mediation models. For each model, an index of moderated mediation is calculated, the test of formal significance for this value is also through a bootstrap generated confidence interval approach. The index of moderated mediation takes into account the entire model as a whole and assesses whether the weight of the moderator in the function defining the indirect effect is different from zero (Hayes 2015; 2018). Hypothesis 13 through 16 proposed labor market characteristics would moderate the path between the mediator and outcome, as a result an index of moderated mediation is calculated for each model, assuming there is evidence that the index of moderated mediation is significant, conditional indirect effects are also calculated, as the indirect effect may be conditional on the value of the moderator (Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007). In order to set the values for the conditional indirect effects for the moderator, the 16th, 50th, and 84th percentile values of the moderator were used as recommended by Hayes (2018). For all of the mediation analyses (simple mediation & moderated mediation) the bootstrap confidence interval is examined to determine if zero falls within the interval, if zero does not fall within the interval than the effect being tested is significant (Hayes, 2018). Further, in regard to the moderated mediation models, "if the bootstrap confidence interval for the index of moderated

mediation does not include zero, then any two conditional indirect effects of X are different regardless of the two values of the moderator that are chosen" (Hayes, 2018, p.429). The moderated mediation models, including the organizational turnover intentions model (Figure 1) and the occupational turnover intentions model (Figure 2) are illustrated below.



Figure 1. Organizational Turnover Intentions Model with labor market characteristics as the moderator.



Figure 2. Occupational Turnover Intentions Model with labor market characteristics as the moderator.

The analyses were conducted with SPSS (v. 24). The simple mediation analyses were conducted through the "PROCESS" (v. 3.2) SPSS macro developed by Hayes (2018). The simple mediation analyses correspond to model template 4 of PROCESS which generates the indirect effect and constructs the percentile bootstrapped confidence interval for the indirect effect. The moderated mediation analyses correspond to model

template 14 of the PROCESS macro, in which the index of moderated mediation is calculated for each model as well as the conditional indirect effects, with bootstrapped confidence intervals generated for each effect.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for all study variables. As expected, the relationship between WFC and organizational turnover intentions was positive (r = .40, p < .01), which supports Hypothesis 1. This positive relationship was stronger between WIF and organizational turnover intentions (r = .46, p < .01), than FIW and organizational turnover intentions (r = .25, p < .01; z = 3.17, p < .01), which supports Hypothesis 2. The relationship between WFC and job satisfaction was negative (r = -.31, p < .01), which supports Hypothesis 3, however the relationship between WIF and job satisfaction (r = -.32, p < .01), was not significantly stronger than the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction (r = -.23, p < .01; z = -1.28, p > .05), thus Hypothesis 4 was not supported. Further, the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions was negative (r = -.46, p < .01), which supports Hypothesis 5.

Table 1

mercorretations between	sindy var	indics										
	М	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Gender	1.47	.50										
2. WFC	2.56	0.76	08	(.87)								
3. WIF	2.74	0.90	08	.90**	(.84)							
4. FIW	2.39	0.81	06	.88**	.59**	(.80)						
5. Job Satisfaction	3.92	1.01	.04	31**	32**	23**	(.81)					
6. Career Satisfaction	3.79	0.88	07	29**	28**	24**	.60**	(.88)				
7. Org. Turnover Intentions	1.96	1.20	06	.40**	.46**	.25**	46**	43**				
8. Occ. Turnover Intentions	2.09	1.19	06	.35**	.40**	.21**	57**	53**	.72**	(.87)		
9. Unemployment	3.16	1.91	.03	.01	.01	.01	03	17**	.07	.07		
10. Projected Growth	8.38	8.73	10	.05	.03	.05	05	.04	.01	12	12*	

Intercorrelations between study variables

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01. Scale reliabilities are shown in parentheses. Age is in years. Gender: men = 1 women = 2. N = 347, Row 9, N = 328. Higher values indicate more of that variable.

In addition, the relationship between WFC and occupational turnover intentions was positive, (r = .35, p < .01), which supports Hypothesis 7. The positive relationship was stronger between WIF and occupational turnover intentions (r = .40, p < .01), than the relationship between FIW and occupational turnover intentions (r = .21, p < .01; z = 2.76, p < .01), which supports Hypothesis 8. The relationship between WFC and career satisfaction was negative (r = -.29, p < .01), which supports Hypothesis 9. However, the relationship between WIF and career satisfaction (r = -.28, p < .01), was not significantly stronger than the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction (r = -.24, p < .01; z = -.56, p > .05), thus Hypothesis 10 was not supported. Lastly, the relationship between career satisfaction and occupational turnover intentions was negative (r = -.53, p < .01), supporting Hypothesis 11.

Tests of Simple Mediation

Hypothesis 6 posits that job satisfaction mediates the relationship between WFC and organizational turnover intentions. The results of the simple mediation analysis for the organizational turnover intentions model are presented in Table 2a. WFC was negatively associated with job satisfaction (B = -.41, t = -6.02, p < .01), job satisfaction was negatively associated with organizational turnover intentions (B = -.44, t = -7.78, p <.01), and the direct effect of WFC on organizational turnover intentions was positive (B =.45, t = 5.98, p < .01). WFC was found to have an indirect effect on organizational turnover intentions, B = .18, 95% CI [.10, .28], which supports Hypothesis 6.

Table 2a

			Conse	quent			
	Jo	b Satisfacti	on	Org. Turnover Intentions			
Antecedent	Coeff.	SE	р	Coeff.	SE	р	
WFC	-0.41	0.07	<.001	0.45	0.08	< .001	
Job Satisfaction	-	-	-	-0.44	0.06	< .001	
Constant	4.97	0.18	<.001	2.54	0.34	< .001	
		$R^2 = 0.105$		$R^2 = 0.287$			
	<i>F</i> (1, 34	5) = 36.26, j	<i>p</i> < .001	F(2, 344) = 69.07, p < .00			

Simple Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions Model

Note. Results for the simple mediation analysis with organizational turnover intentions as the outcome.

In regard to the occupational turnover intentions model, Hypothesis 12 posits that career satisfaction mediates the relationship between WFC and occupational turnover intentions. The results of the simple mediation analysis for the occupational turnover intentions model are presented in Table 2b. WFC was negatively associated with career satisfaction, (B = -.33, t = -5.62, p < .01), career satisfaction was negatively associated with career with occupational turnover intentions (B = -.64, t = -10.24, p < .01), and the direct effect of WFC on occupational turnover intentions was positive (B = .32, t = 4.50, p < .01). WFC was found to have an indirect effect on occupational turnover intentions, B = .21, 95% CI [.10, .28], which supports Hypothesis 12.

Table 2b

	Consequent							
	Car	eer Satisfac	tion	Occup. 7	Occup. Turnover Intentions			
Antecedent	Coeff.	SE	р	Coeff.	SE	р		
WFC	-0.33	0.06	<.001	0.32	0.08	< .001		
Career Satisfaction	-	-	-	-0.64	0.06	< .001		
Constant	4.66	0.16	<.001	3.68	0.34	< .001		
		$R^2 = 0.084$		$R^2 = 0.335$				
	F(1, 34)	5) = 31.53,	<i>p</i> < .001	F(2, 344) = 82.87, p < .001				

Simple Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions Model

Note. Results for the simple mediation analysis with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome.

Tests of Moderated Mediation

Hypotheses 13 and 14 examine moderation in the aforementioned mediation models. First, projected occupation growth is examined as a moderator of the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions, such that this relationship will be stronger for those in occupations with a high projected growth. The direct effect of WFC on organizational turnover intentions is positive (B = .45, t = 6.00, p < .01). However, the cross-product term between projected growth and job satisfaction was not significant (B = .00, t = .90, p > .05), as was the PROCESS (v 2.16) macro index of moderated mediation, B = -.003, 95% CI [-.009, .004], thus Hypothesis 13 is not supported. Further, each direction of WFC was examined separately as the predictor in the organizational turnover intentions model. The index of moderated mediation when WIF was the predictor was not-significant, B = -.001, 95% CI [-.007, .004], as was the index when FIW was the predictor, B = -.002, 95% CI [-.007, .003]. The results of the moderated mediation models with organizational turnover intentions as the outcome, projected growth as the moderator, and WFC as the predictor including both its directions (WIF and FIW) displayed in Tables 3a, 3b, and 3c respectively.

Table 3a

				(Consequent				
		M (Je	b Satisfaction)		Y (Org. Turnover Intentions)			
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р	
X (WFC)	а	-0.41	0.07	< .001	с	0.45	0.08	< .001	
M (Job Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.49	0.08	< .001	
W (Projected Growth)		-	-	-	b_2	-0.03	0.03	.30	
M×W		-	-	-	b ₃	0.01	0.01	.37	
Constant	i_{M}	4.97	0.18	<.001	iy	2.78	0.41	< .001	
			$R^2 = 0.105$				$R^2 = 0.290$		
		F(1, 345) = 36.26, p < .001					F(4, 342) = 34.80, p < .001		

Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions (Projected Growth)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with organizational turnover intentions as the outcome, projected growth as the moderator, and WFC as predictor.

Table 3b

				C	onsequent				
		M (Job Satisfaction)				Y (Org. T	Surnover Intent	tions)	
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р	
X (WIF)	а	-0.36	0.06	< .001	с	.46	0.06	< .001	
M (Job Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.45	0.08	< .001	
W (Projected Growth)		-	-	-	b_2	-0.02	0.03	.50	
$M \times W$		-	-	-	b ₃	0.00	0.01	.58	
Constant	i_{M}	4.90	0.17	< .001	iy	2.49	0.39	<.001	
			$R^2 = 0.10$				$R^2 = 0.32$		
		F(1, 345) = 38.68, <i>p</i> < .001			F(4, 342) = 40.41, p < .001				

Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions (Projected Growth)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with organizational turnover intentions as the outcome, projected growth as the moderator, and WIF as predictor.

Table 3c

				C	onsequent				
		M (Job Satisfaction)				Y (Org. T	rg. Turnover Intentions)		
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р	
X (FIW)	а	-0.28	0.06	< .001	с	.23	0.07	<.01	
M (Job Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.56	0.08	< .001	
W (Projected Growth)		-	-	-	b_2	-0.03	0.03	.26	
$\mathbf{M} imes \mathbf{W}$		-	-	-	b ₃	0.01	0.01	.32	
Constant	i_{M}	4.60	0.16	< .001	iy	3.66	0.39	<.001	
			$R^2 = 0.06$				$R^2 = 0.24$		
		F(1, 345	(5) = 19.07, p < 100	.001	F(4, 342) = 26.63, p < .001				

Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions Model (Projected Growth)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with organizational turnover intentions as the outcome, projected growth as the moderator, and FIW as predictor.

The same analyses were then conducted using occupation-specific unemployment as the moderator. The direct effect of WFC on organizational turnover intentions is positive (B = .47, t = 6.11, p < .01). Further, the cross-product term between the occupation-specific unemployment rate and job satisfaction was significant (B = .06, t =-2.06, p < .05). Simple slopes were plotted at the 16th, 50th, and 84th percentiles of the moderator (Figure 3), showing the conditional effects of job satisfaction on organizational turnover intentions are negative. This negative association is greatest when the occupation-specific unemployment is high (simple slope = -.51, t = -7.55, p < .01) compared to moderate (simple slope = -.40, t = -6.59, p < .01), and this association is weakest when the occupation-specific unemployment rate was low (simple slope = -.34, t= -4.5, p < .01). Further, the index of moderated mediation was significant, B = .023, 95% CI [.002, .046], thus the indirect effect of WFC is moderated. As the occupation-specific unemployment rate increases, the conditional indirect effect of WFC also increases in magnitude, thus Hypothesis 14 is not supported.



Figure 3. Organizational turnover intentions moderated mediation results. Organizational turnover intentions are predicted by job satisfaction, moderated by occupation unemployment. Low unemployment = 16^{th} percentile; medium unemployment = 50^{th} percentile, high unemployment = 84^{th} percentile). WFC included as part of model.

In addition to WFC, each direction of WFC was examined separately as the predictor in the organizational turnover intentions model. When only FIW was examined, the direct effect of FIW on organizational turnover intentions was positive, (B = .23, t =3.16, p < .01), in addition the cross-product term between the occupation-specific unemployment rate and job satisfaction was significant (B = -.06, t = -2.07, p < .05). The same percentiles (16th, 50th, and 84th) of the moderator were used to plot the simple slopes, the conditional effects of job satisfaction on organizational turnover intentions at the three different percentiles of the occupation-specific unemployment rate are all negative which can be seen in Figure 4. This negative association is greatest when the occupation-specific unemployment is high (simple slope = -.57, t = -8.39, p < .01) compared to moderate (simple slope = -.46, t = -7.45, p < .01), and this association is weakest when the occupation-specific unemployment rate was low (simple slope = -.40, t = -5.13, p < .01). Further, the index of moderated mediation was significant, B = .017, 95% CI [.001, .039], which indicates that the indirect effect is moderated, as a result the conditional indirect effects of FIW, were also calculated. The conditional indirect effects also indicated that, as occupation-specific unemployment increases, the magnitude of the indirect effect of FIW also increases. When WIF was examined, the index of moderated mediation was not significant, B = .017, 95% CI [-.001, .037], thus the indirect effect was not moderated. The results of the moderated mediation models with organizational turnover intentions as the outcome and occupation unemployment as the moderator and WFC as the predictor including its directions (FIW and WIF) are presented in tables 4a, 4b, 4c respectively



Figure 4. Organizational turnover intentions, moderated mediation results. Organizational turnover intentions are predicted by job satisfaction, moderated by occupation unemployment. Low unemployment = 16^{th} percentile; medium unemployment = 50^{th} percentile, high unemployment = 84^{th} percentile). FIW included as part of the model.

Table 4a

				Co	onsequent			
		M (J	ob Satisfaction)		Y (Org. T	ions)	
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р
X (WFC)	а	-0.41	0.07	<.001	с	.47	0.08	<.001
M (Job Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.25	0.11	.02
W (Occ. Unemployment)		-	-	-	b_2	0.25	0.11	.02
$M \times W$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.05	0.02	.04
Constant	i_{M}	4.97	0.18	< .001	iy	1.63	0.51	<.001
			$R^2 = 0.09$				$R^2 = 0.30$	
		F(1, 326) = 33.86, <i>p</i> < .001			F(4, 323) = 35.25, p < .001			

Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with organizational turnover intentions as the outcome, occupation unemployment as the moderator, and WFC as predictor.

Table 4b

				Co	onsequent				
		M (J	ob Satisfaction	l)		Y (Org. T	rg. Turnover Intentions) SE p 3 0.07 < 0 0.11 < 6 0.11 < 6 0.03 < 0 0.52 <		
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р	
X (FIW)	а	-0.29	0.07	< .001	с	.23	0.07	<.01	
M (Job Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.30	0.11	<.01	
W (Occ. Unemployment)		-	-	-	b_2	0.26	0.11	<.05	
$\mathbf{M} imes \mathbf{W}$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.06	0.03	<.05	
Constant	i_{M}	4.62	0.17	<.001	iy	2.50	0.52	< .001	
			$R^2 = 0.06$				$R^2 = 0.25$		
		F(1, 326	5) = 19.11, <i>p</i> <	.001		F(4, 323) = 26.45, p < .001			

Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with organizational turnover intentions as the outcome, occupation unemployment as the moderator, and FIW as predictor.

Table 4c

				Co	onsequent				
		M (J	ob Satisfaction	l)		Y (Org. T	Turnover Intent	tentions)	
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р	
X (WIF)	а	-0.35	0.06	<.001	с	.49	0.06	<.001	
M (Job Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.25	0.10	<.05	
W (Occ. Unemployment)		-	-	-	b_2	0.22	0.11	.02	
$M \times W$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.05	0.03	.04	
Constant	iм	4.88	0.17	< .001	iy	1.52	0.48	<.001	
			$R^2 = 0.10$				$R^2 = 0.34$		
		F(1, 326) = 34.50, p < .001			F(4, 323) = 41.76, p < .001				

Moderated Mediation Organizational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with organizational turnover intentions as the outcome, occupation unemployment as the moderator, and WIF as predictor.

Hypothesis 15 posits the same moderating role of projected occupation growth in the model of occupational turnover intentions – projected occupation growth will moderate the relationship between career satisfaction and occupational turnover intentions, such that this relationship will be stronger for those in occupations with low projected growth. The direct effect of WFC and occupational turnover intentions is positive, (B = .32, t = 4.48, p < .01). Further, the cross-product term between projected growth and career satisfaction was not significant (B = -.00, t = -.24, p > .05). The index of moderated mediation was also not-significant, B = .001, 95% CI [-.004, .004], therefore Hypothesis 15 is not supported. When only FIW was examined, the index of moderated mediation was not-significant, B = .000, 95% CI [-.004, .003], likewise when WIF was examined in the model, the index of moderated mediation was not-significant, B = .001, 95% CI [-.003, .004]. The results of the moderated mediation models with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome and projected growth as the moderator and WFC as the predictor including both its directions (WIF and FIW) are presented in Tables 5a, 5b, and 5c respectively.

Table 5a

					Consequent				
		M (Career Satisfaction)		Y (Occ. T	Y (Occ. Turnover Intentions)				
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р	
X (WFC)	а	-0.33	0.06	< .001	с	.32	0.07	< .001	
M (Career Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.63	0.08	<.001	
W (Projected Growth)		-	-	-	b_2	0.01	0.03	.80	
$M \times W$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.01	0.01	.81	
Constant	i_{M}	4.66	0.16	< .001	i _Y	3.63	0.41	< .001	
			$R^2 = 0.08$				$R^2 = 0.33$		
		F(1, 345) = 31.53, p < .001				F(4, 342) = 41.22, p < .001			

Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Projected Growth)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome, projected growth as the moderator, and WFC as predictor.

Table 5b

					Consequent					
		M (Ca	reer Satisfactio	on)		Y (Occ. T	urnover Intent	ions)		
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р		
X (WIF)	а	-0.27	0.05	< .001	с	.36	0.06	< .001		
M (Career Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.60	0.08	< .001		
W (Projected Growth)		-	-	-	b_2	0.01	0.03	.68		
M imes W		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.00	0.01	.70		
Constant	i_{M}	4.54	0.15	< .001	iy	3.38	0.39	<.001		
		F(1, 345	$R^2 = 0.08$ 5) = 28.28, p <	.001		$R^2 = 0.35$ F(4, 342) = 46.56, p < .001				

Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Projected Growth)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome, projected growth as the moderator, and WIF as predictor.

Table 5c

				Co	onsequent				
		M (Ca	reer Satisfactio	on)		Y (Occ. T	Turnover Intent	ions)	
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р	
X (FIW)	а	-0.26	0.06	< .001	с	.13	0.07	.06	
M (Career Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.69	0.08	<.001	
W (Projected Growth)		-	-	-	b_2	0.01	0.03	.88	
$M \times W$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.00	0.01	.91	
Constant	i_{M}	4.42	0.14	< .001	iy	4.37	0.39	< .001	
			$R^2 = 0.06$				$R^2 = 0.29$		
		F(1, 345) = 21.05, p < .001				F(4, 342) = 35.44, p < .001			

Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Projected Growth)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome, projected growth as the moderator, and FIW as predictor.

In addition to projected growth, occupation-specific unemployment rate is examined as a moderator for the occupational turnover intentions model, such that the relationship between career satisfaction and occupational turnover intentions will be stronger for those in occupations with a high unemployment rate. The direct effect of WFC on organizational turnover intentions is positive (B = .16, t = 2.18, p < .05). However, the cross-product term between the occupation-specific unemployment rate and career satisfaction was not significant (B = -.02, t = -.86, p > .05). When WFC was examined, the index of moderated mediation was not significant, B = .007, 95% CI [-.001, .021], therefore, Hypothesis 16 was not supported. The index of moderated mediation for when only FIW was included in the model, was not-significant, B = .004, 95% CI [-.001, .016], likewise when WIF examined in the model, the index of moderated mediation was not-significant, B = .005, 95% CI [-.001, .016]. The results of the moderated mediation models with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome and occupation unemployment as the moderator, and WFC including its directions (WIF and FIW) are presented in tables 6a, 6b, 6c respectively.

Table 6a

				C	onsequent					
-		M (Career Satisfaction)				Y (Occ. Turnover Intentions				
Antecedent	_	Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	p		
X (WFC)	а	-0.34	0.06	< .001	с	.36	0.08	< .001		
M (Career Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.54	0.12	< .001		
W (Occ. Unemployment)		-	-	-	b_2	0.07	0.10	.49		
$M \times W$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.02	0.03	.39		
Constant	i_{M}	4.64	0.17	< .001	iy	3.29	0.54	< .001		
		$R^2 = 0.08$			$R^2 = 0.33$					
	F(1, 326) = 29.05, p < .001					F(4, 323) = 39.60, p < .001				

Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome, occupation unemployment as the moderator, and WFC as predictor.

Table 6b

		Consequent								
		M (Ca	reer Satisfactio	on)		Y (Occ. T	Turnover Intent	ions)		
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р		
X (WIF)	а	-0.27	0.05	< .001	с	.38	0.06	< .001		
M (Career Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b ₁	-0.54	0.11	< .001		
W (Occ. Unemployment)		-	-	-	b_2	0.06	0.10	.54		
$M \times W$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.02	0.02	.44		
Constant	iм	4.52	0.15	<.001	iy	3.14	0.51	< .001		
			$R^2 = 0.07$			$R^2 = 0.36$				
		F(1, 326	(5) = 25.44, p < 100	.001		F(4, 323) = 44.89, <i>p</i> < .001				

Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome, occupation unemployment as the moderator, and WIF as predictor.

Table 6c

		Consequent								
	M (Career Satisfaction)				Y (Occ. T	ions)				
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р	_	Coeff.	SE	р		
X (FIW)	а	-0.27	0.06	< .001	c	.16	0.07	< .05		
M (Career Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.62	0.12	< .001		
W (Occ. Unemployment)		-	-	-	b_2	0.04	0.10	.67		
$\mathbf{M} imes \mathbf{W}$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.02	0.03	.54		
Constant	iм	4.42	0.15	< .001	iy	4.14	0.54	< .001		
		$R^2 = 0.06$			$R^2 = 0.29$					
		F(1, 326	(5) = 20.07, p < 100	.001	F(4, 323) = 33.31, p < .001					

Moderated Mediation Occupational Turnover Intentions (Occupation Unemployment)

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome, occupation unemployment as the moderator, and FIW as predictor.

Supplemental Analyses

Given that there was no evidence of moderated mediation for the occupational turnover intentions model, additional post hoc analyses were conducted. Specifically, the occupational turnover intentions model was modified such that job satisfaction, rather than career satisfaction, was examined as the linking mechanism between WFC and occupational turnover intentions. Despite being related, there is reason to expect that job satisfaction may play a more salient role in these relationships as a more proximal attitudinal outcome of WFC. The Rhodes and Doering (1983) model also proposes job satisfaction as a direct link between antecedents (i.e., WFC) and occupational turnover intentions. The same moderators (projected occupation growth and the occupationspecific unemployment rate) were examined in the supplemental analyses.

When projected occupation growth is included as the moderator in this new model, the direct effect of WFC on occupational turnover intentions is positive (B = .29, t = 4.15, p < .01). However, the cross-product term between job satisfaction and projected growth is not significant (B = .00, t = .58, p > .05), as was the index of moderated mediation, B = -.002, 95% CI [-.001, .003]. Further, each direction of WFC was examined separately as the predictor in the occupational turnover intentions model. The index of moderated mediation when FIW was the predictor was not significant, B = -.001, 95% CI [-.005, .002], as well as when WIF was the predictor, B = -.001, 95% CI [-.005, .003]. Thus, as before in the primary analyses, there was no evidence of projected occupational growth playing a role in these relationships.

The same analyses were then conducted using occupation-specific unemployment as the moderator. The direct effect of WFC on occupational turnover intentions is positive (B = .32, t = 4.44, p < .01), and the cross-product term between the occupationspecific unemployment rate and job satisfaction was significant (B = -.06, t = -2.34, p < -0.06.05). Further, the index of moderated mediation was significant, B = .035, 95% CI [.001, .051], thus the indirect effect of WFC is moderated. As the occupation-specific unemployment rate increases, the indirect effect of WFC on occupational turnover intentions via job satisfaction also increases in magnitude. In addition to WFC, each direction of WFC was examined separately as the predictor. The direct effect of FIW on occupational turnover intentions was positive, (B = .15, t = 2.23, p < .05), in addition, the cross-product term between the occupation-specific unemployment rate and job satisfaction was significant (B = -.06, t = -2.34, p < .05). Further, the index of moderated mediation was significant, B = .018, 95% CI [.004, .044], thus the indirect effect of FIW is moderated. The conditional indirect effects indicated that, as the occupation-specific unemployment increases, the magnitude of the indirect effect of FIW also increases. Lastly, the direct effect of WIF on occupational turnover intentions was positive, (B =.34, t = 5.56, p < .01), and the cross-product term between the occupation-specific unemployment rate and job satisfaction was significant (B = -.05, t = -2.16, p < .05). Further, the index of moderated mediation was significant, B = .020, 95% CI [.004, .043], thus the indirect effect of WIF is moderated. The conditional indirect effects indicated that, as the occupation-specific unemployment increases, the magnitude of the indirect effect of WIF also increases. The results of the moderated mediation models

Table 7a

		Consequent								
		M (J	ob Satisfaction	l)		Y (Occ. Turnover Intentions)				
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р		
X (WFC)	а	-0.41	0.07	< .001	с	.32	0.07	<.001		
M (Job Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.38	0.10	<.001		
W (Occ. Unemployment)		-	-	-	b_2	0.26	0.10	.01		
$\mathbf{M} imes \mathbf{W}$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.06	0.03	.04		
Constant	i _M	4.97	0.19	<.001	iy	1.63	0.51	.02		
		F(1, 326	$R^2 = 0.09$ 6) = 33.86, <i>p</i> <	.001	$R^2 = 0.36$ F(4, 323) = 46.64, p < .001					

Moderated Mediation Supplemental Analyses Occupational Turnover Intentions

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome, job satisfaction as the mediator, occupation unemployment as the moderator, and WFC as predictor.

Table 7b

		Consequent								
		M (J	ob Satisfaction	l)		Y (Occ. T	urnover Intent	ions)		
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р		
X (FIW)	а	-0.29	0.07	< .001	С	.15	0.07	.02		
M (Job Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.42	0.10	<.001		
W (Occ. Unemployment)		-	-	-	b_2	0.27	0.11	.01		
$M \times W$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.06	0.03	.01		
Constant	\dot{i}_{M}	4.62	0.17	<.001	iy	3.31	0.48	<.001		
			$R^2 = 0.06$		$R^2 = 0.34$					
		F(1, 326	(5) = 19.11, p < 100	.001	F(4, 323) = 41.16, <i>p</i> < .001					

Moderated Mediation	Sunnlemental	Analyses Occi	upational Turno	ver Intentions
moderated mediation	Supplemental	Analyses Occi	лранопан Гитю	ver miennons

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome, job satisfaction as the mediator, occupation unemployment as the moderator, and FIW as predictor.

Table 7c

				Co	onsequent				
		M (J	ob Satisfaction	l)		Y (Occ. T	urnover Intentions)		
Antecedent		Coeff.	SE	р		Coeff.	SE	р	
X (WIF)	а	-0.35	0.06	< .001	с	.34	0.06	<.001	
M (Job Satisfaction)		-	-	-	b_1	-0.38	0.10	<.001	
W (Occ. Unemployment)		-	-	-	b_2	0.24	0.10	.01	
$M \times W$		-	-	-	b ₃	-0.05	0.02	.03	
Constant	i_{M}	4.80	0.17	<.001	iy	2.58	0.46	<.001	
			$R^2 = 0.10$		$R^2 = 0.39$				
		F(1, 326	5) = 34.50, <i>p</i> <	.001	F(4, 323) = 50.80, <i>p</i> < .001				

Note. Results for the moderated mediation analysis, with occupational turnover intentions as the outcome, job satisfaction as the mediator, occupation unemployment as the moderator, and WIF as predictor.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between work-family conflict (WFC) and both organizational and occupational turnover intentions, and to determine if the relationship can be explained via employees' satisfaction with their job or career, respectively. Further, the role of the labor market was examined as a contextual boundary condition for the links between satisfaction and turnover intentions. Most previous studies that have explored the influence of the labor market on turnover have only examined organizational turnover (e.g., Dreher & Dougherty, 1980; Steel, 1996; Trevor, 2001). This study also examined occupational turnover intentions which allowed for any differences in the influence of the labor market on both forms of turnover to be explored within the same sample. Further, this study includes a sample that is nationally representative of a wide variety of occupations which allows specific labor market characteristics to be examined.

Before discussing the individual models, several relationships among the focal variables are worthy of discussion. First, results indicate that WFC is associated with numerous work-related consequences, and overall, the bivariate relationships among primary study variables mirror past findings. WFC was positively related to both occupational as well as organizational turnover intentions, and for both outcomes, work interference with family (WIF) had a stronger relationship with turnover intentions than did family interference with work (FIW). These findings are consistent with prior research and support the matching hypothesis (Amstad et al., 2011). Further, both WIF and FIW were equivalently negatively related to both job and career satisfaction,
demonstrating that both directions of WFC are important to take into consideration when examining workplace attitudinal outcomes. In addition, job satisfaction was found to be negatively related to organizational turnover intentions, which is consistent with many organizational turnover models, as job satisfaction is identified as a critical antecedent of organizational turnover intentions within such models (e.g., Mobley et al., 1979; Price & Mueller, 1986; Hom & Kinicki, 2001). Lastly, career satisfaction was found to be negatively related to occupational turnover intentions, which is consistent with the Rhodes & Doering (1983) model of occupational turnover which proposed that direct consequences of career dissatisfaction are thoughts and intentions of changing careers.

Organizational Turnover Intentions

The results demonstrate that the association between WFC and organizational turnover intentions can be partially explained by job satisfaction, thus WFC is positively associated with organizational turnover intentions through job dissatisfaction. This finding is consistent with several other empirical studies (e.g.; Kuo et al., 2014; Crede et al., 2007; Rode et al., 2007) and supports prominent models of organizational turnover (e.g., Mobley, 1979; Hom & Kinicki, 2001). Specifically, the aforementioned models of turnover propose inter-role conflict as an antecedent of job satisfaction, and job satisfaction is a primary driving force for the individual to develop the intention to leave their organization. Therefore, the present study adds to the existing evidence demonstrating that job satisfaction may be an important attitudinal factor linking the experience of WFC and withdrawal related cognitions.

To expand our understanding of contextual variables that may influence this process, the present study examined the role of labor market characteristics in the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions. As mentioned previously, several prominent models of organizational turnover include labor market characteristics, often in the form of availability of employment alternatives, as part of the overall organizational turnover process (e.g., Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1979; Lee & Mitchell, 1994). A central tenant among such models is that the perception of available alternatives can inflate intentions to turnover among dissatisfied employees. The Mobley et al. (1979) model of organizational turnover specified that the availability of alternatives is a function of the individual's labor market perceptions. Although perceived alternatives were not assessed in the present study, we did examine the objective labor market characteristics theorized to inform these perceptions, namely each employee's occupation-specific unemployment rate, and the projected future growth of their occupation. A similar approach has been taken in other studies of turnover (e.g., Kirshenbaum & Mano-Negrin, 1999; Carsten & Spector, 1987; Hulin et al., 1985; Dreher & Dougherty, 1980).

Results of the present study indicated that projected occupation growth did not influence the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions. Interestingly, unlike projected growth, occupation-specific unemployment rate did explain variation in the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions. Specifically, individuals with lower job satisfaction had higher intentions to leave their organization, and this relationship is stronger for those in occupations with a higher unemployment rate. Thus, when looking at the full model of organizational turnover (Figure 1a) results indicate that WFC is positively related to organizational turnover intentions, through decreases in job satisfaction, and this overall effect is stronger for those in occupations with higher unemployment rates. Thus, individuals with high WFC who are in occupations with a high unemployment rate may be more likely to intend to leave their organization through dissatisfaction with their job. This is contrary to the expectation that this effect would be strongest for those in occupations with low unemployment rates, as low unemployment rates would suggest more job alternatives available to the individual.

There are several possible explanations for this unexpected finding. One possible explanation is based on the specific sample used in this study in which the average occupation-specific unemployment rate (3.17%) was significantly less than the average national unemployment rate (4.87%) during the year of data collection (2016), and in years prior to data collection (5.28% in 2015 and 6.12% in 2014). This means there were more opportunities within the occupations represented in this study compared to occupations in general during the same timeframe, as only 14.6% of individuals in this study were in an occupation that had an unemployment rate higher than the national average. Therefore, our results are consistent with the expectation that movement between organizations would be high (organizational turnover intentions) due to many opportunities within an occupation, given the relatively low average occupation unemployment rate compared to the national average (Anderson & Milkovich, 1980). Another possible explanation for the unexpected finding relates to organizational

turnover intentions were being assessed by one item; "I plan to leave my current job within the next year." Specifically, this item does not take into account each employee's post-exit destination, which could include another job within the same occupation and organization, another job within the same occupation and a new organization, or a break or exit from the labor force (e.g., family demands, educational pursuits, leisure; Hom et al., 2012). An individual's decision to leave their job could also be influenced by their spouse's employment, such as the need to relocate or change jobs for financial reasons (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Inderrieden, 2005). In the present study, all participants were married, and 97.6% indicated that they were also responsible for taking care of a child. Thus it is possible that factors outside of the individual's organization (e.g., becoming a full-time parent) could have influenced an individual's decision to leave their job, independent of the unemployment rate for their occupation. It is possible that those individuals who had a high intention to leave their organization and belonged to an occupation with a high unemployment rate simply had a post-exit destination that was not another job, and thus their intentions to leave may not have been heavily influenced by the labor market.

Given that there was an effect of WFC on organizational turnover intentions through job satisfaction, each direction of WFC was examined separately, in order to further understand the nature of WFC's role in this process. When examining models with only FIW or WIF as antecedents, results indicate that WFC is related to organizational turnover primarily through FIW. That is, FIW was positively related to organizational turnover intentions through decreased job satisfaction, and this finding is stronger for those in occupations with higher unemployment rates. Interestingly, there was no evidence of an effect of WIF in the organizational turnover model. These findings of our study replicate past work finding that FIW, but not WIF, has a positive relationship with organizational turnover intentions through job satisfaction (e.g., Post et al., 2009). These findings suggest that it is family demands interfering with work, rather than work demands interfering with family, which may foster job dissatisfaction and downstream withdrawal cognitions. These findings support the cross-domain hypothesis (Frone et al., 1992a), which proposes that even though conflict originates in one domain (family), outcomes in the other domain are affected (e.g., turnover intentions; Amstad et al., 2011). For example, individuals with high FIW may feel overwhelmed by the ensuing struggle to meet their work demands due to family demands interfering with their work, and as a result may experience a reduction in the quality of their work life (Frone et al., 1992a). The outcomes of interest in this study arguably reside in the work domain (organizational and occupational turnover intentions), and thus null results for WIF align with other studies supporting the cross-domain hypothesis. One potential explanation for these findings may relate to employees' role salience, a stable individual difference representing how important one role (e.g., work) is compared to another (e.g., family) (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). In the present study, it may be that individuals tended to have higher levels of work centrality, meaning their work role was of primary importance. If work is valued more than family, FIW may play a stronger role than WIF, as the role that is more valued (work) is being interfered with. Past work supports these

ideas, showing that the relationship between WIF and organizational turnover was stronger when an individual valued family over work (Carr et al., 2008).

Occupational Turnover Intentions

In addition to examining organizational turnover intentions, the present study also separately examined the relationship between WFC and occupational turnover intentions through a similar theoretical lens. Results demonstrated that the association between WFC and occupational turnover intentions can be partially explained by career satisfaction, thus WFC is positively associated with occupational turnover intentions through career satisfaction. This particular finding supports the Rhodes & Doering (1983) model of occupational turnover, as the model proposes that inter-role conflict is an antecedent of satisfaction with career, and career satisfaction is a central mechanism that drives occupational turnover. This finding is consistent with recent research showing that individuals' attitudes towards their occupation partially explain the relationship between WFC and occupational turnover intentions (e.g., Singh et al., 2018; Van Der Heijden et al., 2009). Thus, the current study adds to the body of evidence highlighting the importance of career satisfaction in the occupational turnover process.

Given that the association between WFC and occupational turnover intentions could be partially explained by career satisfaction, the potential role of the labor market in the relationship between career satisfaction and occupational turnover intentions was also examined. Similar to the organizational turnover process, the Rhodes & Doering (1983) model of occupational turnover proposes that the labor market influences an individual's perception of available alternative job opportunities, in which the perceived availability of alternative opportunities influences an individual's thoughts of leaving their occupation. Indeed, alternative occupation opportunities have been found to be positively related to an individual's intention to leave their occupation (e.g., Blau, 2007). Results of the present study indicate that neither labor market characteristic (projected occupation growth and occupation-specific unemployment) influenced the relationship between career satisfaction and occupational turnover intentions.

Supplemental Occupational Turnover Intentions Analyses

Given that there was no evidence of moderated mediation for the originally proposed occupational turnover model with career satisfaction as the linking mechanism between WFC and occupational turnover intentions, additional analyses were conducted with job satisfaction rather than career satisfaction as the linking mechanism. Results indicate that projected occupation growth did not influence the relationship between job satisfaction and occupational turnover intentions in this supplemental model. However, unlike projected growth, occupation-specific unemployment rate did moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions, such that the negative relationship between job satisfaction occupational turnover intentions is stronger for those in occupations with a higher unemployment rate. Thus, individuals with high WFC who are in occupation through dissatisfaction with their job, rather than dissatisfaction with their career.

Given the significant overall effect, WFC was examined by direction, and similar results were found for both FIW and WIF. Both directions were positively related to

occupational turnover intentions through job satisfaction, and this effect is stronger for those in occupations with higher unemployment rates. In sum, the results of the supplemental analyses indicate that, similar to results for organizational turnover, occupation-specific unemployment has an influence on the relationship between job satisfaction and occupational turnover intentions. Thus, it seems that individuals' more proximal perceptions of the labor market (i.e., unemployment rate rather than projected growth) play an important role linking inter-role conflict, job satisfaction, and critical withdrawal cognitions.

IMPLICATIONS

There are several theoretical and practical implications of the present this study. First, despite many theoretical models of organizational turnover noting the importance of the labor market in the organizational turnover process (e.g., Mobley et al. 1979; Hom & Griffeth, 1991; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Hom & Kinicki, 2001), such labor market characteristics are infrequently included in empirical studies of turnover. The results of this study support the notion that the labor market may play an important role in the processes linking work-family conflict and organizational as well as occupational turnover intentions, encouraging future tests of these theories to include labor market characteristics.

An additional theoretical implication of this study is that level of measurement matters. The results of this study highlight three specific ways that construct operationalization and measurement are of critical importance. First, two labor market characteristics at the occupation level were examined, and results indicate that not all characteristics of the labor market may operate in the same way. Specifically, the occupation-specific unemployment rate played a significant role in both the organizational and occupational turnover intentions process, but projected occupation growth did not exhibit a similar influence. This may be due to the occupation-specific unemployment rate being more salient for employees, as employees may be more aware of the current unemployment rate for their particular occupation than the projected growth of their occupation for the future. Alternatively, the null effects of projected occupation growth may shed light on these differences, suggesting that individuals may not place as much value on rewards and information in the future compared to rewards and information that are immediate (e.g., temporal discounting; Doyle, 2013). These interesting results align with past research demonstrating differential prediction of turnover across a broad array of labor market characteristics (e.g., region-based, occupation-based, and globalized measures; Steel, 1996). In sum, the role of the labor market is complex, and one characteristic is unlikely to capture the entire complexity. Therefore, when researchers include characteristics of the labor market in studies of organizational turnover, how each characteristic is measured is an important decision which should be intentional and driven by theory and past empirical work.

Second, the findings of this study highlight the importance of measuring both directions of work-family conflict (WFC) – family interference with work (FIW) and work interference with family (WIF) (Bruck, 2002). For this study, the overall link between WFC and organizational turnover intentions through job satisfaction was found for FIW but not WIF, which supports the cross-domain hypothesis. Had FIW and WIF not been measured and analyzed separately, the null relationships for WIF would not be known. Therefore, it is imperative to explore both directions of WFC as there may be differences between both directions of conflict in regard to the outcome(s) of interest, regardless of the domain of the outcome (e.g., work or family).

Lastly, the results of this study indicate that job satisfaction may have a critical role in both the organizational and occupational turnover intentions process. For both forms of turnover intentions, job satisfaction was found to be a linking mechanism between WFC and turnover intentions, and the labor market had an influence on the

turnover process when job satisfaction rather than career satisfaction was included in the model. Thus, when considering the labor market's influence on occupational turnover, job satisfaction may have a more critical role than broader career satisfaction. This highlights a need to further understand the differential roles of job satisfaction and career satisfaction. Based on traditional models of organizational and occupational turnover, and the results of this study, it is still not clear if each form of turnover (organizational versus occupational) consists of a unique theoretical process. Several scholars have called attention to the problem of occupational and organizational turnover not being differentiated as turnover is often viewed simply as a decision to leave a job, with the form of turnover (a new organization versus an entirely new occupation) rarely being assessed (e.g., Li, Yu, Huang, & Jin 2019; Simon, Mueller, & Hasselhorn, 2010; Parry, 2008; Fields, Dingman, Roman, & Blum, 2005). By not differentiating the type of turnover, researchers overlook that the theoretical processes for each form of turnover may not be the same, therefore it is imperative to differentiate the form of turnover in order to better elucidate any unique or differential mechanisms that may help better predict voluntary employee exits.

In addition to theoretical implications, there are also practical implications of the present study. First, as previously mentioned, organizations should consider the destination of the employee, as this may provide useful insights for organizations to determine what factors may be contributing to organizational and/or occupational turnover (Fields, et al., 2005). Similar to the results of the current study, research shows that the strength of relationships between antecedents and each form of turnover can

differ (Li et al., 2019; Fields et al., 2005). Thus, the failure to differentiate the type of turnover may harm the accurate prediction of employee exits (Fields et al., 2005). Further, some occupations experience high turnover in general (e.g., nursing; Kovner, Brewer, Fatehi, 2014) but it is not always known if employees are leaving just the organization or the occupation entirely. Given that both forms of turnover may consist of unique processes, it is imperative for organizations to properly differentiate the form of turnover by considering the destination of the employee and not treat turnover as a broad unidimensional construct. This also includes gathering data to identify those who are leaving the workforce entirely (e.g., full-time parent, additional education, leisure; Hom et al., 2012). There may be unique antecedents for those who leave the job and are not remaining in the workforce compared to those who have post-exit destinations within the workforce. Thus, by considering the destination of the employee, organizations may better allocate policies and resources via a focused approach targeting one or both types of turnover as well as destinations outside of the workforce, which may allow organizations to improve the retention among those employees who may be more susceptible to leave (Li et al., 2019).

Second, this study adds to the deep literature demonstrating that variables that extend beyond the work domain (e.g., WFC) are related to critical workplace outcomes (e.g., turnover). Employee turnover is both very costly and prevalent, thus it is of great interest of employers to reduce employee turnover as much as possible. One method to do so is for organizations to train supervisors to provide family-supportive supervision for employees struggling with incompatible work and family demands. Past work shows that employees with high levels of FIW and managers who underwent Family Supportive Supervisor Behavior (FSSB) training exhibited higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of turnover intentions compared to similar employees (high FIW) who had managers that did not undergo the FSSB training (Hammer, Kossek, Anger, Bodner, & Zimmerman, 2011). In both the Hammer et al. (2011) study as well as the current study, FIW was found to have an impact on an individual's intention to leave their organization, which is indicative that the inference of family and work roles, particularly family interfering with work, can have consequences in the work domain. Further, FSSB has been demonstrated as a method to alleviate such consequences (e.g., Hammer et al., 2011; Odle-Dusseau et al., 2016), thus organizations should encourage supervisors to engage in FSSB, as this can translate into beneficial outcomes for the organization (e.g., reduced turnover).

Limitations and Future Directions

The present study is not without limitations which can be addressed in future research. First, the cross-sectional design of the study is limiting in several key ways. One consequence of the cross-sectional design is the inability to make causal inferences. Especially in studies of mediation, internal validity should be established, and in the present design, it is not possible to rule out alternative explanations. In a meta-analysis of turnover predictors, other classifications of predictors in addition to traditional job attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction), the job market (e.g., occupation unemployment), and personal conditions (e.g., WFC) have been demonstrated to have a role in the employee turnover process (Rubenstein et al., 2017). For example, organizational-context predictors (e.g., rewards offered), employee behavior predictors (e.g., OCBs), and person-context interface predictors (e.g., job embeddedness) were not assessed as part of this study (Rubenstein et al., 2017). Thus, it is not possible to rule out how such other factors may play roles in the employee turnover process when compared to the factors included in the study. Further, with the cross-sectional design, the turnover predictors in this study were only measured and not manipulated, which does not allow for any causal claims to be made. When examining such relationships in the future, research should take a longitudinal approach and include a form of manipulation for turnover predictors to properly assess any mediating effects (Maxwell & Cole, 2007).

Relatedly, an individual's intention to leave their organization and occupation was only assessed at one-time point in the present study. Employee turnover is a dynamic process (Becker & Cropanzano, 2011), thus an individual may vary in their intention to leave their job, as various factors related to turnover can also change over time (e.g., organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job search behaviors; Kammeyer-Mueller, Wanberg, Glomb, & Ahlburg, 2005). Likewise, the labor market values included in the study were from a static point in time based on when data were collected. The labor market is another dynamic variable (Gerhart, 1990), and the approach taken here precludes the ability to examine how changes in the labor market may influence an individual's decision to leave their organization and/or occupation. Further, prominent theoretical models of both organizational and occupational turnover propose that the withdrawal process consists of multiple steps including the intention to search, actual search behaviors, the comparison of alternative opportunities with their current job/career, organizational/occupational turnover intentions, and actual organizational/occupational turnover (Mobley 1977; Rhodes & Doering 1983). Therefore, measurement at multiple time points may be able to better capture the dynamic process of turnover and simultaneously improve the ability to make causal inferences.

Another primary limitation focuses on the present study's exclusive use of objective labor market data. Self-report data is an often-noted limitation and general concern in many research domains, specifically due to individuals' potential for socially desirable responding or other biases (Holtgraves, 2004). In contrast, in the present study, it would have been informative to obtain individuals' own perceptions of the labor market. Objective labor market characteristics can provide an estimate of the number of alternative opportunities available in general and is an informative measure, but "the specific mix of skills and experiences of a person are equally as important" (Hulin et al., 1985, p. 239). Thus, "labor market characteristics should influence the individual's perceived ease of movement, but the magnitude of the relationship is limited to the extent that the perceived ease of movement reflect idiosyncratic differences in individual labor markets that stem from variations in skills, abilities, and experiences" (Gerhart, 1990, p. 5). Further, the salience of labor market data may vary based on the individual's occupation (Malm, 1953). For example, some workers (e.g., blue-collar) may tend to localize their job search in which regional rather than occupation-based labor market characteristics may be of the most importance to the individual when considering alternative opportunities (Steel, 1996). Future studies should include an individual's

assessment of their perception of labor market conditions in addition to objective labor market data to further understand the role of the labor market in the turnover process, as an individual's own perception of the labor market is just as important as objective labor market data. In addition, future studies should explore how accurate an individual's assessment of the labor market is compared to objective measures, and what factors (e.g., tenure, age, and occupation-type) may relate to accurate versus inaccurate labor market perceptions. Relatedly, future studies could assess job search behaviors, which are shown to sharpen an individual's labor market knowledge and align individual perceptions with reality (Steel, 1996; 2002). As a result, individuals involved in job search behaviors may have more accurate perceptions of the labor market. For those individuals who are better calibrated, the labor market may have a stronger influence.

Lastly, the present study was limited in its assessment of turnover, measuring only intentions rather than actual organizational and occupational turnover. Given that turnover intention is an attitudinal construct, it is sensitive to fluctuations in everyday work life (Kirschenbaum & Weisberg, 1990), unlike actual turnover which is discernable and objectively measurable (Cohen, Blake, & Goodman, 2016). For example, an argument or praise from a supervisor can drastically influence an individual's intention to leave from day to day (Kirschenbaum & Weisberg, 1990). Further, the results of the present study indicated that the labor market did not have a significant influence on occupational turnover intentions, however given that there are multiple steps in the withdrawal process, it possible that the labor market may have an influence on other components of the withdrawal process that were not measured in this study. The Rhodes & Doering (1983) model of occupational turnover includes a preparation for change step, which consists of the individual acquiring the necessary resources, such as occupationspecific skills and financial resources to prepare for changing occupations. It is possible that the labor market plays a stronger role in that step, and less of a role later when employees develop concrete intentions to leave their job and start a new career. In the occupational turnover process, the labor market may have an influence in the earlier stage(s) of the withdrawal process such as an individual's intention to search as well as actual search behaviors for alternative opportunities, as not nearly as many resources are sacrificed in these steps of the withdrawal process, when compared to having to the intention to leave the occupation as well as actually leaving their occupation.

Relatedly, the results of this study indicate that the labor market is related to an individual's intention to leave their organization. However, it is important to acknowledge that the intention to turnover may not always translate to actual turnover. Even though turnover intention is a widely used proxy for actual turnover, the meta-analytic relationship between turnover intentions and actual turnover is imperfect (r = .45; Griffeth et al., 2000), thus there are many additional factors at play. Some scholars speculate that an actual job offer is the critical determinant of actual turnover, as the majority of employees "do not quit on the basis of probabilities estimated from alternatives available; they quit on certainties represented by jobs already offered" (Hulin et al., 1985, p. 244). Therefore, an individual could be in a favorable job market (e.g., low occupation specific unemployment), perceive high mobility, consider leaving, but without an actual alternative job offer could fail to actually turnover (Gerhart, 1990).

Future studies should include actual turnover as an outcome, as well as assess the other many components of the withdrawal process, to better understand the role of the labor market in both organizational and occupational turnover processes.

CONCLUSION

The present study examined the relationship between WFC and organizational (occupational) turnover intentions through job (career) satisfaction, and the role that the labor market may have in the process. The results of this study indicated that the labor market may have an influence in the organizational as well as occupational turnover intention process. Further examination of the role of the labor market, including both objective and perceptual measures on both forms of turnover, is a valuable avenue of research to further understand the complex and dynamic process of turnover.

REFERENCES

- Allen, D. T., Herst, E. D., Bruck, S. C., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278-308. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.278
- Amstad, T. F., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A metaanalysis of work-family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relationships. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(2), 151-169. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022170
- Anderson, E. S., Coffey, S. B., & Byerly, T. R. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 28(6), 787-810. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920630202800605
- Anderson, C. J., & Milkovich, T. G. (1980). Propensity to leave: A preliminary examination of March and Simon's Model. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial*, 35(2), 279. https://dx.doi.org/10.7202/029063ar
- Armknecht, P. A., & Early, J. F. (1972). Quits in manufacturing: A study of their causes. *Monthly Lab. Rev.*, 95, 31-37.

Aryee, S., & Luk, V. (1996). Work and non-work influences on the career satisfaction of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(1), 38-52. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0032</u>

- Aryee, S., Srinivas, E. S., & Tan, H. H. (2005). Rhythms of life: Antecedents and outcomes of work-family balance in employed parents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 132-146. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.132
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*(6), 1173.
- Becker, W. J., Cropanzano, R., & Sanfey, A. G. (2011). Organizational neuroscience: Taking organizational theory inside the neural black box. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 933-961.
- Blau, G. (1985). The measurement and prediction of career commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 58(4), 277-288. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1985.tb00201.x
- Blau, G. (2000). Job, organizational, and professional context antecedents as predictors of intent for interrole work transitions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(3), 330-345. https://dx.doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1718
- Blau, G. (2003). Testing for a four-dimensional structure of occupational commitment. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76(4), 469-488. https://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317903322591596

Blau, G. (2007). Does a corresponding set of variables for explaining voluntary organizational turnover transfer to explaining voluntary occupational turnover? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(1), 135-148. https://dx.doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2006.07.007.

- Blau, G. & Boal, K. (1989). Using job involvement and organizational commitment interactively to predict turnover. *Journal of Management*, 15(1), 115-127. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920638901500110
- Blau, G. & Lunz, M. (1998) Testing the incremental effect of professional commitment on intent to leave one's profession beyond the effects of external, personal, and work-related variables. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52(2), 260-269. https://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1997.1601
- Blomme, J. R., Rheede, V. A., & Tromp, M. D. (2010). Work-family conflict as a cause for turnover intentions in the hospitality industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10(4), 269-285. https://dx.doi.org/10.1057/thr.2010.15
- Boyar, S., Maertz, C., Pearson, A., & Keough, S. (2003). Work-Family Conflict: A model of linkages between work and family domain variables and turnover intentions. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 15(2), 175-190.
- Brief, A. P. (1998). Attitudes in and around organizations (Vol. 9). Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.
- Bruck, S. C., Allen, D. T., & Spector, E. P. (2002). The relation between work-family conflict and job satisfaction: A finer-grained analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60(3), 336-353.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor (2017), Current Population Survey (CPS 2017).

- Buonocore, F. & Russo, M. (2013). Reducing the effects of work-family conflict on job satisfaction: The kind of commitment matters. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 23(1), 91-108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2011.00187.x
- Cardenas, R. A., Major, D. A., & Bernas, K. H. (2004). Exploring work and family distractions: Antecedents and outcomes. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 11(4), 346-365. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.11.4.346
- Carlson, S. D., & Kacmar, M. K. (2000). Work-family conflict in the organization: Do life roles values make a difference? *Journal of Management*, 26(5), 1031-1054. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600502
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(2), 249-276.
- Carr, C. J., Boyar, L. S., & Gregory, T. B. (2008). The moderating effect of work-family centrality on work-family conflict, organizational attitudes, and turnover behavior. *Journal of Management*, 34(2), 244-262. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206307309262
- Carsten, J. M., & Spector, P. E. (1987). Unemployment, job satisfaction, and employee turnover: A meta-analytic test of the Muchinsky model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(3), 374-381. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.72.3.374
- Carson, D. K., Carson, P. P., & Bedeian, G. A. (1995). Development and construct validation of a career entrenchment measure. *Journal of Occupational and*

Organizational Psychology, 68(4), 301-320. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1995.tb00589.x

- Carson, K. D., Carson, P. P., Roe, C. W., Birkenmeier, B. J., & Phillips, J. S. (1999).
 Four commitment profiles and their relationships to empowerment, service recovery, and work attitudes. *Public Personnel Management*, 28(1), 1-13.
- Cascio, W. (2000). Managing a virtual workplace. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *14*(3), 81-90. https://dx.doi.org/10.5465/ame.2000.4468068
- Cohen, G., Blake, R. S., & Goodman, D. (2016). Does turnover intention matter?
 Evaluating the usefulness of turnover intention rate as a predictor of actual turnover rate. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *36*(3), 240-263.
- Curry, J., Wakefield, D., Price, J., & Mueller, C. (1986). On the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 29(4), 847-858.
- Coughlan, T. A., & Schmidt, M. R. (1985). Executive compensation, management turnover, and firm performance: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 7(1-3), 43-66. <u>https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0165-4101(85)90027-8</u>
- Crede, M., Chernyshenko, S. O., Stark, S., Dalal, S. R., & Bashshur, M. (2007). Job satisfaction as mediator: An assessment of job satisfaction's position within the nomological network. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(3), 515-538. https://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317906x136180

- Dansereau, F., Cashman, J., & Graen, G. (1973). Instrumentality theory and equity theory as complementary approaches in predicting the relationship of leadership and turnover among managers. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 10(2), 184-200. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(73)90012-3</u>
- Doyle, J. R. (2012). Survey of time preference, delay discounting models. *Delay Discounting Models (April 20, 2012).*
- Dreher, F. G., & Dougherty, W. T. (1980). Turnover and competition for expected job openings: An exploratory analysis. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 23(4), 766-772.
- Driscoll, J. W. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. *Academy of Management journal*, *21*(1), 44-56.
- Eby, L. T., & Rothrauff-Laschober, T. C. (2012). The relationship between perceptions of organizational functioning and voluntary counselor turnover: A four-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 42(2), 151-158. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2011.10.008
- Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. (2007). Methods for integrating moderation and mediation: a general analytical framework using moderated path analysis. *Psychological Methods*, *12*(1), 1.
- Egan, M., Yang, & Bartlett, R. K. (2004). The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention.*Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15(3), 279-301.

- Fields, D., Dingman, M. E., Roman, P. M., & Blum, T. C. (2005). Exploring predictors of alternative job changes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(1), 63-82.
- Fisher, G. G., Matthews, R. A., & Gibbons, A. M. (2016). Developing and investigating the use of single-item measures in organizational research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 21(1), 3-23.
- Frone, M. R. (2000). Interpersonal conflict at work and psychological outcomes: Testing a model among young workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 246-255. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.246
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology. 143-162. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10474-007
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992a). Prevalence of work-family conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(7), 723-729.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of workfamily conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(1), 65-78. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.77.1.65
- Gaertner, S. (1999). Structural determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover models. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(4), 479-493.

Gattiker, E. U., & Larwood, L. (1988). Predictors for managers' career mobility, success, and satisfaction. *Human Resources*, 41(8), 569-591. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678804100801

Gerhart, B. (1990). Voluntary turnover and alternative job opportunities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 467.

Gemignani, J. (1998). Best practices that boost productivity. *Business and Health*, 16(3), 37-42.

Geurts, S., Kompier, M., Roxburgh, S., & Houtman, I. (2003). Does work–home interference mediate the relationship between workload and well-being? *Journal* of Vocational Behavior, 63(3), 532-559. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00025-8

Grandey, A., L. Cordeiro, B., & Crouter, C. A. (2005). A longitudinal and multi-source test of the work–family conflict and job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(3), 305-323. https://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317905X26769

Grandey, A. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). The conservation of resources model applied to work-family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 350-370. https://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1666

Greenhaus, J. & Beutell, N. (1985). Source of conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88. https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/258214

- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 64-86.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Collins, K. M. (2001). Career involvement and family involvement as moderators of relationships between work–family conflict and withdrawal from a profession. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(2), 91-100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.2.91
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between workfamily balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 510-531. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8
- Griffeth, W. R., Hom, W. P., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator, tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 463-488. https://dx.doi.org/ 10.1177/014920630002600305
- Haar, M. J. (2004). Work-family conflict and turnover intention: Exploring the moderation effects of perceived work-family support. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33(1), 35-40.

Haar, M. J., & Roche, M. (2012). Work-family conflict and turnover intentions amongst indigenous employees: The importance of the Whanau/Family for Maori. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(12), 2546-2560. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.610344

- Hammer, B. L., Bauer, N. T., & Grandey, A. A. (2003). Work-family conflict and workrelated withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(3), 419-436.
- Hammer, L. B., Cullen, J. C., Neal, M. B., Sinclair, R. R., & Shafiro, M. V. (2005). The longitudinal effects of work-family conflict and positive spillover on depressive symptoms among dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *10*(2), 138-154. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.138
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011).
 Clarifying work–family intervention processes: The roles of work–family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 134.
- Hayes, A. F. (2018). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach. New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Hayes, A. F. (2015). An index and test of linear moderated mediation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 50(1), 1-22.
- Hayes, Andrew F. (2013). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Inderrieden, E. J. (2005). Shocks as causes of turnover: What they are and how organizations can manage them. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business*

Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management, 44(3), 337-352.

- Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Eberly, M. B. (2008). Turnover and retention research: A glance at the past, a closer review of the present, and a venture into the future. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2, 231-271.
- Hom, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (1991). Structural equations modeling test of a turnover theory: Cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(3), 350-366. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.3.350</u>
- Hom, W. P., Caranikas-Walker, Fanny, Prussia, Griffeth, R. (1992). A meta-analytical structural equations analysis of a model of employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6), 890-909.
- Hom, W. P., & Griffeth, W. R. (1995). *Employee turnover*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.
- Hom, W. P., & Knicki, J. A. (2001). Toward a greater understanding of how dissatisfaction drives employee turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 975-987.
- Hom, P. W., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Griffeth, R. (2012). Further clarification on the Hom, Mitchell, Lee, and Griffeth (2012) model: Reply to Bergman, Payne, and Boswell (2012) and Maertz (2012). *Psychological Bulletin*, *138*(5), 871-875. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029277

- Hom, P. W., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (2012). Reviewing employee turnover: focusing on proximal withdrawal states and an expanded criterion. *Psychological bulletin*, 138(5), 831.
- Hom, P. W., Lee, T. W., Shaw, J. D., & Hausknecht, J. P. (2017). One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 530-545. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000103
- Hox, J. J. (1999). A review of current software for handling missing data. *Kwantitatieve Methoden*, 20, 123-138.
- Hulin, C. L., Roznowski, M., & Hachiya, D. (1985). Alternative opportunities and withdrawal decisions: Empirical and theoretical discrepancies and an integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97(2), 233-250.
 http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.97.2.233
- Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36(1), 16-78. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(85)90020-2
- Joo, B., & Park, S. (2010). Career satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention: The effects of goal orientation, organizational learning culture and developmental feedback. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 31(6), 482-500.
 https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437731011069999

103

- Judge, T. A., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D. (1994). Job and life attitudes of male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 767-782. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.5.767
- Kahn, L. R., Wolfe, M. D., Quinn, P. R., Snoek, D. J., & Rosenthal, A. R. (1965).
 Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. *American Sociological Review*, *10*(1). 620. https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2091375
- Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Wanberg, C. R. (2003). Unwrapping the organizational entry process: disentangling multiple antecedents and their pathways to adjustment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 779.
- Kelloway, K., & Barling, J. (1991). Job characteristics, role stress, and mental health. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 64(4), 291-304. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1991.tb00561.x
- Kim, S. W., Price, J. L., Mueller, C. W., & Watson, T. W. (1996). The determinants of career intent among physicians at a U.S. Air Force hospital. *Human Relations*, 49(7), 947–976.
- Kirchmeyer, C. & Cohen, A. (1999). Different strategies for managing the work non-work interface: A test for unique pathways to work outcomes. *An International Journal of Work, Health, & Organizations, 13*(1), 59-73. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/026783799296192
- Kirschenbaum, A., & Mano-Negrin, R. (1999). Underlying labor market dimensions of" opportunities": The case of employee turnover. *Human Relations*, 52(10), 1233-1255.

- Kirschenbaum, A., & Weisberg, J. (1990). Predicting worker turnover: An assessment of intent on actual separations. *Human Relations*, 43(9), 829-847.
- Kossek, E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work–family conflict, policies, and the job–life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior– human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139-149. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.139
- Kuo, H. Lin, K., & Li, I. (2014). The mediating effects of job satisfaction on turnover intention for long-term care nurses in Taiwan. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 22(2), 225-233. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12044
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Lazear, E. P., & Spletzer, J. R. (2012). The United States labor market: Status quo or a new normal?. *National Bureau of Economic Research*, 1-53.
- Lee, T. (1988). How job dissatisfaction leads to employee turnover. *Journal of Business* and Psychology, 2(3), 263-271.
- Lee, T., & Mitchell, T. (1994). An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *The Academy of Management Review, 19*(1), 51-89.
- Lee, K. Carswell, J. J., & Allen, J. N. (2000). A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: Relations with person and work related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 799-811. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.799

- Lee, T., Mitchell, T., Wise, L., & Fireman, S. (1996). An unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *39*(1), 5-36.
- Li, H. J., Yu, K., Huang, Y., & Jin, X. (2019). Not All Leaving Is Created Equal. *Journal* of Personnel Psychology.
- Lu, Y., Hu, X. M., Huang, X. L., Zhuang, X. D., Guo, P., Feng, F. L., Hu, W., Chen,
 L., Zou, H., & Hao, Y. T. (2017). The relationship between job satisfaction,
 work stress, work-family conflict, and turnover intention among physicians in
 Guangdong, China: A cross-sectional study. *BMJ Journals*, 7(5), 1-12.
 https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014894
- MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., & Williams, J. (2004). Confidence limits for the indirect effect: Distribution of the product and resampling methods. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(1), 99-128.
- Maertz, C., & Campion, M. A. (1998). 25 Years of voluntary turnover research: A review and critique. *International Review of Industrial Organizational Psychology*, 13, 49-81.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). Organizations. Oxford, England: Wiley.
- Martins, L. L., Eddleston, K. A., & Veiga, J. F. (2002). Moderators of the relationship between work-family conflict and career satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 399-409.
- Maxwell, S. E., & Cole, D. A. (2007). Bias in cross-sectional analyses of longitudinal mediation. *Psychological Methods*, *12*(1), 23.

- McPherson, J., Popielarz, P., & Drobnic, S. (1992). Social networks and organizational dynamics. *American Sociological Review*, 57(2), 153-170.
- Mitchell, T., Holtom, B., Lee, T., Sablynski, C., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay:
 Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6), 1102-1121.
- Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(2), 237-240. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.62.2.237
- Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., & Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *63*(4), 408-414. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.63.4.408
- Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., & Meglino, B. M. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(3), 493-522. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.493
- Morrell, K. (2005). Towards a typology of nursing turnover: the role of shocks in nurses' decisions to leave. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *49*(3), 315-322. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03290.x
- Mortimer, J. T., Lorence, J., & Kumka, D. S. (1986). *Modern sociology. Work, family, and personality: Transition to adulthood.* Westport, CT, US: Ablex Publishing.
- Neapolitan, J. (1980). Occupational change in mid-career: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 16(2), 212-225. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791 (80)90052-4

- Neapolitan, J. (1983). Support for and opposition to capital punishment: Some associated social-psychological factors. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *10*(2), 195-208.
- Nickell, S. (1997). Unemployment and labor market rigidities: Europe versus North America. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *11*(3), 55-74.
- Netemeyer, R., Boles, J. & Mcmurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of workfamily and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400-410.
- Netemeyer, R., Brashear-Alejandro, T., & Boles, J. (2004). A cross-national model of job-related outcomes of work-role and family role variables: A retail sales context. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *32*(1), 49-60. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0092070303259128
- Nohe, C., & Sonntag, K. (2014). Work–family conflict, social support, and turnover intentions: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85(1), 1-12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.03.007
- Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Britt, T. W., & Greene-Shortridge, T. M. (2012). Organizational work–family resources as predictors of job performance and attitudes: The process of work–family conflict and enrichment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(1), 28.
- "O*NET OnLine." *O*NET OnLine*, National Center for O*NET Development. Retrieved from www.onetonline.org/.
- Parry, J. (2008). Intention to leave the profession: antecedents and role in nurse turnover. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 64(2), 157-167.
- Peters, C. M., Montgomery, W., Bakker, J. A., & Schaufeli, B. A. (2005). Balancing work and home: How job and home demands are related to burnout. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 12(1), 43-61.
- Pfeffer, J., & Davis-Blake, A. (1992). Salary dispersion, location in the salary distribution, and turnover among college administrators. *ILR Review*, 45(4), 753-763. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001979399204500410
- Philips, B. N., & Lee, M. (1980). The changing role of the American teacher: Current and future sources of stress. *White Collar and Professional Stress*, 93-111.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603-609. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0037335
- Post, C., DiTomaso, N., Farris, G. F., & Cordero, R. (2009). Work–family conflict and turnover intentions among scientists and engineers working in R&D. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24(1), 19-32.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36(4), 717-731.
- Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 42(1), 185-227.

- Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *Absenteeism and turnover of hospital employees*. JAI press.
- Price, J., & Mueller, C. (1981). A causal model of turnover for nurses. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3), 543-565.
- Randsley de Moura, G., Abrams, D., Retter, C., Gunnarsdottir, S., & Ando, K. (2009).
 Identification as an organizational anchor: How identification and job satisfaction combine to predict turnover intention. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*(4), 540-557. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.553
- Rhodes, R. S., & Doering, M. M. (1993). Intention to change careers: Determinants and process. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 42(1), 76-92. https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.1993.tb00250.x
- Rhodes, S., & Doering, M. (1983). An integrated model of career change. *The Academy* of Management Review, 8(4), 631-639.
- Rode, J. C., Rehg, M. T., Near, J. P., & Underhill, J. R. (2007). The effect of work/family conflict on intention to quit: The mediating roles of job and life satisfaction. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 2(2), 65-82.
- Rubenstein, L. A., Eberly, B. M., Lee, W. T., & Mitchell, R. T. (2017). Surveying the forest: A meta-analysis, moderator investigation, and future-oriented discussion of the antecedents of voluntary employee turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 71(1), 23-65. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/peps.12226

- Ryan, D. T., & Sagas, M. (2009). Relationships between pay satisfaction, workfamily conflict, and coaching turnover intentions. *An International Journal*, 15(3), 128-140. https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13527590910964919
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1997). Eight common but false objections to the discontinuation of significance testing in the analysis of research data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(5), 661-681.
- Schneider, J. (1976). The "greener grass" phenomenon: Differential effects of a work context alternative on organizational participation and withdrawal intentions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *16*(2), 308-333. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90019-2
- Silvia, I. J., & Toledo, M. (2013). The unemployment volatility puzzle: The role of matching costs revisited. *Economic Inquiry*, 51(1), 836-843. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7295.2011.00407.x
- Simon, M., Müller, B. H., & Hasselhorn, H. M. (2010). Leaving the organization or the profession–a multilevel analysis of nurses' intentions. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 66(3), 616-626.
- Singh, R., Zhang, Y., Wan, M., & Fouad, N. A. (2018). Why do women engineers leave the engineering profession? The roles of work–family conflict, occupational commitment, and perceived organizational support. *Human Resource Management*, 57(4), 901-914.
- Steel, R. P. (2002). Turnover theory at the empirical interface: Problems of fit and function. Academy of Management Review, 27(3), 346-360.

- Steel, R. P. (1996). Labor market dimensions as predictors of the reenlistment decisions of military personnel. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(4), 421.
- Steel, R. P., & Griffeth, R. W. (1989). The elusive relationship between perceived employment opportunity and turnover behavior: A methodological or conceptual artifact? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(6), 846–854. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.6.846
- Spurk, D., Abele, A. E., & Volmer, J. (2011). The career satisfaction scale: Longitudinal measurement invariance and latent growth analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84(2), 315-326.
- Thatcher, B. J., Stepina, P. L., & Boyle, J. R. (2014). Turnover of information technology workers: Examining empirically the influence of attitudes, job characteristics, and external markets. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 19(3), 231-261.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(2), 259-293. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00874.x
- Thibaud, B. (2017). Job openings, hires, and separations rise, but at a slower pace, in 2016. *Monthly Labor Review*, 1-28. https://dx.doi.org/10.21916/mlr.2017.20
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 6-15. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.6

- Tnay, E., Othman, A.E., Siong, H.C., & Lim, S.L. (2013). The influences of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on turnover intention. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 97, 201-208. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.223
- Trevor, C. (2001). Interactions among actual ease-of-movement determinants and job satisfaction in the prediction of voluntary turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 621-638.
- Van der Heijden, B. I., van Dam, K., & Hasselhorn, H. M. (2009). Intention to leave nursing: The importance of interpersonal work context, work-home interference, and job satisfaction beyond the effect of occupational commitment. *Career Development International*, 14(7), 616-635.
- Van der Wal, M. A., Schönrock-Adema, J., Scheele, F., Schripsema, N. R., Jaarsma, A.
 D. C., & Cohen-Schotanus, J. (2016). Supervisor leadership in relation to resident job satisfaction. *BMC Medical Education*, *16*, 194. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12909-016-0688-z
- Vinokur, D. A., Pierce, F. P., & Buck, L. C. (1999). Work-family conflicts of women in the Air Force: Their influence on mental health and functioning. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(6), 865-878.
- Wang, I., Lee, B., & Wu, S. (2017). The relationships among work-family conflict, turnover intention and organizational citizenship behavior in the hospitality industry of Taiwan. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(8), 1130-1142. https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ijm-04-2015-0056

- Wheeler, A. R., Gallagher, V. C., Brouer, R. L., & Sablynski, C. J. (2007). When person organization (mis) fit and (dis) satisfaction lead to turnover. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(2), 203-219.
 http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940710726447
- Witt, A. L., Andrews, C. M., & Kacmar, M. (2000). The role of participation in decision making in the organizational politics job satisfaction relationship. *Human Relations*, 53(3), 341-358. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726700533003
- Youngblood, S. A., Mobley, W. H., & Meglino, B. M. (1983). A longitudinal analysis of the turnover process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(3), 507-516. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.3.507

APPENDIX

Work-Family Conflict

(Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000)

Participant Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with

the following statements.

Response Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

Work-to-Family Interference:

- 1.) My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.
- 2.) The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.
- 3.) I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.
- 4.) The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home.
- 5.) Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.
- 6.) The behaviors I perform that make me more effective at work do no help me to be a better parent and spouse.
- 7.) When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities/responsibilities.
- 8.) I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family.
- 9.) Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.

Family-to-Work Interference:

1.) The time I spend on my family responsibilities often interferes with my work responsibilities.

- 2.) The time I spend with my family often causes me to not spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career.
- 3.) I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities.
- 4.) The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be effective at work.
- 5.) Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at work.
- 6.) The problem-solving behavior that works for me at home does not seem to be as useful at work.
- 7.) Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work.
- 8.) Because I am often stressed from family responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work.
- 9.) Tension and anxiety from my family life often weakens my ability to do my job.

Job Satisfaction

(Fisher, Matthews, and Gibbons, 2016)

Participant Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with

the following statement.

Response Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

1.) Overall, I am satisfied with my job.

Career Satisfaction

(Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990)

Participant Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with

the following statements.

Response Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

- 1.) I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.
- 2.) I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals.
- 3.) I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income.
- 4.) I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting goals for advancement.
- 5.) I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new skills.

Organizational Turnover Intentions

Participant Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with

the following statement.

Response Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

1.) I plan to leave my current job with the next year.

Occupational Turnover Intentions

(Carson, Carson, Roe, Birkenmeier, & Phillips, 1999)

Participant Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with

the following statements.

Response Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

1.) I am thinking about leaving my profession.

2.) I intend to look for a different profession.

3.) I intend to leave this profession.

O*NET Occupation Identification

Participant Instructions: Using the drop-down menus below select the occupation description that best fits your current job. These are standardized jobs defined by the United States government. Combined with the job title you just entered above, selecting your job from this list will allow researchers to better compare different jobs.

First, select the broad category that your job falls under, then use the remaining dropdown menus to further narrow down the choices, choosing the occupation that best matches your current job in the final drop-down. For example, if you are a barista, you would first choose "Food Preparation and Serving Related Occupations" followed by "Food and Beverage Serving Workers" then "Fast Food and Counter Workers" and finally "Baristas (35-3022.01)."

There are many categories and occupations listed, so you might need to go back and change some of the categories to explore and find the occupation that best matches your current job.



Thesis and Dissertation Services