



경영학석사학위논문

The Relationship Between Regulatory Focus and Turnover Intention: A Network Perspective Approach

조절 초점과 이직 의도의 관계: 직원의 네트워크 특성을 중심으로

2021년 2 월

서울대학교 대학원

경영학과 경영학 전공

이 한 호

The Relationship Between Regulatory Focus and Turnover Intention: A Network Perspective Approach

지도 교수 김성수

이 논문을 경영학석사 학위논문으로 제출함 2020 년 10 월

> 서울대학교 대학원 경영학과 경영학 전공 이 한 호

이한호의 경영학석사 학위논문을 인준함 2021 년 2월



ABSTRACTS

The Relationship Between Regulatory Focus and Turnover Intention: A Network Perspective Approach

Hanho Lee

Department of Business Administration The Graduate School Seoul National University

Extant literature on regulatory focus agrees that promotion focus benefits organizations more than prevention focus, but the effect of regulatory focus on turnover remains unclear. This study examines mechanisms through which regulatory focus influences turnover intention, utilizing network perspectives. Study 1, with a sample of 194 employees in the United States recruited from MTurk, investigated the mediating effect of employees' instrumental network characteristics--network size and strength of ties-- on the relationship between regulatory focus and turnover intention, as well as whether network density moderates the mediated relationship between regulatory focus and turnover intention via network size and strength of ties. The results showed that stronger promotion focus was associated with larger network size, which in turn increased turnover intention. The moderating effect of network density was significant, where employees with sparse networks showed a stronger, positive relationship

i

between network size and turnover intention, whereas employees with dense networks showed a weaker, negative effect of tie strength on turnover intention. In a sample of 203 employees in South Korea, Study 2 sophisticated the model tested in Study 1 by taking into account the location of networks-internal and external. The results revealed that employees with stronger promotion focus had larger external network size, which in turn increased turnover intention, whereas those with stronger prevention focus had stronger internal tie strength, which lowered turnover intention. These findings demonstrate how employees' regulatory focus develops and maintains their instrumental networks which influence employees' turnover processes. Implications are discussed in light of the literature on social networks and employees' turnover.

Keywords: regulatory focus; social networks; turnover Student Number: 2018-26352

| TABLE | OF | CONTENTS |
|-------|----|----------|
| | | |

| ABSTRACT | |
|---|----|
| LIST OF TABLES | |
| LIST OF FIGURES | |
| | |
| CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS | 7 |
| 2.1. Research in Turnover | 7 |
| 2.2. The Relationship Between Regulatory Focus and Turnover Intention | 9 |
| 2.2.1. Promotion Focus and Turnover Intention | 9 |
| 2.2.2. Prevention Focus and Turnover Intention | 11 |
| 2.3. The Mediating Role of Network Characteristics | 12 |
| 2.3.1. Regulatory Focus and Network Characteristics | 15 |
| 2.3.2. Network Characteristics and Turnover Intention | 20 |
| 2.4. The Moderating Role of Network Density | |
| CHAPTER 3. OVERVIEW OF STUDIES | |
| CHAPTER 4. STUDY 1 | 26 |
| 4.1. Method | 26 |
| 4.1.1. Sample Description and Procedure | 26 |
| 4.1.2. Measures | 27 |
| 4.2. Results | 30 |
| 4.3. Discussion | 38 |
| CHAPTER 5. STUDY 2 | |

| | 5.1. Method | |
|----|---|----|
| | 5.1.1. Sample Description and Procedure | 40 |
| | 5.1.2. Measures | 41 |
| | 5.2. Results | 43 |
| | 5.3. Additional analysis | 48 |
| | 5.4. Discussion | 52 |
| CI | CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION | |
| | 6.1. General Discussion | 53 |
| | 6.2. Theoretical Contributions | 54 |
| | 6.3. Practical Implications | 58 |
| | 6.4. Limitations and Future Research | 60 |
| | 6.5. Summary | 63 |
| | - | |

REFERENCES

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 1 | Study 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Variables | 33 |
|---------|--|----|
| Table 2 | Study 1: Regression Results of Relationships between Regulatory Focus and Network Characteristics | 34 |
| Table 3 | Study 1: Regression Results of Relationships with Turnover Intention | 35 |
| Table 4 | Results Regarding Hypothesized Indirect Effects for Studies 1 and 2 | 36 |
| Table 5 | Study 2: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Variables | 45 |
| Table 6 | Study 2: Regression Results of the Relationship between Regulatory Focus and Network Characteristics | 46 |
| Table 7 | Study 2: Regression Results of Relationships with Turnover Intention | 47 |
| Table 8 | Additional analysis: Regression Results of Interaction Effects of Tenure with Regulatory Focus on Internal Network Characteristics | 50 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 1 | Theoretical Model | 6 |
|----------|--|----|
| Figure 2 | The Effects of Network Size on Turnover Intention at Low and High Levels of Network Density | 37 |
| Figure 3 | The Effects of Strength of Ties on Turnover Intention at Low and High Levels of Network Density | 37 |
| Figure 4 | The Effects of Tenure on Internal Network Size at Low and High Levels of Promotion Focus | 51 |
| Figure 5 | The Effects of Tenure on Internal Network Size at Low and High Levels of Prevention Focus | 51 |

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Self-regulation is critical for flexible functioning (Higgins, 2001). People often find discrepancies between their current and desired states, which makes them regulate their thoughts, feelings and behaviors to align reality and expectations or desires (Hoyle, 2010). A large number of prior studies have proved that regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997) is useful, as it expands the understanding of self-regulation by offering two fundamentally different forms of self-regulation, that is, promotion and prevention-focus (Scholer & Higgins, 2010). Self-regulation through a promotion-focus is triggered by advancement needs and often involves striving for ideals via accomplishment. This focus prompts eagerness behavioral strategies aimed to achieve individual's desired states. On the other hand, self-regulation through a prevention-focus is activated by security needs and generally involves fulfilling duties and obligations via vigilant behavioral strategies. This focus makes people behave in cautious manner to avoid conditions which can be hindrances to their desired end-states.

Because of such distinct motivation concerns and behavioral strategies of different regulatory focus, scholars in the field of business administration have paid considerable attention to regulatory focus theory (Lanaj, Chang, & Johnson, 2012). For example, employees with promotion focus are likely to have higher job satisfaction and affective commitment than those of prevention focus (Kruglanski, Pierro, Higgins, & Capozza, 2007; Markovits, Ullrich, Van Dick, & Davis, 2008). In addition to these work attitudes, employees with promotion focus are likely to show higher task performance and creativity than those with prevention focus (Wallace, Johnson, & Frazier, 2009). Moreover, CEO's strategic inclination is also

influenced by different types of regulatory focus, where CEOs with promotion focus tended to show positive approach toward merger and acquisitions (M&A), whereas those with prevention focus have conservative stances toward M&A (Gamache, McNamara, Mannor, & Johnson, 2015). Likewise, based on the evidence to date, promotion and prevention focus seem to be critical individual characteristics that distinctly affect employee's attitudes and behaviors at work.

Despite these findings, the effect of regulatory focus to employee's turnover process remains a gap in the field of business administration (see, Lanaj et al., 2012). Theoretical integration of regulatory focus theory with turnover research is essential, considering that employees' turnover is one of the critical issues for organizations and managers. The loss of employees can result in the decrease of organizational competitiveness because it can incur extra expenses (Allen, Bryant, & Vardaman, 2010). For example, not only can employees' turnover involve direct costs such as those for recruiting, selecting, and training, but also it can incur indirect costs due to loss of human capital, organizational knowledge and experienced mentors (Cascio, 2006; Allen et al., 2010). Furthermore, many organizations have difficulties in retaining key employees, for instance, high performers and employees with firm-specific human capital (Allen et al., 2010). Thus, investigating the effects of promotion and prevention focus, significant person-based characteristics, may be helpful for HR managers to manage employee's retention in an organization.

To the best of my knowledge, there have been four studies attempting to combine the regulatory focus theory with employees' turnover process. As for an example, the regulatory fit between leadership styles and followers' regulatory

focus affect followers' turnover intention (Hamstra, Van Yperen, Wisse, & Sassenberg, 2011). Although, there were several attempts to investigate the direct relationship between regulatory focus and turnover intention, the results are mixed in terms of direction and significance. For instance, some studies have reported a positive relationship between promotion focus and turnover intention, and a negative relationship between prevention focus and turnover intention (e.g., Andrews, Kacmar, & Kacmar, 2014; Leon, Bellairs, & Halbesleben, 2015). In contrast, Jung & Yoon (2015) found the negative relationship between promotion focus and turnover intention, whereas the positive relationship between prevention focus and turnover intention. Thus, to clarify such mixed results regarding the relationship between regulatory focus and turnover, in this study, I investigated the direct effect of regulatory focus on turnover intention as well as mechanisms linking regulatory focus and turnover intention.

Based on regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997), I believe that the different characteristics of promotion- and prevention-focus have distinct impacts on the key antecedents of turnover intention including attitude toward turnover, job-searching behavior, and evaluating job alternatives (Hom & Griffeth, 1991). To be specific, this study argues that employees' promotion focus will positively be associated with turnover intention in that a promotion focus will make employees have positive attitude toward turnover, actively involve in job-searching behavior, and positively evaluate potential outside job alternatives. In contrast, I hypothesize that employee's prevention focus will negatively be related to turnover intention because of vigilant stances toward quitting, conservative attitude toward searching outside job alternatives, and negatively evaluating potential job alternatives.

As for the developing a process model of linking regulatory focus and turnover intention, I hypothesize that different types of regulatory focus will have distinct impacts on the structure of employees' instrumental networks, defined as the networks that provide such informational resources as advices and information (Podolny & Baron, 1997). Given that promotion and prevention focus have distinct sensitivity toward benefits and costs (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Idson, Liberman, & Higgins, 2004) and that networking behaviors produces both benefits and costs (Klein, Lim, Saltz & Mayer., 2004), I expect that different regulatory focus adopt distinct networking strategies that give rise to different network structures. Specifically, employees with strong promotion focus will construct larger network size and a weaker strength of ties in their network structures, whereas those with strong prevention focus will establish a smaller network size but a stronger strength of ties in their social worlds. These differences in employees' network characteristics may translate into more of a willingness to leave their current organization for those with strong promotion focus and less of a willingness to quit their current organization for those with strong prevention focus.

In addition, although I expect that the network size increases turnover intention, whereas strength of ties among network contacts decrease turnover intention, I recognize that network density would also matter in such relationships. Given the fact that the network density affects not only the amount of social capital but also the type of social capital (e.g., informational or psychological resources), I argue that distinguishing whether employees are embedded in dense network structure represents a relevant approach. Brokerage logic (Burt, 2004) and weakties theory (Granovetter, 1973) argue that individuals whose networks have many

structural holes and weak ties have competitive advantages on accessing to large and non-redundant informational resources. Thus, I suggest that the positive effect of network size on turnover intention is significantly weakened when employees are embedded in dense network, whereas the negative effect of strength ties on turnover intention is strengthened when employees are embedded in dense network. (see Figure 1 for overall theoretical model).

In Study 1, I test the mediated model described above by using employees' overall network characteristics combining internal and external networks as well as the moderating effect of overall network density on the relationship between network characteristics (e.g., network size and strength of ties) and turnover intention. Then, in Study 2, I expand the original mediated model to closely examine the impact of network contacts located in different locations (e.g., internal and external networks) on employees' turnover processes. Considering that network contacts within versus outside of an organization have access to different types of resources (Porter, Woo, & Campion., 2016), the distinction between internal and external networks is especially relevant to how network contacts affect turnover processes (Porter, Woo, Allen, & Keith., 2019). Thus, in Study 2, I expand the original mediated model of Study 1 by dividing total network contacts into internal and external networks to evaluate how the characteristics of internal and external networks affect employees' turnover processes differently.

Overall, this research makes several important contributions to the existing literature. First, given that it has been somewhat overlooked to investigate the effects of regulatory focus on employee's withdrawal behaviors (e.g., absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover; Lanaj et al., 2012), this research expands existing research

on the impact of regulatory focus in the workplace by clarifying the distinct relationship between different types of regulatory focus and turnover intention. Second, I utilize network perspectives as an explanatory framework to build a process model that better explicates the relationship between regulatory focus and turnover intention. Third, I build on extant network-turnover literature, which has primarily focused on the different types of degree centrality (i.e., network size) inside of an organization (see Porter et al., 2019), by simultaneously investigating the impact of network size and strength of ties between contacts regardless of the location of contacts (i.e., internal organization and external organization) on turnover process. Fourth, I add to network-turnover literature by indirectly capturing employee's accessibility to diverse informational resources, emphasizing the role of network density. Finally, I also add to the social network literatures by finding distinct impact of different regulatory focus on social networks, thereby highlighting the role of individual differences in constructing social networks.





CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS

2.1. Research in Turnover

There are several turnover theories that explicate employee's turnover process (e.g., March & Simon, 1958; Mobley, 1977; Hom & Griffeth, 1991; Price & Mueller, 1981). Although these theories are based on different research traditions (e.g., administrative decision theory, psychology, labor economics and sociology), they all endeavor to find key antecedents of employees' decision to leave their current employer. Most of the researches regarding the turnover process generally have drawn from March & Simon's (1958) theory concerning perceived desirability and ease of movement as two critical antecedents that affect employees' turnover decision (Steel & Lunsbury, 2009). In their seminal work, desirability of movement, generally assessed through job satisfaction, are perceived by the disparity between employee's ideal status and reality (March & Simon, 1958). The greater the disparity (i.e., job-dissatisfaction), employees are more likely to leave their current employer (Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000). In addition, ease of movement, conventionally measured as perceived outside job alternatives and jobsearching behavior, also facilitates employee's turnover decision (Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth., 2012).

Another approach to explain employee's turnover behavior is to investigate how individual differences affect one's turnover decision. Beginning with March & Simon's (1958) theory suggesting that such personal attributes as age, gender, tenure determine individual's available extra-organizational alternatives, considerable number of studies have demonstrated that young, male, or low tenure employees are more likely to make turnover decision (Griffeth et al., 2000). In

addition to such demographic characteristics, individual's personality traits have also drawn attention to researchers in understanding employee's turnover behavior (Zimmerman, Swider, Woo & Allen., 2016). For example, based on five-factor model of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1985), in his meta-analysis, Zimmerman (2008) found out that individual's emotional stability negatively predicted employee's intention to quit, whereas the one's conscientiousness and agreeableness negatively predicted actual turnover decision. He also confirmed that personality characteristics had stronger relationships with turnover intention and turnover than did job complexity or job characteristics (Zimmerman, 2008), traditionally regarded as key factors of turnover, thus suggesting that individual differences significantly matter in understanding employee's turnover decision.

More recently, researchers have attempted to incorporate relational constructs in explicating employee's turnover process (Jo & Ellingson, 2019). Employee's interpersonal behaviors, such as internal networking behaviors and interpersonal citizenship behaviors, negatively predicted employee's turnover decision (e.g., Porter, Woo, & Allen, 2016; Mossholder, Settoon, & Henagan, 2005). In addition, although the results are somewhat mixed, the structural position of an employee in their social networks also predicted turnover process of employees (e.g., Feeley, Hwang, & Barnett, 2008; Soltis, Agneessens, Sasovova, & Labianca, 2013; Vardaman, Taylor, Allen, Gondo, & Amis, 2015). Finally, the psychological constructs, such as leader-member exchange or social support, were also significant factors that deter employee's turnover decision (e.g., Harris, Li, & Kirkman, 2014; Humphrey, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007). Thus, the social perspectives of turnover process should not be overlooked in turnover literatures.

All in all, building on these extant turnover literatures, I attempt to find individual differences that facilitate or hinder employee's turnover process. I expect that motivational and behavioral differences between promotion focus and prevention focus of employees may have distinct impact on employees' relational constructs (i.e., network characteristics), thereby differently affecting turnover intention. I do acknowledge that turnover intention is not a final stage of turnover process, however, given that turnover intention is the most proximal antecedents of actual turnover behavior (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino., 1979), I believe that investigating the individual characteristics that affect turnover intention will also contribute to understanding employees' decision to leave an organization.

2.2. The Relationship Between Regulatory Focus and Turnover Intention

2.2.1. Promotion Focus and Turnover Intention

I expect that employees' promotion focus is positively associated with their turnover intention due to their positive attitude toward turnover, active involvement in job-searching, and positive evaluation of job-searching outcomes. First, promotion focus is concerned with advancements and accomplishments to satisfy growth needs (Higgins, 1997). This tendency and motivation make individuals not only view a change as one of the ways of reaching their ideal selves, but also have a willingness to switch goals if there appear to be better opportunities (Brockner & Higgins, 2001; Molden & Hui, 2011). Further, people with promotion focus are more likely to have greater attention to positive information and outcomes instead of negative ones (Higgins 1997; 1998), which suggests that they may evaluate the consequences of quitting itself as positive. As such, employees with a strong promotion focus may view a job change as a means of achieving their ideal endstates, thereby considering turnover as positive.

Second, promotion focus entails an exploratory orientation and proactiveness (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Friedman & Förster, 2001). That is, individuals with promotion-focus tend to seek opportunities to obtain potential gains that increase the likelihood of their advancement, even if such exploratory behaviors incur substantial costs. For example, CEO's promotion focus is positively related to CEO's M&A likelihood because of their active opportunity seeking behavior (Gamache et al., 2015). These proactiveness and risk-taking propensity of promotion-focused individuals may make them be more actively involved in jobsearching behaviors. Moreover, individuals with a strong promotion focus tend to pay higher attention to potential opportunities than prospective losses because they are sensitive to positive features (Higgins 1997; 1998). Likewise, when these employees evaluate job alternatives, they may pay more attention to positive aspects of such alternatives. Even if the results of evaluating job alternatives are ambiguous, they may interpret the information in a more positive way (Gamache et al., 2015). Thus, employees with stronger promotion focus may be more likely to explore job alternatives and assess those alternatives as positive, thereby resulting in higher turnover intention.

Hypothesis 1. Employees' promotion focus is positively related to their turnover intention.

2.2.2. Prevention Focus and Turnover Intention

In contrast, employees' prevention focus may negatively be related with their turnover intention because of their concerns of security and obligations, tendencies of risk-aversion, and sensitiveness toward negative information. Leaving the current job often requires huge courage for employees in that turnover can entail significant consequences coupled with uncertainty (Griffeth & Hom, 2002). Prevention focus involves a tendency to maintain the status quo even if other opportunities available to satisfy security needs (Higgins, 1997). These conservative stances of prevention-focused employees may view changing their current job as a risk, not as a chance. In addition, employees' prevention focus is positively associated with normative- and continuance-commitment (Lanaj et al., 2012) due to their tendencies of duty-fulfilling and vigilant attitudes (Kark & Van-Dijk, 2007). Thus, employees with prevention focus are likely to view quitting their job as negative because of their attempt at fulfilling obligations and their tendencies to avoid losses.

In line with these vigilant attitudes and behavioral strategies of preventionfocused individuals, they are less likely to make an effort to search for external job alternatives. Exploring job alternatives requires time and effort (Hom & Griffeth, 1991). Such costs may be regarded as a serious impediment for prevention-focused employees in that their current situation (e.g., performance, relationship with colleagues) may be agitated by such costs. Moreover, although employees with prevention-focus demonstrate job-search behavior and collect information on job alternatives, they may pay more attention to negative aspects of such alternative options (Lanaj et al., 2012; Higgins, 1997; 1998). For example, as they go through

the evaluation process of outside employment opportunities, employees with prevention focus may have much more attention to such negative aspects as the possibility of meeting inhospitable colleagues than positive aspects of leaving their current position. Therefore, employees with high prevention focus may have low willingness to quit their job due to conservative stances toward quitting their job and inclination toward negative information gathered through the process of jobsearching behavior.

Hypothesis 2. Employees' prevention focus is negatively related to their turnover intention.

2.3. The Mediating Role of Network Characteristics

To fully understand how regulatory focus affects turnover intention, I adopt network perspectives as an explanatory framework to illustrate the underlying mechanisms of the relationship between regulatory focus and turnover intention. Although several network-turnover researches substantiate the usefulness of network perspectives in understanding employee's turnover process by investigating the role of different types of network centrality (i.e., network size) in employee's turnover process (e.g., Vardaman et al., 2015; Soltis et al., 2013; Feeley et al., 2008), the results are mixed in terms of direction and significance (Jo & Ellingson, 2019; Porter et al., 2019), thus suggesting the need for further studies to clarify the role of network constructs in employee's turnover process. I thought that these mixed results are resulted from two significant issues that have been overlooked in the extant network perspective's turnover literatures: the study of

how different network characteristics (i.e., network size and strength of ties) and how different location of network contacts (i.e., internal and external networks) simultaneously affect employee's turnover process.

First, extant network-turnover literatures mainly focused on how the network centrality affect employee's turnover decision (see Porter et al., 2019). Social exchange theory suggests that it is through different network characteristics that employees gather distinct types of resources (e.g., informational and psychological; Podolny & Baron, 1997). To illustrate, large size of social networks has advantages on gathering informational resources such as novel information (Burt, 1992), whereas large number of strong ties are beneficial in accessing psychological resources such as trust and social support (Liem & Liem, 1978; Roberts & O'Reilly, 1979). Although, in their meta-analysis, Porter et al. (2019) have attempted to solve this issue by incorporating two different types of network centrality (e.g., instrumental and expressive) in their network-turnover process model, which reveals that both instrumental and expressive network centrality negatively affect employee's turnover, they have overlooked the impact of strength of ties among employee's social network. Given that there is a possibility of being contacts offering psychological resources such as social support or trust in employee's instrumental networks, research is needed to assess the role of network size and strength of ties in employee's instrumental networks simultaneously. Thus, in this research, I focused on employee's instrumental networks and investigate the impact of two different network characteristics, network size and strength of ties, on turnover processes.

Second, although there are several network-turnover researches that delineate

the relationship between network size and employee's turnover process (e.g., Mossholder et al., 2005; Ballinger, Cross, & Holtom, 2016, Vardaman et al., 2015), those researches are mainly focused on the role of networks within an organization (i.e., internal networks), neglecting how networks outside of an organization (i.e., external networks) influence employee's turnover process (Porter et al., 2019). This distinction of the location of networks is important in network-turnover research, as the location of contacts may influence the exposure to different types of resources as well as the ease of perception of outside job alternatives (Porter et al., 2016; Porter et al., 2019). Although, there are a few exceptions (e.g., Porter et al., 2016; Moynihan & Pandey, 2008), these researches focus on employees' networking behaviors, not on actual characteristics of their network structures that influence employees' turnover processes. Thus, in this research, I expanded employee's network boundary to outside of one's organization, investigating the distinct impacts of internal and external networks on turnover processes.

All in all, to address these neglect issues, in this study, I operationalized the employee's social network as the sets of network contacts employee have with others in their own organization and with individuals outside of the organization who give work-related advice or information (i.e., instrumental networks). Further, given that different network characteristics, network size and strength of ties, are distinct channel to access different types of resources (Liem & Liem, 1978; Roberts & O'Reilly, 1979), I will simultaneously evaluate the role of network size and strength of ties in understanding employee's turnover intention. To elaborate the mediating role of these network characteristics in the relationship between regulatory focus and turnover intention, I begin by discussing how different self-

regulation strategies, promotion and prevention-focus, affect network characteristics in terms of size and strength of ties, and then progress to discussing how these distinct network characteristics differently affect turnover intention.

2.3.1. Regulatory Focus and Network Characteristics

Social exchange theory suggests that any interaction between individuals produce both benefits and costs (Blau, 1964). These benefits and costs may be more evident in employee's instrumental networks than other types of social networks (e.g., friendship and adversarial networks; Klein et al., 2004). To illustrate, employees benefit from seeking advice when they receive useful information or novel ideas that they need, whereas such advice-seeking behaviors produce some costs if they are humiliated by others because of disclosing their own ignorance or if they waste time and effort due to the failure of gaining any productive outcomes resulted from the interactions. Moreover, since people pursue relationship with others in a selfinterested way, they regulate their networking behaviors not only to maximize potential benefits but also to potential minimize costs (Blau, 1964; Molm & Cook, 1995).

If it is the case that people consider both potential benefits and potential costs when they interact with others, regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997; 1998) is especially relevant in understanding individual differences of social networks. Scholars in regulatory focus studies have empirically demonstrated that promotionfocused and prevention-focused individuals have different sensitivity toward gains (i.e., benefits) and losses (i.e., costs) (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Idson, Liberman, & Higgins, 2004). In addition, the motivational differences between promotion-

focused and prevention-focused individuals, from distinctions in priority on growth and safety to differences in inclination toward eagerness and vigilant behavioral strategies, can serve as critical underpinnings for explaining the role of individual characteristics in understanding distinct networking behaviors (Pollack et al., 2015). Thus, in this section, I delineate how employee's regulatory focus affect one's networking strategies, which in turn, results in different network characteristics.

2.3.1.1. Regulatory Focus and Network Size

Network size refers to the number of contacts in individual's social networks (Burt, 1982). Employees with strong promotion focus are more likely to initiate relationships not only with a wider range of people at work, but also with contacts outside of organization. Strong promotion-focus entails tendency to emphasize advancement and growth from a current status quo (Higgins, 1997). Given that interacting with instrumental network contacts produce benefits that affect their growth and advancement (Regts & Molleman, 2016), employees with strong promotion focus may actively engage in initiating relationships with new contacts to gain potential opportunities for their own growth. For instance, networking with others can be an important channel for novel ideas and valuable information that improve their performance or creativity (Mehra, Kilduff, & Brass., 2001; Baer, 2010), which affects faster promotion or higher incentives in an organization. Even though such networking behaviors produces potential costs, such as time and effort, heightened risk-taking propensity of strong promotion-focused employees may let them involve in networking behavior while accepting such potential costs. For

instance, Pollack, Forster, Johnson, Coy, & Molden (2015) demonstrated that promotion-focused entrepreneurs are more likely to seek advice and resources from others for enhancing performance of their business. Therefore, as promotionfocused employees more concern about potential benefits that affect their advancement, they are more likely to initiate new relationships which could bring future gains, which in turn, increases the number of people in their social network.

Hypothesis 3. Promotion focus is positively related to network size (3a), internal network size (3b), and external network size (3c).

In contrast, prevention-focused employees may have a higher threshold for initiating relationships with new contacts. Networking behaviors toward instrumental network contacts tend to incur potential costs such as time and effort if they fail to receive any valuable information they lack or humiliation and embarrassment if they disclose their own ignorance to others (Klein et al., 2004). Given that prevention-focus entails primary concern of safety and maintenance of the status quo (Higgins, 1997; 1998), such costs are likely to be weighed strongly on employees with strong prevention focus (Idson et al., 2004). This conservative stance of strong prevention-focused employees let them behave in vigilant ways to avoid potential loss (i.e., costs), which consequently leads them to safe-networking behavior. For example, they may minimize interaction with unknown contacts, and even avoid situation in which they have to meet new people. This does not mean that prevention-focused employees never engage in initiating new relationships, but rather, they are likely to make new relationships when there are significant

potential benefits beyond potential costs. Thus, to the extent that preventionfocused employees consider about the potential costs, they are less likely to initiate new relationships, which consequently leads them to relatively small network size.

Hypothesis 4. Prevention focus is negatively related to network size (4a), internal network size (4b), and external network size (4c).

2.3.1.2. Regulatory Focus and Strength of Ties

Networks can also vary on the strength of ties between actors in network structures. Strong ties are those that are of long duration, exercised frequently, and emotionally close (Granovetter, 1973). As I illustrated above, strong promotion focus makes employees involve in network-broadening behaviors to gain potential opportunities for their advancement and growth. Considering that resources, such as time and effort, are limited, it may be important for individuals to divide these resources between initiating new contacts and deepening existing relationships. As the extent to which people consider potential benefits when they interact with other people, they are more likely to initiate new contacts rather than to cultivate existing contacts. In addition, such sensitiveness toward positive benefits may let employees to regard the contacts as a channel for informational resources, not for psychological resources. That is, rather than frequently interacting with existing contacts to promotes emotional closeness, they may interact intermittently when they need information or resources that they lack. To my knowledge, there are no studies that directly explicates the relationship between regulatory focus and strength of ties, but there is an evidence that promotion focus fits well with lower

network density, network structures that represents the degree of interconnectedness among personal social contacts, because of the greater access to information and opportunities (Zou, Ingram, & Higgins, 2015). Likewise, strong promotion-focused employees are likely to use their time to initiate new relationships rather than to make their established relationship stronger, which consequently leads to lower network strength.

Hypothesis 5. Promotion focus is negatively related to strength of ties (5a), internal strength of ties (5b), and external strength of ties (5c).

In contrast, people with high prevention focus are more likely to interact frequently with a more limited group of people whom they already know each other. Prevention focus have a propensity to react sensitive toward potential loses, which makes them behave in a cautious way to avoid potential costs (Higgins, 1997; 1998). Given that the results of networking behaviors in instrumental networks involve uncertainty (Klein et al., 2004), such as time loss and humiliation, they are likely to involve in networking behaviors in the way of reducing uncertainty. In this sense, frequent interaction with established contacts is helpful for decreasing such uncertainty, for such frequent interactions with established contacts not only provide a sense of belonging, but also cultivate coherent set of normative with expectations within networks (Coleman, 1990). Similar with these arguments, Zou (2009) demonstrated that people with higher prevention focus tend to experience higher life satisfaction when they are embedded with closure networks having a large proportion of strong ties and high

network density. Considering that people behave in the way of promoting their psychological well-being (Zou, 2009), this result may indirectly suggest that prevention focus are likely to construct their networks in the way of cultivating strong ties through the interactions, and of forging interconnectedness among limited contacts to fulfill their safety needs. Thus, I expect that as employees concern more about potential uncertainty of interacting with other people, they are more likely to use their time to interact with whom they are familiar, thus resulting in higher network strength.

Hypothesis 6. *Prevention focus is positively related to related to strength of ties* (6*a*), *internal strength of ties* (6*b*), *and external strength of ties* (6*c*).

2.3.2. Network Characteristics and Turnover Intention

2.3.2.1. Network Size and Turnover Intention

Although several network-turnover researches assumed and confirmed the relationship between instrumental network size and turnover as negative (e.g., Feeley, 2000; Vardaman et al., 2015), I expect that instrumental network size will have positive effect on turnover intention while controlling the effect of strength-of-ties among instrumental network contacts. Given that employees interacting with larger contacts within their organization are likely to perform better at work (Porter et al., 2019), network size may promote employee's perception of outside job alternatives. Employees with larger internal network size have more advantages in accessing informational resources such as how-to knowledge for doing their work, enabling employees to learn from their networks about how to solve work-

related issues or how to handle with sensitive political situations inside their organization (Cross & Sproull, 2004). This leads them to perform better in an organization, which enhances their visibility in the job market outside of their current organization (Allen & Griffeth, 2001), thus facilitating employee's turnover process.

In external networks, network contacts can be a more direct channel for perceiving outside job alternatives. While interacting with network contacts outside of an organization, employee's not only exchange job-related information (Van Hoye, Hooft, & Lievens, 2009), but also share one's competencies or desire for changing their jobs, thus making the network contacts introduce alternative employers to a focal employee. In addition, larger networks outside of an organization can also be a source of "soft" information, such as who to contact as an alternative employer and how to prepare for an interview, for seizing alternative employment (Barbulescu, 2015). These patterns of interaction make it possible for employees to have higher belief that they could find better job outside of their current organization, which consequently promotes the perception of ease of movement (March & Simon, 1958). In line with these arguments, Porter et al. (2016) have demonstrated that employees' external networking behaviors have positive effect on perceived job alternatives as well as actual job offer. Thus, with this heightened perception of ease of movement, employees may have high willingness to leave their current organization.

Hypothesis 7. Network size (7a), Internal network size (7b) and External network size (7c) mediates the positive relationship between promotion focus and turnover intention.

2.3.2.2. Strength of Ties and Turnover Intention

In contrast, unlike the positive effect of network size on turnover intention, strength of ties among instrumental network contacts will have negative impact on employees' willingness to leave their current organization. In internal networks, strong network strength with colleagues inside of an organization offer social support or trust that develop constituent forces (e.g., organizational commitment or job embeddedness; Maertz & Campion, 2004), which deters employees' quit decision (Ellingson, Tews, & Dachner, 2016). Exchanging these psychological resources with internal networks also enhances felt-obligations toward the colleagues, thereby decreasing the willingness to leave their workplace (Mossholder et al., 2005).

In external networks, strong network strength may hinder perceiving outside job alternatives which affect employees' perception of their ease of movement. According to Granovetter's (1973) strength-of-weak-ties-theory, network filled with weak-ties, characterized by infrequent interaction, short duration and low emotional closeness, are especially useful to access diverse and non-redundant information, as such network structures have advantages to interacting with people outside of their network boundaries. That is, if network structures are saturated with strong ties among network contacts, employees may be less likely to access diverse information about outside job alternatives, which deters employees' turnover process. Thus, it can be assumed that with rich psychological resources via strong intra-organizational network strength and limited informational

resources via robust extra-organizational network strength, employee's turnover intention may decrease.

Hypothesis 8. Strength of ties (8a), Internal strength of ties (8b), and External strength of ties (8c) mediates the negative relationship between employee's prevention focus and turnover intention.

2.4. The Moderating Role of Network Density

Although researchers in the field of network-turnover literatures have paid considerable attention on the effects of structural features of social relationships (e.g., Vardaman et al., 2015; Soltis et al., 2013; Ballinger et al., 2016), there is less interest in understanding the role of network density in employees' turnover process. Network density refers to the interconnectivity of structural closure of network members (Coleman, 1990). That is, the higher the network density, the more contacts in one's social network are connected with each other, and the less structural holes exist within network (Podolny & Baron, 1997). Network density is particularly relevant in the turnover research, as it influences the amount of informational resources or psychological (Burt, 2004), which affects employee turnover processes.

In line with the brokerage argument of Burt (2004), I expect that the effects of network characteristics on turnover intention will be stronger when network density is considered. Specifically, the positive relationship between network size and turnover intention will be stronger when employees have lower network density, whereas the negative relationship between strength of ties and turnover

intention will be weaker when employees have lower network density. Burt (2004) argued that employees whose networks have many structural holes have early access to large and non-redundant informational resources, which gives them competitive advantages on gathering valuable information. In the brokerage network, ties are relatively "weak" because of limited resources for developing strong relationships with many contacts (Granovetter, 1973). Suggesting the same structural explanation as did Burt (2004), Granovetter (1973) also confirmed that it is through weak ties that individuals' access to non-redundant information. Thus, employees who are embedded in brokerage network may leverage their social network to access valuable information that enhance task performance or the perception of outside job alternatives, which affects their turnover processes. Given that ego-network density represents an index of structural holes in an employee's network (Podolny & Baron, 1997), I made the following predictions:

Hypothesis 9. Network density moderates the positive relationship between network size and turnover intention, such that the relationship is stronger when network density is lower rather than higher.

Hypothesis 10. Network density moderates the negative relationship between strength of ties and turnover intention, such that the relationship is stronger when network density is higher rather than lower.

CHAPTER 3. OVERVIEW OF STUDIES

I conducted two survey studies to test the hypotheses. In Study 1, using a sample of employees in United Stated collected by Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), I examined the mediated model using total network characteristics—combining internal and external networks—and the moderating effect of network density on the relationship between network characteristics (e.g., network size and strength of ties) and turnover intention (Hypothesis 1, 2, 3a, 4a, 5a, 6a, 7a, 8, 9). Study 2 was an extension of mediated model of Study 1 using a sample of employees in South Korea. In Study 2, to fully investigate the distinct effect of network contacts located in different locations (e.g., internal and external networks), I tested the mediated effects of network characteristics, with the location of which being divided into internal and external networks, on regulatory focus and turnover intention (Hypothesis 1, 2, 3b, 3c, 4b, 4c, 5b, 5c, 6b, 6c, 7b, 7c).

CHAPTER 4. STUDY 1

4.1. Method

4.1.1. Sample Description and Procedure

The data was collected by using MTurk, which allows researchers to build customized surveys within the online platform. MTurk is widely being used to collect research samples in the field of applied psychology and organizational studies (Woo, Keith, & Thornton, 2015). According to a meta-analysis research regarding the validity of online panel samples (e.g., MTurk, Qualtrics panels, etc.), the internal and external validity of data provided by online panel were as appropriate as other convenience field samples in the field of applied psychology (Walter, Seibert, Goering, & O'Boyle., 2018). The average time for participating in the survey was about 27 minutes, and participants received as a reward for participation (\$ 2.50).

To ensure whether the participants have sufficient work experience within the work environment and long enough tenure to develop workplace networks, a screening survey was used to assess the following qualification: 1) full-time employed more than one year; 2) employed by an organization with more than 50 employees. Only qualified participants were given access to complete the battery of survey questions. Further, to detect inattentive responses (e.g., to answer without reading the question) among participants, four bogus items (e.g., I do not understand a word of English) with a clear correct answer were included. Participants who choose an incorrect answer were assumed to be responding carelessly (Meade & Craig, 2012). Participants who check more than two incorrect answers among four bogus items were removed from the final sample. Total 194

samples are used for an analysis. Sample was comprised of 123 males (63.4 %) and 71 females (36.6 %). Mean age of the sample was 35.43 years old (SD = 7.7 years). Mean organizational tenure for the sample was 7.45 years (SD = 4.85 years).

4.1.2. Measures

I used an ego-centric network approach to capture ego's instrumental networks (e.g., Smith, Collins, & Clark, 2005; Baer, 2010; Ballinger et al., 2016; Betts, 2016). Respondents are first asked to respond to a name generator question (e.g., Rodan & Galunic, 2004): "Please identify the all people at work (i.e., internal network) and outside of your work (i.e., external network) who have been the sources of professional advice and information regarding work-related issues, whom you approach if you have work-related issues or when you want advice or information on a work-related decision you have to make." The network survey allowed each participant (ego) to list up to 12 networks for each network (e.g., internal and external network). After investigating their networks, respondents were asked to respond to a set of name interpreter questions for each contact to capture the average strength of ties. Specific questions for each network variable are elucidated below. we also gave instruction: "Please also add the people to your list, even those you interact with less frequently, more informally, or less intensively", to participants in that people tend to stop generating names before including weaker contacts (Perry-Smith, 2006).

Network size. Network size (i.e., degree-centrality; Kilduff & Tsai, 2003) was calculated by the number of network contacts listed in response to the name generator question
Strength of ties. To construct an index of strength of ties, this study had employees respond to three items of assessing closeness, duration, and frequency (Granovetter, 1973): The measure of strength of ties is constructed by averaging responses to the three items assessing closeness, duration, and frequency across all contacts in an ego's network and then averaging these scores (standardized) across items (e.g., Baer, 2010). "How long have you known each individual?" (1 = Less*than one year*; 2 = 1 to 3 year, 3 = 4 to 6 years, 4 = 7 to 9 years, 5 = More than 10 *years*); "How close are you with each individual?" (1 = Acquaintance, 2 =*Distance colleague*, 3 = Friendly colleague, 4 = Close colleague, <math>5 = Very close *colleague*); "On average, how often do you talk to each individual?" (1 = Once a*year or less*, 2 = Several times a year; <math>3 = Once a month, 4 = Several times a*month*, <math>5 = Several times a week, 6 = Daily; Perry-Smith, 2006; Baer, 2010).

Network density. I asked participants to answer, "*Who knows whom in your network*?" Participants were asked to indicate whether there is any relationship among the contacts they listed by checking in a matrix indicating the relationship between alters. Then, the number of these actual ties was divided by the total number of potential ties, n (n - 1)/2. The maximum score occurs when every alter in ego's direct-tie network is connected.

Regulatory focus. The two types of regulatory focus were measured using a Neubert, Kacmar, Carlson, Chonko, & Roberts., (2008)'s Work Regulatory Focus Scale. Nine items were used to measure promotion focus (e.g., "I take chances at work to maximize my goals for advancement") as well as prevention focus (e.g., "I do everything I can to avoid loss at work.". The response scale for these questions ranges from 1(strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Turnover intention. Turnover intention was measured using a three-item scale developed by Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski & Erez (2001). Items were "Do you intend to leave the organization in the next 12 months?", "How strongly do you feel about leaving the organization within the next 12 months?" and "How likely is it that you will leave the organization in the next 12 months?". Respondents used 5-point scales (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, 1 = not at all strongly to 5 = very strongly, and 1 = not at all likely to 5 = very likely, respectively).

Control variables. When predicting network characteristics, employees' tenure, gender, and rank are controlled, as these variables affect the pattern of interaction in organizations (Mehra et al., 2001). When predicting turnover intention, this study controlled for tenure, gender as demographic variables that affect turnover processes (Griffeth et al., 2000). Further, job satisfaction and job embeddedness are also controlled since those variables can affect turnover intention (Griffeth et al., 2000). To measure job satisfaction, I utilize 3-itme scale developed by Mitchell et al (2001). Sample items included "All in all, I am satisfied with my job", and "In general, I like working here." Respondents used 5-point scales (l = not at all to 5 = extremely). Job embeddedness were measured by using global job embeddedness scale (Crossley, Bennett, Jex, & Burnfield., 2007). Sample items included "It would be difficult for me to leave this organization.", "I feel tied to this organization." The response scale for these questions ranges from 1(strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

4.2. Results

Before testing the hypotheses, I tested for the presence of common method effect since the data were collected from a single source. The confirmatory factor analysis showed that the single-factor did not fit the data (χ^2 [377] = 2367.606, CFI = . 249, TLI = . 191, RMSEA = .165, SRMR = .175). In addition, Harman's single factor test was conducted with an unrotated factor solution. The test revealed an explained variance of 21.185%, well below the threshold of 50% suggested by Podaskoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podaskoff (2003), suggesting that common method variance is not a pervasive problem in this sample.

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations of all key variables for study 2. Hypothesis 1 and 2 predicted that two types of regulatory focus differently affect turnover intention, where promotion focus would positively affect turnover intention (H1), whereas prevention focus negatively would (H2). As shown in model 2 of Table 3, after entering the control variables, results from regression analyses indicated that promotion focus was positively predicted turnover intention ($\beta = 0.49$, p < .001), whereas prevention focus negatively predicted turnover intention ($\beta = -0.25$, p < .05), thus supporting Hypothesis 1 and 2.

Table 2 presents the regression results of relationship between regulatory focus and overall network characteristics. In the support of Hypothesis 3a, the regression results indicated that promotion focus was positively related to overall network size $(\beta = 2.08, p < .001)$. However, prevention focus is not significantly related to overall network size $(\beta = 0.19, n.s.)$, thus rejecting Hypothesis 4a. In addition, promotion focus is negatively related to strength of ties of overall networks $(\beta = -$

0.24, p < .01), thus supporting Hypothesis 5a. However, the results revealed that prevention focus is not significantly related to strength of ties of overall networks ($\beta = 0.13$, *n.s.*), thus rejecting Hypothesis 6a.

As shown in Table 3, Models 3 and 4, the regression results revealed that total network size is positively related to turnover intention ($\beta = 0.03$, p < .05), whereas total strength of ties is negatively related to turnover intention ($\beta = -0.42$, p < .001). However, the results of bootstrapping mediation analysis (5,000 simulations), conducted through the Mediation package (Tingley, Yamamoto, Hirose, Keele, & Imai, 2014) in R statistical software, revealed that there were no significant mediating effects of network characteristics on regulatory focus and turnover intention. Specifically, as shown in Table 4, the results indicated that the indirect effect of promotion focus on turnover intention through total network size, is not significant (*Indirect effect* = 0.04, 95% *CI* = [-0.01, 0.11]), thus rejecting Hypothesis 8a.

Hypothesis 9 predicted that the positive relationship between network size and turnover intention is stronger when network density is low. As shown in Table 3, Model 6, network size and network density interact to predict turnover intention ($\beta = -0.19, p < .01$), I plotted simple slopes of the relationship between network size and turnover intention at high (+ 1 SD) and low (- 1 SD) of network density. As shown in Figure 2, the relationship between network size and turnover intention is positive and significant when network density is low ($\beta = 0.24, p < 0.01$) but not when network density is high ($\beta = -0.15, n.s.$). The interaction between strength of ties and network density also significantly predict turnover intention ($\beta = 0.14, p < .05$) but this result was opposed to Hypothesis 10 that the negative relationship

between strength of ties and turnover intention is stronger when network density is higher, thus rejecting Hypothesis 10. The results of the simple slope analysis, depicted in Figure 3, showed the relationship between strength of ties and turnover intention is negative and significant when network density is low ($\beta = -0.36$, p < 0.01) but not when network density is high ($\beta = -0.08$, *n.s.*).

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------|------|-------|
| 1. Age | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Tenure | .48*** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Gender | .19** | .08 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Rank | .08 | $.18^{*}$ | 12 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Job satisfaction | 27*** | .05 | .03 | .26*** | (06.) | | | | | | | |
| 7. Job embeddedness | 13 | .14 | .05 | .14 | $.60^{***}$ | (.83) | | | | | | |
| 8. Promotion focus | 22** | 05 | 07 | .14 | $.30^{***}$ | .12 | (.85) | | | | | |
| 9. Prevention focus | .19** | $.16^{*}$ | .21** | .06 | .14* | .10 | $.17^{*}$ | (.80) | | | | |
| 10. Network size | 15* | 00. | 24*** | .22** | .19** | .06 | .27*** | .02 | | | | |
| 11. Strength of ties | .37*** | .40*** | 00. | 90. | 11 | 02 | 21** | .11 | 25*** | | | |
| 12. Network density | .11 | .05 | 02 | 02 | .02 | .01 | 13 | 02 | 32*** | .37*** | | |
| 13. Turnover intention | 03 | 28*** | 12 | 07 | 52*** | 43*** | .11 | 20** | .12 | 30*** | 21** | (.93) |
| Mean | 35.43 | 7.54 | 1.37 | 2.56 | 3.99 | 3.33 | 3.74 | 4.07 | 10.29 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 2.36 |
| SD | 7.7 | 4.85 | 0.48 | 0.73 | 1.03 | 0.93 | 0.70 | 0.59 | 6.51 | 0.79 | 0.28 | 1.22 |
| <i>Note.</i> $N = 194$, Internal co | onsistency r | eliabilities | (Cronbach' | s alpha coe | fficient) are | e on the dia | gonal. * p< | <0.05, ** p< | <0.01, *** _I | ><0.001 | | |

Study 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Variables

Table 1.

Table 2.

Study 1: Regression Results of Relationships between Regulatory Focus and

| | Network Size | Strength of ties |
|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| | Model 1 | Model 2 |
| Tenure | .00 | .06*** |
| | (.09) | (.01) |
| Rank | 1.49* | .01 |
| | (.63) | (.07) |
| Gender | -2.85** | 10 |
| | (.94) | (.11) |
| Promotion focus | 2.08** | 24** |
| | (.64) | (.08) |
| Prevention focus | .19 | .13 |
| | (.79) | (.09) |
| R^2 | .15 | .20 |
| $Adj. R^2$ | .13 | .18 |
| F | 6.55*** | 9.63*** |

Network Characteristics

Note: N = 194, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 3.

| | | | Turnover | intention | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------------|----------|
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | Model 5 | Model 6 |
| Age | 01 | .00 | .00 | .01 | .01 | .01 |
| | (.01) | (.01) | (.01) | (.01) | (.01) | (.01) |
| Tenure | 05** | 05** | 03 | 03* | 04* | 03 |
| | (.02) | (.02) | (.02) | (.02) | (.02) | (.02) |
| Gender | 19 | 10 | 15 | 09 | 10 | 09 |
| | (.15) | (.15) | (.15) | (.14) | (.14) | (.14) |
| Job satisfaction | 52*** | 60*** | 58*** | 63*** | - .61*** | 62*** |
| | (.09) | (.09) | (.08) | (.08) | (.08) | (.08) |
| Job embeddedness | 19 | 16 | 17 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| | (.10) | (.09) | (.09) | (.09) | (.09) | (.08) |
| Promotion focus | | .49*** | | .39*** | .38*** | .39*** |
| | | (.10) | | (.10) | (.10) | (.10) |
| Prevention focus | | 25* | | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| | | (.12) | | (.12) | (.12) | (.11) |
| Network size | | | .03* | .02* | .02 | .05 |
| | | | (.01) | (.01) | (.01) | (.08) |
| Strength of ties | | | 42*** | 37*** | 33** | 22** |
| | | | (.10) | (.09) | (.10) | (.08) |
| Network density | | | | | 28 | 17* |
| | | | | | (.26) | (.08) |
| Network size * | | | | | | 19** |
| Network density | | | | | | (07) |
| Strength of ties * | | | | | | (.07) |
| Network density | | | | | | .14* |
| • | | | | | | (.06) |
| R^2 | .36 | .43 | .45 | .49 | .50 | .54 |
| $Adj. R^2$ | .34 | .41 | .43 | .47 | .47 | .51 |
| F | 20.85*** | 19.98*** | 21.86*** | 20.02*** | 18.17^{***} | 17.55*** |

Study 1: Regression Results of Relationships with Turnover Intention

Note: N = 194, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 4.

| | Stuc | ly 1 | | Stu | dy 2 | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| | PRO | PRE | Р | RO | P | RE | |
| | Total NS | Total ST | Internal NS | External NS | Internal ST | External ST | |
| Indirect effect | | | | | | | |
| Bootstrap estimate | .04 | 05 | 06 | .12 | 06 | .00 | |
| LL 95% CI | 01 | 13 | 16 | .03 | 14 | 04 | |
| UL 95% CI | .11 | .01 | .02 | .23 | 01 | .05 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Direct effect | | | | | | | |
| Bootstrap estimate | .39 | 22 | .21 | .21 | 26 | 26 | |
| LL 95% CI | .17 | 47 | 06 | 07 | 50 | 51 | |
| UL 95% CI | .58 | .02 | .47 | .47 | .00 | .00 | |
| Total effect | | | | | | | |
| Bootstrap estimate | .43 | 26 | .14 | .32 | 32 | 26 | |
| LL 95% CI | .23 | 52 | 12 | .05 | 57 | 51 | |
| UL 95% CI | .63 | 04 | .42 | .60 | 05 | .00 | |

Results Regarding Hypothesized Indirect Effects for Studies 1 and 2

Note. N = 194 for Study 1; N = 203 for Study 2. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000. PRO = promotion focus; PRE = prevention focus; NS = network size, ST = strength of ties; LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit.

Figure 2. The Effects of Network Size on Turnover Intention at Low and High





Figure 3. The Effects of Strength of Ties on Turnover Intention at Low and

High Levels of Network Density



4.3. Discussion

Based on the results of Study 1, I found out that different self-regulation strategies, promotion- and prevention-focus are differently related to turnover intention. Employees with stronger promotion focus are likely to have higher willingness to leave their organization, whereas those with higher prevention focus are less likely to have turnover intention. Although, the study did not find the mediating effects of regulatory focus and turnover intention through overall network characteristics, there was significant interaction effects of network density with two different network characteristics (e.g., network size and strength of ties) on turnover intention. Specifically, the study revealed that the employees with larger but less dense network were more likely to have higher turnover intention. In addition, employees with stronger tie strength and less dense network are less likely to have willingness to leave their current organization. Clearly there are important implications regarding the effect of different self-regulation strategies and network density on turnover intention. In Study 2, to closely examine the mediating effects of network characteristics in the relationship between regulatory focus and turnover intention, I tested the mediating effects of network characteristics, with the location of which being divided into internal and external networks with the different sample of Study 1.

CHAPTER 5. STUDY 2

Study 2 extends the Study 1 in two important ways. First, I further extend Study 1 by including other individual characteristics as control variables when evaluating the effect of regulatory focus on network characteristics. Specifically, I additionally controlled for sociability and shyness, which are relatively stable individual characteristics (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998), when predicting employees' network characteristics with their regulatory focus. Past research has empirically shown that sociability and shyness affect not only the size of peer network of people but also influence how much time they spent in social interaction because these personalities affect people's interaction patterns (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998). Thus, I expect that the effect of the regulatory focus on network characteristics can be evaluated more accurately by including sociability and shyness that could have confounded the relationships between regulatory focus and network characteristics.

Second, Study 2 extends Study 1 by examining the distinct effects of network contacts located in different locations (e.g., internal and external networks) on turnover intention. As I mentioned earlier, the location of contacts, within or outside of an employee's organization, is likely a critical boundary condition in the relationship between network characteristics and turnover intention. As for the network size, although I argue that both internal and external instrumental network increase employees' willingness to leave an organization, it is possible that network contacts outside of the organization are more likely to be helpful for a focal employee to have information about outside job alternatives (Porter et al., 2019, Griffeth, Steel, Allen, & Bryan., 2005). In addition to network size, the distinction between internal and external networks is also particularly relevant in

understanding the effect of strength of ties among network contacts on turnover processes. While I also maintain that the strength of ties among instrumental network contacts may decrease employees' turnover intention regardless of whether they are located within or outside of their current organizations, it is plausible that network contacts within versus outside of the organization have access to different types of resources that facilitate or hinder employees' turnover processes differently (Porter et al., 2016). Thus, in Study 2, to closely examine the distinct impact of network contacts in different locations, I test the mediated effects of network characteristics, with the location of which being divided into internal and external networks, on regulatory focus and turnover intention.

5.1. Method

5.1.1. Sample Description and Procedure

The sample consisted of 203 employees from private firms in South Korea. Sixtyfive percent of the sample were male, and 39% were married. Mean age was 33.14 year (SD = 5.97), and average organizational tenure was 4.73 years (SD = 5.58).

Data were collected in three waves to minimize common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). At Time 1, employees were asked to respond to the questions regarding regulatory focus, demographic information (e.g., age, tenure, gender, etc.), and control variables (e.g., job satisfaction, job embeddedness). Two weeks later (Time 2), the second survey was distributed to capture employees network characteristics. Finally, one month after the second survey (Time 3), employees assessed their turnover intention and other individual characteristics (e.g., sociability and shyness). Employees' personal e-mail addresses were also collected to match the data over time. Regarding response rate, 332 employees finished Survey 1, 219 completed Survey 2, and 203 completed all three surveys (Total response rate was about 65%).

5.1.2. Measures

Regulatory focus, network size, and strength of ties were measured using the same measure from the Study 1.

Internal and external social networks. For internal network contacts, I asked a following question: "Please identify the all people at work (e.g., colleagues and supervisors etc.) who have been the sources of professional advice and information regarding work-related issues, whom you approach if you have work-related issues or when you want advice or information on a work-related decision you have to make." For external network contacts, respondents were asked to respond a following question: "Please identify the all people outside of your work (i.e., external network: former colleagues, customers, suppliers etc.) who have been the sources of professional advice and information regarding work-related issues, whom you approach if you have work-related issues or when you want advice or information on a work-related decision you have to make." Same as Study 1, the network survey allowed each participant (ego) to list up to 12 networks for each location of networks. I also gave an instruction: "Please also add the people to your list, even those you interact with less frequently, more informally, or less intensively", to participants in that people tend to stop generating names before including weaker contacts (Perry-Smith, 2006).

Turnover intention. Turnover intention was measured using a four-item scale

developed by Lin, Scott, & Matta (2019). Sample Items were "I am thinking about leaving this organization" and "I am planning to look for a new job". Respondents used 5-point scales ($1 = strongly \ disagree$ to $5 = strongly \ agree$).

Control variables. When predicting network characteristics, employees' tenure, gender, and rank are controlled, as these variables affect the network pattern of interaction in organizations (Mehra et al., 2001). Unlike Study 1, I additionally added sociability and shyness as control variables when predicting network characteristics since these variables also affect network size and ties strength (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998). Sociability was measured using a five-item scale developed by Cheek & Buss (1981). Sample items were "I prefer working with others rather than alone" and "I find people more stimulating than anything else". A five-item measure developed by Asendorpf (1987) was used to measure shyness. Sample items were "I feel shy in the presence of others" and "I feel uneasy at parties and in large groups". Respondents used 5-point scales for sociability and shyness (1 = not at all to 5 = extremely).

When predicting turnover intention, I controlled for tenure, gender as demographic variables which affect turnover processes (Griffeth et al., 2000). Further, job satisfaction and job embeddedness are also controlled because these variables strongly affect turnover intention (Griffeth et al., 2000). The measure of job satisfaction and job embeddedness were used the same measures as reported in Study 1.

5.2. Results

I followed similar analysis procedures as in Study 1. Before testing the hypotheses,

I tested for the presence of common method bias in the sample of Study 2 since the data were collected from a single source. The confirmatory factor analysis showed that the single-factor did not fit the data (χ^2 [405] = 2078.534, CFI = .254, TLI = .198, RMSEA = .143, SRMR = .148). In addition, Harman's single factor test was conducted with an unrotated factor solution. The test revealed an explained variance of 17.581%, well below the threshold of 50% suggested by Podaskoff et al. (2003), suggesting that common method variance is not a major problem in this sample.

Table 5 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations of all key variables. Consistent with Study 1, as shown in Table 7, Model 2, after controlling for the control variables, regression results indicated that promotion focus is positively related to turnover intention ($\beta = 0.26$, p < .05) and prevention focus is negatively related to turnover intention ($\beta = -0.34$, p < .05). Thus, Hypothesis 1 and 2 were supported again.

Table 6 shows the results of regression analysis of the relationships between regulatory focus and network characteristics. As shown in Table 6, Models 1 and 3, promotion focus is positively related to internal network size ($\beta = 1.13, p < .01$) and external network size ($\beta = 1.25, p < .01$), thus supporting Hypothesis 3b and 3c. In contrast, regression results revealed that prevention focus is negatively related to internal network size ($\beta = -0.98, p < .01$) and external network size ($\beta = -0.98, p < .01$) and external network size ($\beta = -0.98, p < .01$) and external network size ($\beta = -0.85, p < .05$), thus supporting Hypothesis 4b and 4c. As shown in Table 6, Models 2 and 4, the regression results indicated that promotion focus is not significantly related to strength of ties of internal networks ($\beta = 0.003, n.s$) and external networks ($\beta = -0.08, n.s.$), thus rejecting Hypothesis 5b and 5c. In addition, the

results revealed that there is a positive, significant relationship between prevention focus and strength of ties of internal networks ($\beta = 0.22, p < .01$), thus supporting Hypothesis 6b. However, the relationship between prevention focus and strength of ties of external networks is not significant ($\beta = 0.19, n.s.$), thus rejecting Hypothesis 6c.

Unlike the results of Study 1 which failed to find significant mediating effects of network characteristics-combining internal and external networks-on regulatory focus and turnover intention, the regression results of Study 2, which consider the location of network contacts, revealed some significant mediating effects of network characteristics on regulatory focus and turnover intention. As shown in Table 7, Model 4, regression results indicated that internal network size $(\beta = -0.05, n.s.)$ and external strength of ties $(\beta = -0.02, n.s.)$ are not significantly related to turnover intention, thus rejecting Hypothesis 7b and 8c. However, the results showed that external network size is positively related to turnover intention $(\beta = 0.10, p < .01)$, whereas internal strength of ties is negatively related to turnover intention ($\beta = -0.28$, p < .05). The results of bootstrapping mediation analysis (5,000 simulations) indicated that the indirect effect of promotion focus on turnover intention through external network size was positive and significant (Indirect effect = 0.11, 95% CI = [0.02, 0.22]), whereas the indirect effect of prevention focus on turnover intention through internal strength of ties is negative and significant (*Indirect effect* = -0.06, 95% *CI* = [-0.14, -0.01], thus supporting Hypothesis 7c and 8b.

| | 1 | 2 | з | 4 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
|---|-------------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|----------|-----------|-------|
| 1.Age (T1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Tenure (T1) | .80*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.Rank (T1) | .80*** | .65*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Gender (T1) | 45*** | 28*** | 35*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Sociability (T3) | 00. | .01 | 01 | 02 | (.76) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Shyness (T3) | 06 | 05 | 08 | 00. | 50*** | (98) | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Job satisfaction (T1) | .25*** | .16* | .28*** | 28*** | $.16^{*}$ | 23** | (.83) | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Job embeddedness (T1) | .43*** | .35*** | .34** | 26*** | .15* | 11 | .48*** | (.82) | | | | | | | |
| 9. Promotion focus (T1) | .05 | 05 | .07 | 06 | .22** | 28*** | .36*** | .03 | (.82) | | | | | | |
| 10. Prevention focus (T1) | 04 | .06 | 11 | .15* | 03 | .15* | 19** | .10 | 25*** | (67.) | | | | | |
| 11. Internal network size (T2) | .07 | 90. | .08 | 00. | .02 | 01 | $.16^{*}$ | .06 | .24*** | 22** | | | | | |
| 12. Internal strength of ties (T2) | .39*** | .41** | .35*** | 16* | 60. | 05 | .10 | .26*** | 02 | $.16^{*}$ | -00 | | | | |
| 13.External network size (T2) | .06 | .04 | .08 | 03 | .08 | -09 | .15* | .05 | .27*** | 21** | .77*** | 12 | | | |
| 14. External strength of ties (T2) | 18* | 20** | 17* | .04 | 00. | .05 | 08 | 09 | 08 | .14 | 15* | .08 | 08 | | |
| 15. Turnover intention (T3) | 41*** | 27*** | 37*** | .38*** | 08 | .05 | 37*** | 51*** | .05 | 12 | .06 | 33*** | .14* | .02 | (.92) |
| Mean | 33.14 | 4.73 | 2.16 | 1.35 | 3.35 | 2.68 | 3.70 | 3.13 | 3.55 | 3.60 | 5.99 | 0.00 | 5.06 | 0.00 | 2.8 |
| SD | 5.97 | 5.58 | 1.19 | 0.48 | 0.62 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.69 | 0.56 | 0.54 | 2.76 | 0.68 | 2.93 | 0.74 | 1.19 |
| <i>Note:</i> N = 203, Internal consistenc Time2, T3= Time3 | y reliabili | iies (Cro | nbach's | alpha co | efficient |) are on | the diag | onal. * p∘ | <0.05, * | * p<0.0 | l, *** p< | <0.001. ⁷ | Γ1 = Tin | ie1, T2 = | |

Study 2: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Variables

Table 5.

Table 6.

| | Intern | al network | Extern | al network |
|------------------|---------|------------------|---------|------------------|
| - | Size | Strength of ties | Size | Strength of ties |
| _ | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Tenure | .05 | .03** | .03 | 03* |
| | (.05) | (.01) | (.05) | (.01) |
| Rank | .02 | $.10^{*}$ | .04 | 02 |
| | (.22) | (.05) | (.23) | (.06) |
| Gender | .42 | 06 | .21 | 09 |
| | (.42) | (.10) | (.45) | (.12) |
| Sociability | .03 | .10 | .14 | .02 |
| | (.35) | (.08) | (.37) | (.10) |
| Shyness | .35 | 00 | .08 | .01 |
| | (.30) | (.07) | (.32) | (.08) |
| Promotion focus | 1.13** | .00 | 1.25** | 08 |
| | (.36) | (.08) | (.38) | (.10) |
| Prevention focus | 98** | .22** | 85* | .19 |
| | (.37) | (.08) | (.39) | (.10) |
| R^2 | .10 | .21 | .10 | .07 |
| Adj. R^2 | .07 | .19 | .07 | .04 |
| F | 3.26** | 7.60*** | 3.16** | 2.08^{*} |

Study 2: Regression Results of the Relationship between Regulatory Focus

and Network Characteristics

Note: N = 203, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 7.

| | | Turnover | intention | |
|------------------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| - | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Age | 05* | 06** | 05* | 06** |
| | (.02) | (.02) | (.02) | (.02) |
| Tenure | .03 | .04 | .04 | $.04^{*}$ |
| | (.02) | (.02) | (.02) | (.02) |
| Gender | .44** | .47** | .44** | .47** |
| | (.16) | (.16) | (.16) | (.16) |
| Job satisfaction | 17 | 32** | 22* | 32** |
| | (.11) | (.12) | (.10) | (.11) |
| Job embeddedness | 59*** | 48*** | 55*** | 47*** |
| | (.12) | (.12) | (.12) | (.12) |
| Promotion focus | | $.26^{*}$ | | .21 |
| | | (.13) | | (.13) |
| Prevention focus | | 34* | | 26 |
| | | (.13) | | (.13) |
| Internal network | | | | |
| Size | | | 05 | 06 |
| | | | (.04) | (.04) |
| Strength of ties | | | 28* | 27* |
| | | | (.11) | (.11) |
| External network | | | | |
| Size | | | $.10^{**}$ | $.09^{**}$ |
| | | | (.04) | (.04) |
| Strength of ties | | | 02 | .01 |
| | | | (.09) | (.09) |
| R^2 | .35 | 0.39 | .41 | .43 |
| $Adj. R^2$ | .33 | 0.37 | .39 | .40 |
| F | 21.20*** | 17.69*** | 15.13*** | 13.34*** |

Study 2: Regression Results of Relationships with Turnover Intention

Note: N = 203, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

5.3. Additional analysis

To further explore the relationship between regulatory focus and network characteristics, I investigated how regulatory focus affects network characteristics over time. Given that the length of time a person has been within an organization affect the opportunities for interaction with colleagues within the organization, I focus on intra-organizational networks to find evidences that regulatory focus tends to develop different social network structures over time. In the absence of longitudinal data, I tested this argument by investigating whether the interaction of regulatory focus and organizational tenure predicted network characteristics of internal networks.

Regarding internal network size, as shown in model 3 in Table 9, regression results revealed that the longer the tenure, the more likely were high promotion focus to occupy larger network size ($\beta = 0.47, p < .05$). In addition, the longer the tenure, the more likely were low prevention focus to occupy larger network size (β = - 0.46, p < .05). These interaction terms explained an additional 4 percent of the variance in internal network size, a statistically significant improvement (p < .001) over model 2, which evaluated direct relationships between regulatory focus and internal network size while controlling for rank, gender, tenure, sociability and shyness. However, as shown in Model 6, the length of tenure did not significantly make differences to the relationship between regulatory focus and strength of ties of internal networks (promotion focus: $\beta = -0.03, n.s.$; prevention focus: $\beta = -0.07$, *n.s.*).

Figure 4 shows that strong promotion-focused employees with longer tenure tended to have larger internal network size ($\beta = 0.96$, p < .05 in simple slope test),

whereas length of time in the organization made no difference to the internal network size of weak promotion-focused employees ($\beta = 0.01, n.s.$). In addition, as shown in Figure 5, weak prevention-focused employees with longer tenure tended to construct larger internal network size ($\beta = 0.94, p < .05$), but strong-prevention-focused employees did not have significant differences in internal network size between employees with high tenure and low tenure ($\beta = 0.03, n.s.$). These results may indirectly suggest that the distinct types of regulatory focus tend to affect the construction of different social network structures over time.

Table 8.

Additional analysis: Regression Results of Interaction Effects of Tenure with

| | Inter | nal network | k size | Intern | al strength | of ties |
|-------------------------------|---------|-------------|------------|---------|-------------|-----------|
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | Model 5 | Model 6 |
| Rank | .21 | .02 | 03 | .19*** | $.10^{*}$ | .10* |
| | (.17) | (.22) | (.21) | (.04) | (.05) | (.05) |
| Gender | .17 | .42 | .41 | 05 | 06 | 06 |
| | (.44) | (.42) | (.41) | (.10) | (.10) | (.10) |
| Sociability | .09 | .03 | .02 | .12 | .10 | .12 |
| | (.36) | (.35) | (.35) | (.08) | (.08) | (.08) |
| Shyness | .29 | .35 | .31 | .03 | 001 | .005 |
| | (.31) | (.30) | (.30) | (.07) | (.07) | (.07) |
| Tenure | | .05 | .48 | | .03** | .19** |
| | | (.05) | (.26) | | (.01) | (.06) |
| Promotion focus | | 1.13** | .64** | | .003 | 003 |
| | | (.36) | (.20) | | (.08) | (.05) |
| Prevention focus | | 98** | 53** | | $.22^{**}$ | $.12^{*}$ |
| | | (.37) | (.20) | | (.08) | (.05) |
| Promotion focus * Tenure | | | .47* | | | 03 |
| | | | (.23) | | | (.05) |
| Prevention focus * Tenure | | | 46* | | | 07 |
| | | | (.20) | | | (.05) |
| R^2 | .01 | .10 | .15 | .13 | .21 | .22 |
| $Adj R^2$ | .00 | .07 | .11 | .11 | .19 | .19 |
| Changes in Adj R ² | | $.07^{***}$ | $.04^{**}$ | | $.08^{***}$ | .00 |

Regulatory Focus on Internal Network Characteristics

Note: N = 203, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Figure 4. The Effects of Tenure on Internal Network Size at Low and High





Figure 5. The Effects of Tenure on Internal Network Size at Low and High



Levels of Prevention Focus

5.4. Discussion

Study 2 also confirmed that different regulatory focus, promotion- and preventionfocus, are distinctly related to turnover intention. In addition, Study 2 found evidences that the network characteristics of network contacts located in different locations, that is within or outside of an organization, have distinct impacts on employees' turnover processes. Specifically, in internal networks, it was strength of ties among employees' colleagues that affect their turnover processes. In external networks, however, network size only influenced employees' turnover intention. Finally, these two network characteristics were somewhat dependent upon the type of self-regulation strategies, promotion- or prevention-focus, where promotion focus encouraged employees' turnover intention through external network size, whereas prevention focus encouraged their retention through strength of ties of internal networks.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION

6.1. General Discussion

Turnover has been received considerable attention in the field of business administration, as it produces substantial costs for organization. I developed and tested process model suggesting that individual characteristics and network constructs significantly matter in predicting employees' turnover processes. Integrating regulatory focus theory and network perspectives, I hypothesized and found that promotion- and prevention-focus play a distinct role in facilitating and deterring turnover processes, where promotion focus was positively associated with turnover intention, whereas prevention focus negatively was. I also found that that promotion focus affects turnover intention by constructing larger extraorganizational network contacts which affects the perception of outside job alternatives, which in turn increases turnover intention. In contrast, prevention focus influences turnover intention by developing strong ties among colleagues inside of an organization, thus decreasing employees' willingness to leave an organization. Finally, the results also showed that network density also affects turnover processes. Specifically, I found that the positive effect of network size on turnover intention were stronger in individuals who had denser network structures, and that the negative effect of strength of ties on turnover intention were weaker who are embedded in denser networks. Below, I address how these results contribute to the literature on regulatory focus theory as well as on networkturnover researches.

6.2. Theoretical Contributions

This study makes several contributions to the literature. First, I extend research on the effect of individual characteristics on employee's turnover process by arguing and finding that two types of regulatory focus distinctly affect employees' turnover intention. Prior research on regulatory focus has shown how regulatory focus matters in predicting positive outcomes such as job satisfaction, task performance, and creativity (see Lanaj et al (2012)'s meta-analysis), neglecting the relationship between regulatory focus and negative outcomes. Turnover intention, in particular, has rarely been studied as the outcome of regulatory focus. Turnover intention is a form of negative outcome that practically important for organizations, as it produces indirect costs such as deterring employee's social exchange behaviors or facilitating deviance behaviors (Mai, Ellis, Christian, & Porter., 2016). In addition, given that turnover intention is the most proximal step for actual turnover behavior (Mobley et al., 1979), it could produce direct costs such as those for selecting and training new employees (Cascio, 2006; Allen et al., 2010). By finding the fact that promotion focus was positively associated with employees' turnover intention, whereas prevention focus negatively was, this study broadens the understanding of the implications of regulatory focus on work-related outcomes.

Second, by integrating network perspectives as an explanatory framework, I build a process model that better explicates the relationships between regulatory focus and turnover intention. In line with my expectations, the current findings explicate that different types of regulatory focus predict turnover through different network characteristics. Specifically, I found that promotion focus was positively related to turnover intention via network size (*specifically, external network size*),

whereas prevention focus was negatively related to turnover intention via strength of ties (*specifically, internal strength of ties*). These results implicitly suggest that distinct types of regulatory focus may have different advantages on accessing different types of resources. That is, employees with strong promotion focus may have advantages on accessing informational resources by constructing brokerage network structures characterized by large network size and weak strength of ties. However, those with strong prevention focus may easily access to psychological resources because of their closure network structures characterized by such network features as a large proportion of strong ties and small network size. Thus, future studies should further investigate how employees' distinct regulatory focus affect their network structures that influence the amount of different types of resources (e.g., informational or psychological resources).

Third, I build on extant network-turnover literature, which has primarily focused on the network size inside of an organization (see, Porter et al., 2019), by offering not only a theoretical explanation but also empirical evidences for how the characteristics of internal and external networks affect employees' turnover processes differently. By simultaneously evaluating the role of network size and strength of ties of network contacts located in within and outside of an organization, this study helps address the issue of mixed results regarding the relationship between internal network size and employees' turnover. Specifically, I found out that, in internal networks, only strength of ties affects employees' turnover processes, whereas it was the network size that influence employees' turnover processes in external networks. These findings may suggest that internal networks are more likely to be a channel for accessing psychological resources that

deter employees' turnover processes, whereas external networks can be an important gateway to receive informational resources that facilitate such processes. Thus, future studies should consider not only different network characteristics but also the location of network contacts simultaneously when predicting employees' turnover processes.

Fourth, the present study is among the first to suggest that the interaction effect of network density with network size and strength of ties on turnover processes. Whereas prior studies have mainly focused on the direct impact of network size on employees' turnover processes (e.g., Mossholder et al., 2005; Ballinger, Cross, & Holtom, 2016, Vardaman et al., 2015), the present study found the evidences that network density also significantly affects the relationship between network size and turnover intention. Specifically, I found that the positive effect of instrumental network size on turnover intention is stronger when employees are embedded in less dense network structures, perhaps because networks with many structural holes have competitive advantages on accessing diverse and non-redundant information, which may affect the perception of outside job alternatives. In this way, the present research suggests the positive effect of network size and turnover intention can be different by how one's social networks are densely structured. Thus, future research should consider network density as a critical boundary condition that strengthen or weaken the positive effect of network size on turnover processes.

As opposed to my expectation, however, the negative effect of strength of ties on turnover intention is weaker when employees are embedded in denser networks. This contradictory result could be explicated by the logic of closure network

argued by Coleman (1990). Although dense networks may convey redundant information, Coleman (1990) found that dense networks have competitive advantages on gathering reliable information, for the dense network of closely tied individuals provides not only trust but also a sense of reciprocity that affect the quality of information. That is, a densely connected cluster of individuals may be more motivated to provide reciprocal exchange of information and may provide an easily accessible information. Given that turnover entails significant uncertainty (Griffeth & Hom, 2002), the reliability of information regarding outside job opportunities may be an important factor when employees consider leaving their organization. For example, Steel and Griffeth (1989) argued that having crystallized alternatives, defined as the concreteness of an individual's employment alternatives (Griffeth & Hom, 1988; Mitchell et al., 2001), are more likely to facilitate employees' turnover processes than having vague impressions of generalized employment alternatives, as alternatives with greater possibilities of attainment may result in higher expected value or utility. Likewise, in line with Colman's (1990) closure network logic, to the extent that network density represents the reliability of information, dense networks filled with strong ties may have competitive advantages on accessing high-quality information that may positively affect the concreteness of job alternatives. Thus, future research could assess the relative effect of brokerage networks and closure networks on turnover processes to confirm which network structures are more likely to facilitate or to deter employees' turnover processes.

Lastly, as an extend to prior researches that explicate the impact of selfregulation on network structures (e.g., Mehra et al., 2003; Pollack et al., 2015), this

study demonstrated how different types of self-regulation strategies impact on constructing distinct network structures in terms of network size and strength of ties. Based on the sample of Study 1 and Study 2, in general, employees with strong promotion focus tend to have large but weak social worlds, whereas those with strong prevention focus remains strongly tied to small number of network contacts. In addition, I also found the evidences that different types of regulatory focus differently affect the development of employees' social networks over time. These results suggest that promotion and prevention focus appear to be a significant individual characteristic that influence the construction of employees' social worlds at work. Thus, based on the empirical evidences from this study, future research could build a process model that links regulatory focus and other work-related outcomes (e.g., performance and creativity) which have traditionally emphasized the importance of employees' social networks.

6.3. Practical Implications

This study provides several implications for HR managers interested in reducing employees' turnover. The findings that strength of ties of internal network encourage employees' retention highlight the importance of offering opportunities for employees to develop emotional closeness with colleagues at work. For example, informal events, such as group lunches and company events (e.g., picnics, fairs) that enhance intimacy among organizational members would encourage employees' retention at work (Holtom, Mitchell, & Lee, 2006). In addition, HR practices, such as rotating project teams or departments, may also indirectly helpful for employees to enhance their emotional bonds with colleagues at work.

Moreover, HR practitioners interested in leveraging employee networks to manage turnover also should remember the result that external network size can facilitate employees' turnover processes. HR practices, such as attending outside conferences or professional meetings, which offer opportunities for employees to interact with people outside of an organization, may increase employees' willingness to leave their current organization. Considering that interacting with outside of an organization is an important channel for informational resources that affect higher performance and creativity (Ballinger et al., 2016; Mehra et al., 2001; Baer, 2010), it would be hard for HR manager to stop implementing such HR practices. Thus, HR managers should find a balance between HR practices that enhance emotional bonds with colleagues at work and practices that encourage interacting with people outside of an organization.

In addition, the results that two types of self-regulation strategies distinctly related to network characteristics and turnover intention provide some insights into how HR managers should differently manage employees with high promotion focus and high prevention focus. Hiring employees with promotion-focus is desirable for organizations, as they are more likely to show higher task performance and creativity than those with prevention focus (Lanaj et al., 2012). However, employees with high promotion focus may have competitive advantages on accessing informational resources because of large network size and weak strength of ties, which may increase the accessibility of information on external job alternatives. Thus, for strong promotion-focused employees, HR managers should implement HR practices that offer opportunities to develop friendship with colleagues within an organization to deter their turnover processes. In contrast,

employees with high prevention focus are likely to have small network size and strong ties among colleagues at work, which affects relatively lower performance than those with strong promotion focus (Molden, Lee, & Higgins, 2008). Thus, for employees with strong prevention focus, HR managers should implement practices that offer chances to interact with as many people as possible to enhance task performance or creativity of employees with strong prevention focus.

6.4. Limitations and Future Research

Despite its theoretical and practical implications, this study has several limitations. First, this research adopted turnover intention as a dependent variable, not actual turnover decision. Although one's intention is highly accurate predictors of behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Dalton, Johnson, & Daily, 1999), and turnover intentions in particular are frequently studied as the proximal step of turnover behavior in turnover research (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007), I do acknowledge the fact that there remains a gap between turnover intention and actual turnover behavior. Thus, future research should adopt a longitudinal research design to examine the effect of regulatory focus and network characteristics to actual turnover decision.

Second, although my three-wave time-lagged research design in Study 1 offers benefits over cross-sectional designs, I cannot unequivocally argue that the direction of causality is determined. For instance, employees with high turnover intention may get involved in external-networking behaviors in order to access external job alternatives, thereby leading to larger external network contacts in their social network. In addition, with their higher turnover intention, their

psychological contracts with organizations is distracted, which increases deviant behaviors toward their colleagues (Mai et al., 2016). Such behavioral patterns may harm the emotional bonds with their colleagues within organizations, thus exacerbating the social relationships at work. Thus, future research could better rule out the possibility of reverse causation between regulatory focus and turnover intention by using longitudinal research design in which the same measures are evaluated repeatedly over several time points.

Third, the fact that all of measures were collected from a single source presents a risk that common method variance (CMV) may have affect the results of this study. However, several aspects of this study suggest that CMV is not a major problem in interpreting the findings of this study. As suggested by Podaskoff et al. (2003), the data for Study 2 were collected in three waves to reduce biases in the retrieval stage of the response process by eliminating the saliency of any contextually provided retrieval cues. Also, the results of Harman's single factor test and confirmatory factor analysis of single-factor model, which are described in the result sections, increase my confidence that CMV is not a major driver of my observed effects. Lastly, given the fact that the interaction effects cannot be artifacts of CMV and can be severely deflated through CMV (Evans, 1985; Siemsen, Roth, & Oliveira, 2010), the presence of significant interaction effects in both studies also suggest that CMV is less likely to explain the findings of this study.

Fourth, although the statistical results regarding CMV showed that CMV is not a major issue in the sample of both studies, future studies could adopt alternative measures for employees' network characteristics to enhance the objectivity of such measures. Although I adopted ego-centric approach to capture employees' network characteristics because it is useful for understanding how an individuals' unique network structures related to variables at the individual level of analysis, such as perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors (Walker, Wasserman, & Wellman, 1993), threats to reliability and validity of such an approach could also be presented since the existence of reported relationships are not validated. Using social network services (SNS), such as Facebook, Instagram, and LinkedIn, can be one of the alternative methods to objectively capture employees' network characteristics. For example, researchers can capture employees' network size by calculating how many contacts do the employees have in their SNS account, and how many messages do they exchange with other colleagues can be used to calculate employees' strength of ties. Likewise, future studies should consider alternative methods that could increase not only the validity but also the objectivity of network measures.

Fifth, the current study focused on instrumental networks of employees because of its conceptual association with the amount of informational resources. However, there are other types of networks, that is expressive and developmental network, that may be considered in relation to employees' turnover processes. Developmental networks, *"the set of people a protege names as taking an active interest in and action to advance the protege's career by providing developmental assistance"* (Higgins & Kram, 2001, p. 268), may especially be relevant in understanding turnover processes since it affects not only career satisfaction (van Emmerik 2004; Higgins & Thomas., 2001) but also job performance (Kirchmeyer 2005), which affects turnover processes. Further, considering that such

developmental networks come from not only within an organization, but also outside organization or beyond the work domain (e.g., family and community; Dobrow, Chandler, Murphy, & Kram., 2012), future researches could further find the implications of a wider range of network contacts on turnover processes.

Lastly, the current study implicitly assumes that network size and strength of ties among network contacts offer access to informational and psychological resources. However, this study did not directly investigate mediating mechanisms between such relationships. To better understand the mechanisms through which network characteristics influence turnover processes, future research could find process models that link network characteristics and employee's turnover processes. For example, as I illustrated in this study, heightened performance and the perception of job alternatives triggered by large network size might mediate its effect on turnover intention. On the other hand, it is possible that strong strength of ties among network contacts are likely to increase organizational commitment or job embeddedness, which deters employees' turnover process. Thus, future research may also extend my findings by building a process model that explicate the distinct implications of different network characteristics on employees' turnover processes.

6.5. Summary

Based on regulatory focus theory and network perspectives, this study revealed that regulatory focus influences employees' turnover processes. In addition to the relationship between regulatory focus and turnover intention, I found that external network size and internal network strength are relevant mediators of the
relationships between regulatory focus and turnover intention. Theses mediating mechanisms were somewhat dependent upon the type of regulatory focus, promotion focus or prevention focus, as promotion focus encouraged turnover intention through external network size whereas prevention focus encouraged retention through internal network strength. In addition, this study found the evidences that network density also matters in understanding employees' turnover processes. Thus, this study explains not only the process through which regulatory focus related to turnover processes, but it also elucidates the importance of considering different network characteristics as well as the location of network contacts when investigating employees' turnover processes.

REFERENCES

- Allen DG, Bryant PC, Vardaman JM. (2010). Retaining talent: Replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, May, 48–64.
- Allen, D. G., & Griffeth, R. W. (2001). Test of a mediated performance–turnover relationship highlighting the moderating roles of visibility and reward contingency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 1014.
- Andrews, M. C., Kacmar, K. M., & Kacmar, C. (2014). The mediational effect of regulatory focus on the relationships between mindfulness and job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Career Development International*.
- Asendorpf, J. B., & Wilpers, S. (1998). Personality effects on social relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1531.
- Baer, M. (2010). The strength-of-weak-ties perspective on creativity: A comprehensive examination and extension. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 592.
- Ballinger, G. A., Cross, R., & Holtom, B. C. (2016). The right friends in the right places: Understanding network structure as a predictor of voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(4), 535.
- Barbulescu, R. (2015). The strength of many kinds of ties: Unpacking the role of social contacts across stages of the job search process. *Organization Science*, 26, 1040–1058.
- Betts, M. (2016). Antecedents of turnover intent: The role of social relationships in job embeddedness. Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Institute of Technology

Blau, P. M. (1964). Justice in social exchange. Sociological Inquiry, 34(2), 193-

206.

- Brockner, J., & Higgins, E. T. 2001. Regulatory focus theory: Implications for the study of emotions at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86: 35-66
- Burt, R. (2004). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110, 349–399.
- Burt, R. S. (1992). Structural Holes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- C. Andrews, M., Michele Kacmar, K., & Kacmar, C. (2014). The mediational effect of regulatory focus on the relationships between mindfulness and job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Career Development International*, 19(5), 494-507.
- Cascio WF. (2006). *Managing human resources: Productivity, quality of work life, profits (7th ed.)*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin/McGraw-Hill
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, *94*, S95-S120.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA:Harvard University Press.
- Cross, R., & Sproull, L. (2004). More than an answer: Information relationships for actionable knowledge. *Organization Science*, *15*(4), 446-462.
- Crossley, C. D., Bennett, R. J., Jex, S. M., & Burnfield, J. L. (2007). Development of a global measure of job embeddedness and integration into a traditional model of voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1031.
- Crowe, E., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: Promotion and prevention in decision-making. *Organizational Behavior*

and Human Decision Processes, 69(2), 117-132.

- Dalton, D. R., Johnson, J. L., & Daily, C. M. (1999). On the use of" intent to..." variables in organizational research: An empirical and cautionary assessment. *Human Relations*, 52(10), 1337-1350.
- Dobrow, S. R., Chandler, D. E., Murphy, W. M., & Kram, K. E. (2012). A review of developmental networks: Incorporating a mutuality perspective. *Journal of Management*, 38(1), 210-242.
- Ellingson, J. E., Tews, M. J., & Dachner, A. M. (2016). Constituent attachment and voluntary turnover in low-wage/low-skill service work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(1), 129
- Evans, M. G. (1985). A Monte Carlo study of the effects of correlated method variance in moderated multiple regression analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36, 305–323. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(85)90002-0
- Feeley, T. H. (2000). Testing a communication network model of employee turnover based on centrality. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 28, 262–277
- Feeley, T. H., Hwang, J., & Barnett, G. A. (2008). Predicting employee turnover from friendship networks. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 36(1), 56-73.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Friedman, R. S., & Förster, J. (2001). The effects of promotion and prevention cues on creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(6), 1001.

- Gamache, D. L., McNamara, G., Mannor, M. J., & Johnson, R. E. (2015).
 Motivated to acquire? The impact of CEO regulatory focus on firm acquisitions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4), 1261-1282.
- Granovetter, M. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78: 1360- 1380.
- Griffeth, R., & Hom, P. (1988). A comparison of different conceptualizations of perceived alternatives in turnover research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9, 103–111.
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & 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.
- Griffeth, R., & Hom, P. (Eds.). (2002). *Innovative theory and empirical research on employee turnover*. IAP.
- Griffeth, R. W., Steel, R. P., Allen, D. G., & Bryan, N. (2005). The development of a multidimensional measure of job market cognitions: The Employment Opportunity Index (EOI). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 335–349.
- Hamstra, M. R., Van Yperen, N. W., Wisse, B., & Sassenberg, K. (2011).
 Transformational- transactional leadership styles and followers' regulatory focus. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*. 10: 182-186
- Harris, T. B., Li, N., & Kirkman, B. L. (2014). Leader–member exchange (LMX) in context: How LMX differentiation and LMX relational separation attenuate LMX's influence on OCB and turnover intention. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 314-328.

- Higgins, E. T. (1997). *Beyond pleasure and pain*. American psychologist, 52(12), 1280.
- Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 1–46). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Higgins, E. T. (2001). Promotion and prevention experiences: Relating emotions to nonemotional motivational states. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Handbook of affect* and social cognition (pp.186 –211). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. *Academy of management review*, 26(2), 264-288.
- Higgins, M. C., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Constellations and careers: Toward understanding the effects of multiple developmental relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 22(3), 223-247.
- Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., & Lee, T. W. (2006). Increasing human and social capital by applying job embeddedness theory. *Organizational dynamics*, 35(4), 316-331.
- 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.
- 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.

Hoyle, R. H. (2010). Personality and self-regulation. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Handbook of personality and self-regulation* (pp. 1–18). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: a meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of applied psychology*, *92*(5), 1332.
- Idson, L. C., Liberman, N., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). Imagining how you'd feel: The role of motivational experiences from regulatory fit. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(7), 926-937.
- Jo, J., & Ellingson, J. E. (2019). Social Relationships and Turnover: A Multidisciplinary Review and Integration. *Group & Organization Management*, 44(2), 247-287.
- Jung, H. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2015). Understanding regulatory focuses: The role of employees' regulatory focus in stress coping styles, and turnover intent to a five-star hotel. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 27(2), 283-307
- Kark, R., & Van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: The role of the self- regulatory focus in leadership processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 500- 528.

Kilduff, M., & Tsai, W. (2003). Social networks and organizations. Sage.

Kirchmeyer, C. (2005). The effects of mentoring on academic careers over time:
Testing performance and political perspectives. *Human Relations*, 58(5), 637-660.

Klein, K. J., Lim, B. C., Saltz, J. L., & Mayer, D. M. (2004). How do they get there? An examination of the antecedents of centrality in team networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(6), 952-963.

- Kruglanski, A. W., Pierro, A., Higgins, E. T., & Capozza, D. (2007). "On the move" or "staying put": Locomotion, need for closure, and reactions to organizational change. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37,
- Lanaj, K., Chang, C. H., & Johnson, R. E. (2012). Regulatory focus and workrelated outcomes: a review and meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 138(5), 998.
- Leon, M., Bellairs, T., & Halbesleben, J. R. (2015). The impact of regulatory focus on employee turnover and performance throughout a merger. *In Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2015, No. 1, p. 17834). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Liem, R., & Liem, J. (1978). Social class and mental illness reconsidered: The role of economic stress and social support. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 139-156.
- Lin, S. H., Scott, B. A., & Matta, F. K. (2019). The dark side of transformational leader behaviors for leaders themselves: A conservation of resources perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(5), 1556-1582.
- Maertz Jr, C. P., & Campion, M. A. (2004). Profiles in quitting: Integrating process and content turnover theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(4), 566-582.
- Mai, K. M., Ellis, A. P., Christian, J. S., & Porter, C. O. (2016). Examining the effects of turnover intentions on organizational citizenship behaviors and

deviance behaviors: A psychological contract approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(8), 1067.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). Organizations. New York, NY: Wiley.

- Markovits, Y., Ullrich, J., Van Dick, R., & Davis, A. J. (2008). Regulatory foci and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73, 485–489.
- Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods*, *17*(3), 437.
- Mehra, A., Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. (2001). The social networks of high and low self-monitors: Implications for workplace performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(1), 121-146.
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablynski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *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.
- 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.
- Molden, D. C., & Hui, C. M. (2011). Promoting de-escalation of commitment: A regulatory- focus perspective on sunk costs. *Psychological Science*, 22(1), 8-12.
- Molm, L. D., & Cook, K. S. (1995). Social exchange theory. Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology, 209-35.

- Mossholder, K. W., Settoon, R. P., & Henagan, S. C. (2005). A relational perspective on turnover: Examining structural, attitudinal, and behavioral predictors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(4), 607-618.
- Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2008). The ties that bind: Social networks, person-organization value fit, and turnover intention. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 205-227.
- Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008). Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1220.
- Perry-Smith, J. E. (2006). Social yet creative: The role of social relationships in facilitating individual creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1), 85-101.
- Podolny, J. M., & Baron, J. N. (1997). Resources and relationships: Social networks and mobility in the workplace. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 673–693
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 438–454.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003).
 Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879.

- Pollack, J. M., Forster, W. R., Johnson, P. D., Coy, A., & Molden, D. C. (2015).
 Promotion and prevention-focused networking and its consequences for entrepreneurial success. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 6(1), 3-12.
- Porter, C. M., Woo, S. E., & Campion, M. A. (2016). Internal and external networking differentially predict turnover through job embeddedness and job offers. *Personnel Psychology*, 69(3), 635-672.
- Porter, C. M., Woo, S. E., Allen, D. G., & Keith, M. G. (2019). How do instrumental and expressive network positions relate to turnover? A metaanalytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(4), 511.
- Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1981). A causal model of turnover for nurses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3), 543-565.
- Regts, G., & Molleman, E. (2016). The moderating influence of personality on individual outcomes of social networks. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 89, 656-682. doi:10.1111/joop.12147
- Roberts, K. H., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1979). Some correlations of communication roles in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22(1), 42-57.
- Rodan, S., & Galunic, C. (2004). More than network structure: How knowledge heterogeneity influences managerial performance and innovativeness. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(6), 541-562.
- Scholer, A. A., & Higgins, E. T. (2010). Regulatory focus in a demanding world. In
 R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Handbook of personality and self-regulation* (pp. 291–314). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Siemsen, E., Roth, A., & Oliveira, P. (2010). Common method bias in regression

models with linear, quadratic, and interaction effects. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13, 456-476.

- Smith, K. G., Collins, C. J., & Clark, K. D. (2005). Existing knowledge, knowledge creation capability, and the rate of new product introduction in hightechnology firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(2), 346-357.
- Soltis, S. M., Agneessens, F., Sasovova, Z., & Labianca, G. (2013). A social network perspective on turnover intentions: The role of distributive justice and social support. *Human Resource Management*, 52(4), 561-584.
- 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.
- Steel, R. P., & Lounsbury, J. W. (2009). Turnover process models: Review and synthesis of a conceptual literature. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(4), 271-282.
- Tingley, D., Yamamoto, T., Hirose, K., Keele, L., & Imai, K. (2014). Mediation: R package for causal mediation analysis.
- Van Emmerik, I. H. (2004). The more you can get the better. *Career development international.*
- Van Hoye, G., & Lievens, F. (2009). Tapping the grapevine: A closer look at wordof-mouth as a recruitment source. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 341.
- Vardaman, J. M., Taylor, S. G., Allen, D. G., Gondo, M. B., & Amis, J. M. (2015). Translating intentions to behavior: The interaction of network structure and behavioral intentions in understanding employee turnover. *Organization Science*, *26*(4), 1177-1191.

- Wallace, J. C., Johnson, P. D., & Frazier, M. L. (2009). An examination of the factorial, construct, and predictive validity and utility of the regulatory focus at work scale. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 30(6), 805-831.
- Walker, M. E., Wasserman, S., & Wellman, B. (1993). Statistical models for social support networks. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 22(1), 71-98.
- Walter, S. L., Seibert, S. E., Goering, D., & O'Boyle, E. H. (2019). A tale of two sample sources: Do results from online panel data and conventional data converge?. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *34*(4), 425-452.
- Woo, S. E., Keith, M., & Thornton, M. A. (2015). Amazon Mechanical Turk for industrial and organizational psychology: Advantages, challenges, and practical recommendations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 171-179.
- Zimmerman, R. D. (2008). UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT OF PERSONALITY TRAITS ON INDIVIDUALS'TURNOVER DECISIONS: A META-ANALYTIC PATH MODEL. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*(2), 309-348.
- Zimmerman, R. D., Swider, B. W., Woo, S. E., & Allen, D. G. (2016). Who withdraws? Psychological individual differences and employee withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(4), 498.
- Zou, X. (2009). Social networks and subjective well-being: Regulatory fit
 between self- regulation and network structure. Doctoral dissertation,
 Columbia University

Zou, X., Ingram, P., & Higgins, E. T. (2015). Social networks and life satisfaction:

The interplay of network density and regulatory focus. Motivation and

Emotion, *39*(5), 693-713.

요약 (국문초록)

조절 초점과 이직 의도의 관계: 직원의 네트워크 특성을 중심으로

서울대학교 대학원

경영학과 경영학 전공

이한호

기존의 조직 행동 및 인사 관리 분야의 조절 초점(regulatory focus) 연구에 따르면 조절 초점은 직원들의 직무 관련 태도와 행동에 영향을 미치며, 일반적으로 직원의 향상 초점(promotion focus)이 예방 초점(prevention focus)에 비해 조직에 더 많은 이점을 제공할 수 있다 는 점을 밝혀 내왔다. 그러나 조절 초점이 직원의 이직에 미치는 영향에 대해서는 아직도 충분한 이해가 부족한 실정이다. 본 연구는 직원의 도 구적 네트워크(Instrumental network) 특성을 중심으로 조절 초점이 이 직 의도에 미치는 영향을 밝혀내고자 한다. 연구 1은 194명의 직원을 대상으로 실증하였고, 조절 초점과 이직 의도 간의 관계에서 직원들의 도구적 네트워크 특성 (네트워크 크기, 네트워크 강도)의 매개 효과 및 네트워크 밀도의 조절 효과를 확인하였다. 여구 2는 206명의 직원을 대 상으로 실증하였으며, 직원의 전체 도구적 네트워크 특성을 활용한 연구 1을 확장하여 직원이 맺고 있는 네트워크를 조직 내부 및 외부로 나누 어 각각의 네트워크 특성들의 매개 효과를 확인하였다. 분석 결과, 향상 초점이 높은 직원들은 조직 외부에 많은 네트워크를 맺고 있었으며 이 는 직원의 이직 의도를 상승시키는 것을 확인하였다. 그러나 예방 초점

이 높은 직원의 경우는 조직 내부의 네트워크 강도가 높은 것으로 나타 났으며, 이러한 네트워크 특성은 직원의 이직 의도를 감소 시키는 것을 확인하였다. 본 연구는 조절 초점이 개인의 네트워크를 구축하는 데 있 어서 영향을 미칠 수 있음을 확인했을 뿐만 아니라, 직원의 조절 초점과 도구적 네트워크 특성이 이직에 영향을 줄 수 있음을 확인했다는 점에 서 의의가 있다.

주요어: 조절 초점, 네트워크, 이직 의도 학번: 2018-26352