

Effect of Employee's Life Events on Organizational Withdrawal Behaviors

Anthony H. Brown, PhD

Abstract

Research on the impact of employees' life events as possible effects on organizational withdrawal behaviors (OWBs) unveiled that **employees' personal distractions ultimately could lead them to voluntary or involuntary turnover**. Employees' better health and economic status were factors that impacted employees' currently working.

Problem

There exist significant research on employees' role performance and job satisfaction. Yet, research is **underdeveloped on the relationship of life events effects on the turnover process** (Bhagat, 1983; Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Ostermann et al., 1999).

Prior to this, research no study have identified the relationship between **employees' personal life events** and **organizational withdrawal behaviors**. Identification of such a relationship could further operationalize the process of turnover by revealing **what could impact changes in employee behavioral patterns** (Hanisch, 1995, 2000; Hulin, Roznowski, & Hachiya, 1985; Locke & Latham, 2004).

Purpose

The intent of the study was to research, test, and accept the hypotheses that the life events of employees do not predict OWBs. The research provided an **understanding of the likely origin and nature of OWBs, as operationally defined by Hanisch (2000)**. It also posited **that in theory CDT and UNT does not modify life events impact on employees OWBs**. The modifier was meant to modify the relationship of the IVs on the DV (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000). **In this study, life events (IVs) were used to predict employees' OWBs (DV), with CDT and UNT serving as the influencers (i.e., modifiers of the predicted impact)..**

Relevant Literature

Bhagat's (1983) utilization of the Holmes and Rahe's (1967) Social Readjustment Rating Scale help **form the suggestion that an alternative theory** could add support for the prediction of life events effect on employees' performance.

Hanisch and Hulin (1991) developed theoretical articles concluding that **aggregated data could operationally identify the process of withdrawal behaviors**, and define them as OWBs.

Ostermann et al. (1999) developed an international multidimensional Situation, Work, and Self (SWS) survey model. **That proposed a multiple antecedent causal effect**.

The theories of **crisis decision theory (CDT)** and **uncertainty navigation theory (UNT)** proposed by Sweeny, 2008; Sweeny and Cavanaugh, 2010, **addressed the call for a new theory** (Bhagat, 1983). Their use was as moderators predicted to enhance the relationship between the decision processes to a negative event, and the array of strategies people use to navigate difficult life pattern changes on OWBs.

Research Questions

RQ1 Do the marital, family, health, and life event changes of employees impact OWBs?

RQ2 Do the marital, family, health, and life event changes of employees influence attitudes that impact OWBs?

RQ3 Do the marital, family, health, and life event changes of employees influence expectations that impact OWBs?

Procedures

Data collection consisted of **12,686 participants** from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLYS79) archival database. Data cleaning and reduction processes, resulted in an overall sample size of **7,656 participants** use to test the RQ and Hypotheses. Of the original 1979 data sample, only a measure of 58.9% was used, with (62.0%) women and (57.2%) of men. Two decades of attrition resulted in a greater drop among Caucasians (49.8%) than African Americans (31.1%) and Hispanics (19.1%).

Data Analysis

Life event changes were hypothesized in terms of being **better predictors** (Model Fit) over the (Null or Intercept) only model. Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), was used to determine the model fit of the null model with predictors and determined RQ1 had an overall better fit over the intercept (null) model. A Chi-Square test substantiated that finding ($p < .001$).

Findings

The respective null hypotheses for each of the RQs were assessed using logistic regression (LR).

- RQ1 The LR model resulted in the null hypothesis being **rejected** because it suggested **employees' with better health and economic status had a greater chance of currently working than those with poorer health**.
- RQ2 The LR model resulted in the null hypothesis being **accepted for failing to show** that **chronic condition** representing employee attitude influenced by life events did not **add to the impact of OWBs**.
- RQ3 The LR model resulted in the null hypothesis being **accepted for failing to show** perceptions of uncertainty navigation have a moderator effect on the potential **effect of life events impact to employees OWBs**.

Limitations

The archived database imposed some limitations because the researcher had **no control** over how the data were collected. In addition, the researcher had **no access to the respondents**, and no ability to select **or influence the instruments** and/or the scoring and coding of the data. These limitations had some impact on the **ability of the researcher to conduct a systematic analysis**.

Default data cleaning methods, transformation, and participant reduction imposed limitations on the viability of the data set.

Conclusions

The study established that when framing life events as the IVs, employee OWBs are not only impacted by job dissatisfaction, organizational demands, or the lack of organizational justice but also **support the measure of multiple antecedents**. This added support narrows the identification of the problem, **and aid in the classification of dose-response relationships as being the process effect that impacts OWBs**:

Social Change Implications

Organizations that understand the impact of life events on OWBs likely are more aware of ways to **better manage employees** who experience stressful situations or other experiences that can have a negative influence on the work environment. They also **see the benefit of developmental opportunities** that could reduce the cost of managing turnover by offering **training programs** that allow employees **to learn** and apply **evidence-based interventions** to manage the effects of negative life events, **thus decreasing imbalances between life and work**.

John Schmidt Committee, Chair; *David Kriska*, Committee Member, and *Richard Thomlinson*, URR Member