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ABSTRACT

Porter, Caitlin M. M.S., Purdue University, May 2013. Differential Relationships of Internal and External Networking Behaviors With Turnover. Major Professor: Sang Eun Woo.

Although networking behaviors are proven to be beneficial for career success, less is known about how networking influences organizational outcomes such as turnover. Using a professional and an academic sample of “stayers” and “leavers”, the present study addresses how two types of networking behaviors, networking focused either internal or external to the organization, differentially influence the voluntary turnover process. Data gathered from “stayers” suggested that internal networking behaviors were positively associated with perceived desirability of movement (i.e., job satisfaction), whereas external networking behaviors were associated with perceived (i.e., perceived employment opportunity) and actual (i.e., job offers) ease of movement. For “leavers”, external networking positively related to attitude-driven turnover, whereas internal networking positively related to opportunity-driven turnover. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.
INTRODUCTION

Professionals often hail networking as essential for career success (e.g., Cross & Thomas, 2011). Indeed, research has shown networking to be useful for predicting both intrinsic (e.g., career satisfaction) and extrinsic (e.g., increased salary, promotions) career success outcomes (Forret & Dougherty, 2004; Wolff & Moser, 2009, 2010). Moreover, networking for career success has the potential to generate alternative job opportunities (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009).

Surprisingly, scant research has focused on the voluntary turnover resulting from such network-instigated job opportunities. Related research has revealed both positive and negative relationships between networking behaviors and “change of employer” (Wolff & Moser, 2010). These contradictory findings may be due to the breadth of the “change of employer” criterion; it fails to distinguish between voluntary and involuntary turnover and between the various forms that voluntary turnover might take. In addition, whether one engages in voluntary turnover may be influenced by the type of networking behavior employed.

On one hand, researchers have proposed that networking behaviors develop career competencies (e.g., “knowing-whom”), which lead to increased employability (DiRenzo & Greenhaus, 2011) and job offers (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009). On the other hand, network connections may promote retention because they provide
instrumental (e.g., job-related information) and emotional (e.g., support) resources that increase positive attitudes toward the job/organization (Morrison, 2002; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Clearly, questions remain regarding how networking behaviors influence turnover processes and outcomes.

The current article attempts to elucidate the possible linkages between networking and voluntary turnover by differentiating between 1) internal versus external networking behaviors (Wolff & Moser, 2006; 2010; Michael & Yukl, 1993), and 2) attitude-driven versus opportunity-driven turnover (Hom, Lee, Mitchell, & Griffeth, 2012; Lee & Mitchell, 1994). Networking behaviors are defined as “behaviors aimed at building, maintaining, and using relationships that possess the (potential) benefit of facilitating work-related activities of individuals by voluntarily granting access to resources and maximizing common advantages” (Wolff & Moser, 2009, pp. 196-197). Internal networking behavior is networking with people who are members of the organization in which one is employed; external networking behavior is networking with people outside of the organization (Michael & Yukl, 1993). Distinguishing between internal and external networking behaviors is crucial, because they differentially relate to factors underlying voluntary turnover decisions (i.e., turnover antecedents) and thus different types of turnover.

**Networking Behaviors and Turnover Antecedents**

March and Simon (1958) proposed that employees are motivated to leave their organizations when perceived desirability and ease of movement are high. Perceived desirability of movement, also known as the “push” factor, is roughly translated into
job dissatisfaction, and perceived ease of movement, or the “pull” factor, is often represented by perceived availability of alternatives (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008). Succeeding turnover theories have converged on the importance of these two factors in the turnover process (Steel & Lounsbury, 2009; Hom et al., 2012). Further, the theoretical and practical significance of these forces has been repeatedly empirically validated (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). Although more recent turnover models recognize additional turnover antecedents (e.g., Lee & Mitchell, 1994), turnover researchers continue to focus on the “push” and “pull” factors, signifying that these seminal constructs represent essential features of the turnover process.

In order to clarify the role of networking behavior in the turnover process, I propose that two types of networking behaviors, internal and external, uniquely influence the “push” and “pull” factors. Specifically, internal networking behaviors inhibit the turnover process by reducing the “push” factor (i.e., decreasing the desirability of movement). On the other hand, external networking behaviors facilitate turnover by fostering the “pull” factor (i.e., increasing ease of movement). Detailed arguments for these suggestions follow.

First, I suggest that internal networking behaviors positively influence factors that promote positive workplace reactions, such as job satisfaction, via socio-emotional mechanisms. For example, building, maintaining, and using connections with coworkers cultivates exchange relationships and perceptions of social support, bolstering job satisfaction (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Igwebuike, 1998). Moreover, supportive and frequent coworker interactions develop a
sense of “fit” between employees’ social needs and what the organization provides; such fit perceptions are positively related to job satisfaction (Cable & DeRue, 2002). In support of the importance of fit to positive workplace reactions, other work attachment constructs (i.e., organizational embeddedness) recognize “fit” as a theoretically significant factor that influences employees’ desire to stay at their employing organizations (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001).

In addition, internal networking leads to increased job satisfaction by providing instrumental resources. For example, internal networking relates to the receipt of extrinsic rewards, such as promotions and salary increases (Wolff & Moser, 2009, 2010). Workplace rewards have been shown to positively relate to job satisfaction (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Kosteas, 2011). Further, the receipt of rewards boosts perceptions of organizational support, which relates to higher job satisfaction (Rhodes & Eisenberger, 2002). Finally, network connections within an organization provide information and resources that enable employees to better adhere to job demands and perform well (Higgins & Kram, 2001; Morrison, 2002). High performance, in turn, relates to higher job satisfaction as well as workplace rewards that promote job satisfaction (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). Therefore, I hypothesize the following:

**H1:** Internal networking behaviors positively relate to job satisfaction.

Second, I expect external networking behaviors to contribute to perceived and actual ease of movement (i.e., strengthen the “pull” factor) for several reasons. For example, external networking may be used to stay abreast of potential job opportunities
or to obtain alternative employment (Steel, 2002). These outcomes result from the exchange of information, an inevitable by-product of network relationships (Granovetter, 1973). External networking likely involves the exchange of job-related information, such as information about alternative job opportunities (Granovetter, 1995; Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009). This information provides a better understanding of the labor market and whether alternative opportunities exist for the networker (Griffeth, et al., 2005).

In addition, external networking behaviors may lead to the attainment of actual job offers. External networking may produce job offers because it is an effective job search strategy (Kanfer, Wanberg, & Kantrowitz, 2001; Wanberg, Kanfer, & Banas, 2000). Not surprisingly, research has shown that networking behaviors focused on job search activities positively predicted the number of subsequent job offers received (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009). Further, external networking may be effective in obtaining job offers because it results in the development of career competencies (i.e., “knowing who”) through broadening a network of professional contacts across organizations, improving networkers' employability (DiRenzo & Greenhaus, 2011). Finally, external networkers may be more attractive candidates to alternative employers than those who do not network. Networkers are more likely to receive job-relevant information than non-networkers, including instrumental information that leads to higher performance (Morrison, 2002; Sparrowe, Liden, Wayne, & Kraimer, 2001). Highly performing networkers may “advertise” their qualifications through external networking behaviors, facilitating the receipt of job offers (Allen & Griffeth, 2001). Based on these arguments, I propose the following hypotheses:
H2: External networking behaviors positively relate to perceived employment opportunities.

H3: External networking behaviors positively relate to job offers.

Networking Behaviors and Turnover Types

According to contemporary turnover theories (e.g., Hom et al., 2012), multiple pathways to turnover (Lee & Mitchell, 1994) or multiple types or forms of turnover exist (Maertz & Campion, 2004; Maertz & Kmitta, 2012). Among the types, attitude-driven and opportunity-driven turnover are the most frequent (Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel, & Hill, 1999; Maertz & Campion, 2004; Maertz & Kmitta, 2012). Attitude-driven turnover is consistent with traditional turnover models (e.g., Mobley et al., 1979; Hom et al., 1992): an employee grows dissatisfied with the job (i.e., increased “push”), actively searches for alternative jobs, and quits when an acceptable alternative is found (i.e., increased “pull”). On the other hand, opportunity-driven turnover represents a modern approach to career management. In this case, employee attitudes are not the motivating force for quitting; instead, an unsolicited job offer or inquiry triggers initial thoughts of quitting, and, if the job offer/inquiry is more attractive than the current job, turnover occurs (Hom et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2008).

Building on earlier discussions of the relationships between (internal and external) networking behaviors and turnover antecedents, here I discuss how the aforementioned two turnover types may be differentially predicted by internal and external networking behaviors. By examining this topic, the current study is intended to make a few potentially important contributions to the theoretical development and
the practical application of turnover research. First, examining differential links between networking behaviors and turnover types elucidates the nomological net surrounding the “expanded turnover criterion” (Hom et al., 2012), which provides further construct validity evidence for the specific types of turnover. To date, little effort has been made to predict multiple types of voluntary turnover. One exception is Maertz and Campion’s (2004) research, which provided an integrative framework for linking “whys” and “hows” of turnover. Their study suggested that eight motivational forces of attachment and withdrawal (e.g., affective, alternative, calculative; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004) were differentially associated with four distinct turnover types (e.g., impulsive, preplanned). The present study goes beyond this literature in that networking behavior is considered a distal, behavioral predictor of multiple turnover types, whereas motivational forces are conceptualized as the most proximal causes (or motives) of turnover decisions (Woo & Maertz, 2012).

Another related concept regarding the differential prediction of turnover types/pathways is Lee and Mitchell’s (1994) concept of “shocks,” defined as discrete events that initiate thoughts of quitting. Shocks theoretically characterize three out of four quit pathways hypothesized in Lee and Mitchell’s unfolding model of voluntary turnover. In addition to shocks, networking behaviors may be useful for discriminating among quitting types because they could function to initiate shocks (e.g., networking may lead to an unsolicited job offer; Lee, Gerhart, Weller, & Trevor, 2008) or to cushion shocks (i.e., akin to the “links” component of organizational embeddedness; Mitchell et al., 2001). Therefore, networking behaviors may influence turnover decisions beyond shocks or may in fact serve as a catalyst for a subsequent shock.
Also, understanding factors influencing specific turnover types will help organizations develop specialized preventive interventions for minimizing dysfunctional turnover (Woo & Maertz, 2012). For example, if an organization suffers from opportunity-driven turnover, it may decide to implement succession planning programs to promote employees’ expectations of future success and provide advancement opportunities. Employees most at risk for opportunity-driven quitting, presumably good performers, may be recognized and groomed for future roles, rather than grow despondent or seek advancement opportunities elsewhere.

From both a theoretical and practical standpoint, attitude- and opportunity-driven turnover types are particularly suitable for intervention because they are more avoidable than other forms of turnover (Maertz & Campion, 2004). Research shows that employees evaluate dissatisfaction-induced reasons and opportunity-related reasons (e.g., higher wages, career opportunity) for leaving as avoidable (Campion, 1991). Further, supervisors identify turnover for opportunity-related reasons as dysfunctional for the organization (Campion, 1991). For practitioners seeking to reduce turnover, the study of these turnover types is particularly informative.

**Attitude-Driven Turnover**

Attitude-driven turnover is characterized by active job search, which is primarily motivated by dissatisfaction with the current employer. I expect internal networking behaviors, but not external networking behaviors, to be related to attitude-driven turnover in a negative direction. Internal networking behavior should reduce the likelihood of attitude-driven turnover because of its positive influence on job satisfaction. As discussed above, those who engage in internal networking behavior
tend to be better adjusted, embedded, and supported within the organization, leading to higher job satisfaction. Satisfied employees are not likely to actively search for alternative jobs, because desirability of movement is weak. On the other hand, I do not expect external networking behavior to directly influence attitude-driven turnover. Whereas external networking behavior may aid ease of movement by increasing one’s visibility to other organizations, it is unlikely to influence the “push” factor that contributes to attitude driven turnover. Therefore, I hypothesize that:

**H4:** Internal networking behaviors negatively predict attitude-driven turnover.

**Opportunity-Driven Turnover**

I expect both internal and external networking behaviors to positively influence opportunity-driven turnover. Intraorganizational contacts (i.e., internal networks) provide informational support, enabling employees to perform better (Morrison, 2002; Higgins & Kram, 2001; Sparrowe, Liden, Wayne, & Kraimer, 2001). High performance, in turn, increases the potential for unsolicited job offers from other organizations (Allen & Griffeth, 1999). Further, if an organization does not sufficiently reward its high performing employees (i.e., promotion, increased compensation), employees may view career opportunities at other organizations to be more attractive (Feldman & Ng, 2007; Trevor, Gerhart, & Boudreau, 1997). For example, being passed over for a promotion may act as a shock that triggers thoughts of leaving (Ford, Truxillo, & Bauer, 2009). Further, if an employee does not believe that they can achieve their career goals at their current employing organization, s/he may be
motivated to seek alternative employment where career goals are more likely to be met (calculative force; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004).

Also, as discussed in the previous section, external networking enhances visibility to alternative employers, which may lead to unsolicited job offers or inquiries. An unsolicited job offer may function as a shock that leads to thoughts of leaving (Lee, et al., 2008). Additionally, networkers may rely upon external connections for job-related information, information used to “keep one’s options open”. Information about alternative jobs could trigger comparisons between one’s current job and potential alternatives. If an alternative job is found to be superior to one’s current role, one may seek alternative job opportunities and quit when an acceptable alternative is found (Maertz & Campion, 2004). Based on these arguments, I propose the following hypotheses:

**H5a:** Internal networking behaviors will positively predict opportunity-driven turnover.

**H5b:** External networking behaviors will positively predict opportunity-driven turnover.
METHOD

Participants and Procedure

I collected data from two industry samples: Human Resource Professionals and Academics. Both industries were thought to require networking behavior for career success. Sample characteristics are detailed below.

Sample 1: Professionals

I identified 3,741 IO psychologists working in applied settings for at least two years and contacted them to participate in an online survey; 540 individuals completed the survey for a response rate of 15.6%. After removing respondents who were not working in applied IO settings, the final sample size was 436. Fifty-seven percent of respondents were female. About 88% were White, 4% were Asian, 3% were Hispanic, and 2% were Black. Fifty-nine percent of participants had a doctorate, 33% had a Master’s degree, and 8% had a professional degree.

Among these, 342 had been with the same organization for the past two years, I refer to them as the “Stayers” sample; 78 voluntarily left their employing organization within the past two years, I refer to them as the “Leavers” sample. For the Stayers sample, our survey included measures of their current networking behaviors, job satisfaction, perceived employment opportunity, and whether they had recently received a job offer. For the Leavers sample, I included questions about their
networking behaviors, job satisfaction, and job search behaviors, all referenced at the time of employment at the previous organization. The last two variables were used to classify respondents into attitude-driven versus opportunity-driven turnover categories (more details are provided below under turnover types).

Sample 2: Academics

To generate a “Stayer” sample, I contacted 1,262 faculty members all from the same university ranked associate professor and lower to participate in an online survey about their networking behaviors. One hundred fourteen participants completed the survey for a response rate of nine percent. Respondents’ average age was 43; 53% were female. About 81% were White, 8% were Asian, 6% were Hispanic, and 3% were Black.

To generate a “Leaver” sample, I used public records to identify faculty members that had left the university within the past three years. I contacted 245 former faculty members via email to complete an online survey about their networking behavior at their former university; 33 completed the survey for a response rate of 13.5%. Respondents’ average age was 43; 61% were female. About 78% were white, 9% were Asian, and 6% were Black. Among these respondents, only 16 reported having the option to remain at the university at the time they left. The measures used for the Academic sample were identical to those used for the Professional sample.
Measures

Control Variables

I controlled for gender, years of work experience, organizational tenure, and organization size because they have been shown to relate to turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000) or networking outcomes (Wolff & Moser, 2010).

Networking Behaviors

In order to measure internal and external networking behaviors, I used 18 items selected from the 44-item scale developed by Wolff and colleagues (Wolff & Moser, 2006; Wolff, Schneider-Rahm, & Forret, 2011). The original 44-item scale was developed based upon two structural facets of internal and external networking, as well as three functional facets of building, maintaining, and using contacts. Each item represents a specific networking behavior capturing one of the structural facets and one of the functional facets. The frequency of each behavior was rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (never/very seldom) to 4 (very often/always). For the purpose of our study, I focused on the distinction between internal and external networking behaviors and chose 9 items for each construct using factor analytic techniques detailed below.

Item reduction. Using an online marketplace for work, Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk), I made available an online survey in which individuals may participate for a nominal reward, $2.00 USD. 370 participants completed the survey. Participants’ average age was 36 and 65% were female. About 77% were White, 8% were Asian, 8% were Black, and 4% were Hispanic. About 34% had a bachelor’s degree, 30% had attended some college or earned an Associates Degree, 18% had an advanced degree
Initially, I ran a principle axis factor analysis with a promax rotation of both internal and external networking items. The functional similarities of the networking behavior items (e.g., building items from both internal and external facets) caused items of different structural facets to form separate factors. As this was not consistent with our underlying theory or purpose, I ran a factor analysis on the internal networking items and the external networking items separately.

I ran a principle axis factor analysis with a promax rotation on the internal networking behavior items based upon a sample size of 365. Three factors emerged with Eigenvalues greater than one. This is consistent with the theory underlying the development of these items; internal networking behaviors have three facets: building, maintaining, and using. I examined the initial communalities to identify those items that accounted for the largest portion of the variance in the internal networking variable (Hinkin, 1998). Nine items were retained based upon the initial communality loadings (ranging from .483 to .611). I included items from all three facets of networking behavior in order to adequately sample from the internal networking behaviors construct. Then, I ran an additional principle axis factor analysis on the retained items, forcing a one-factor solution. About 44% of the variance in the items was explained by the internal networking behaviors variable. The alpha reliability of the final nine items was .87.

I conducted a similar procedure for the external networking behaviors scale. I ran a principle axis factor analysis with a promax rotation. Two factors emerged with
Eigenvalues greater than one; the third factor had an Eigenvalue slightly below one. Again, I examined the initial communalities (ranging from .498 to .680) and retained nine items. Then, I ran an additional principle axis factor analysis on the retained items, forcing a one-factor solution. About 47% of the variance in the items was explained by the external networking behaviors variable. The alpha reliability of the final nine items was .88. The revised internal and external networking behavior scales are in Table 1.

Using the current dataset, confirmatory factor analysis of the selected items revealed that a two-factor model with separate internal and external networking factors fit the data significantly better ($\chi^2 = 39.36$, $df = 8$, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .10) than a one-factor model ($\chi^2 = 374.46$, $df = 9$, CFI = .73, RMSEA = .31), supporting our distinction between internal and external networking types.

**Job Satisfaction**

Stayers’ job satisfaction was measured with the 8-item Abridged Job in General scale (Russell, Spitzmuller, Lin, Stanton, Smith, & Ironside, 2004).

**Perceived Employment Opportunity**

Stayer’s perceived employment opportunity was measured using a 3-item Ease of Movement subscale from the Employment Opportunity Index that captured perceived availability of alternatives (Griffeth, Steel, Allen, & Bryan, 2005).

**Job Offer**

Whether or not stayers had recently received job offers was assessed using the following question: “Within the past six months, have you received one or more job offers?” (yes = 1, no = 0).
**Turnover Types**

I classified Leavers into four categories (i.e., Preplanned, Impulsive, Attitude-driven, and Opportunity-driven) based on existing theories of turnover types (e.g., Hom et al., 2012; Lee et al., 1999; Maertz & Campion, 2004). Preplanned quitting results when one enacts a quit plan but does not necessarily attempt to find a different job (either internally or externally); impulsive quitting occurs quickly after a negative work experience. Opportunity-driven quitting occurs following a job offer, which may be unsolicited. And attitude-driven quitting occurs following a job offer due to dissatisfaction with the job.

Attitude-driven and opportunity-driven turnover result in alternative employment, whereas preplanned and impulsive turnover do not lead to alternative employment. As the decision to attain alternative employment is a key aspect of quit pathways, it is central to our classification. If one had a job offer at the time of turnover, they were classified into either attitude-driven or opportunity-driven turnover. If not, they were considered an impulsive or preplanned leaver (professional, $n = 4$; academic, $n = 2$).

When distinguishing between opportunity- and attitude-driven turnover, I considered the extent to which workers searched for alternative employment before leaving. I chose job search as a key factor because a truly dissatisfied worker is more likely to engage in job search behaviors so they may more readily find a job alternative (March & Simon, 1958; Van Hooft, Born, Taris, Flier, & Blonk, 2004). Further, I distinguished between active job search and passive job search. Employees engage in passive job search behaviors such as speaking with colleagues or friends about job
openings to stay abreast of the job market (Blau, 1993). However, these behaviors do not indicate that one is actively seeking to change jobs; rather, they may be ‘testing the waters’. Those who engage in a more comprehensive job search were thought to be more motivated to leave due to reduced job satisfaction. Therefore, I classified those who engaged in a more comprehensive job search as attitude-driven quitters (professional, \( n = 30 \); academic, \( n = 13 \)). Those who engaged no job search or less comprehensive job search were classified as opportunity-driven quitters (professional, \( n = 44 \); academic, \( n = 18 \)). Attitude-driven leavers reported lower levels of job satisfaction with their previous employers than opportunity-driven leavers in the professional sample (Cohen’s \( d = -.32 \)), supporting the conceptual distinction between the two turnover types. However, this distinction was not supported in the academic sample (Cohen’s \( d = 1.10^1 \)),

---

\(^1\)The academic sample was in the opposite of the hypothesized direction. This may be due to the small sample size (\( n = 16 \)). Alternatively, academic “leavers” may not have felt comfortable reporting dissatisfaction in a non-anonymous survey to researchers affiliated with their former employer
RESULTS

Table 2 presents means, standard deviations, reliabilities and intercorrelations of variables included in the analysis of both professional and academic Stayer samples. Overall, patterns of these correlations were largely consistent with our expectations. Within the professional sample, internal and external networking behaviors were both positively related to job satisfaction, perceived employment opportunity, and job offers. Within the academic sample, external networking was related to perceived employment opportunity, whereas internal networking was not.

In order to test Hypotheses 1-2, I ran two sets of hierarchical linear regression analyses, as shown in Table 3. In all regression models, control variables were entered first, followed by internal and external networking behaviors as predictors. Hypothesis 1 suggests that internal networking behavior positively predicts job satisfaction. In the professional sample, the first linear regression analysis showed a positive predictive relationship between internal networking behavior and job satisfaction after controlling for other predictors ($\beta = .27, p < .01$), whereas no such relationship was found for external networking behavior. For the academic sample, a similar relationship emerged; internal networking was positively related to job satisfaction ($\beta = .21, p = .09$). Contrary to expectations, external networking negatively predicted job satisfaction ($\beta = -.23, p < .05$). In the professional sample, Hypothesis 2 was also
supported: external networking behaviors positively predicted perceived employment opportunity ($\beta = .22, p < .01$). In addition, internal networking behaviors positively related to perceived employment opportunity ($\beta = .13, p < .05$). No such relationships were present in the academic sample.

Hypothesis 3 pertains to the positive relationship between external networking behaviors and obtaining job offers. As seen in Table 4, the result of hierarchical logistic regression (with job offers as a dichotomous outcome) revealed that external networking behavior was positively related to job offers ($B = .71, p < .01$) for professionals. A similar relationship did not exist for the academic sample.

Means, standard deviations, reliabilities and intercorrelations of study variables for the Leaver samples are reported in Table 5. Biserial correlations of internal and external networking behaviors with the turnover outcome were not statistically significant at a $p$-value of .05, most likely due to the small sample size and the dichotomous nature of the turnover variables.

To test Hypotheses 4-5b, I ran two separate hierarchical logistic regression analyses with attitude-driven turnover and opportunity-driven turnover coded as dichotomous outcomes. These results are reported in Tables 6 and 7. Results from the professional sample provided some support for the hypotheses, but results from the academic sample were not significant. Hypothesis 4 suggests that internal networking behavior negatively predicts attitude-driven turnover. Although the logistic regression coefficient of internal networking behavior was consistent with the hypothesized direction, it was not statistically significant ($B = -.82, p = .12$). Unexpectedly, external networking behavior was found to be positively related to attitude-driven turnover ($B = \ldots$
Hypotheses 5a and 5b proposed positive predictions of opportunity-driven turnover from internal and external networking behaviors. Results showed that internal networking behaviors positively predicted opportunity-driven turnover with marginal significance ($B = .92, p < .10$), rendering some tentative support for Hypothesis 5a. However, Hypothesis 5b was not supported: the regression coefficient of external networking behavior was neither consistent with expectations, nor statistically significant ($B = -.82, ns$).
DISCUSSION

Results from two unique samples suggest that an employee’s networking strategies within and outside of the organization can affect how s/he quits, at least to some extent. As expected, internal and external networking behaviors were shown to uniquely influence the turnover process. The findings indicate that internal networking behaviors weaken the “push” factor, or one’s desire for movement. In contrast, external networking behaviors contribute to the “pull” factor, increasing not only one’s perceptions of employment opportunity, but also the receipt of actual job offers. In other words, those who build, maintain, and use relationships with people within the organization are less inclined to leave, whereas those who expand their networks across firms tend to be more mobile. Although previous research has identified networking as a functional job search strategy (Wanberg et al., 2000; Van Hoye & Lievens, 2009), results from the professional sample go beyond previous findings to demonstrate the utility of external networking in increasing employees’ career self-efficacy and ability to secure alternative employment. However, these findings were not replicated in the academic sample. Perhaps alternative employers base their hiring decisions upon more concrete measures of job performance (e.g., publications) in academic settings. Whereas, in applied settings informal selection methods such as personal recommendations may be relied upon more often (Scholarios & Lockyer, 1999).
Furthermore, results from the professional sample suggest that networking behaviors differentially influence types of turnover, although not necessarily as expected. First, internal networking behaviors were found to be positively related to opportunity-driven turnover. Networking with colleagues within the organization provides informational and social resources that facilitate effective performance, making employees more attractive candidates to other employers. In addition, as employees develop job-relevant knowledge and skills through their network connections, they may desire professional advancement (Sparrowe, et al., 2001). Especially true for “flat” organizations (Appelbaum & Santiago, 1997), employees may consider career opportunities elsewhere if their advancement desires are not met in their current organizations (Feldman & Ng, 2007; Ford, Truxillo, & Bauer, 2009).

Also, although not hypothesized, external networking behaviors were positively related to attitude-driven turnover. Building, maintaining, and using network connections outside of one’s organization develops informational and social resources that may be leveraged to generate alternative job opportunities. In addition, turnover theory suggests that dissatisfied employees will search for jobs before they quit; it is likely that external networking was one method of job search utilized by attitude-driven leavers. Results were not replicated in the academic sample, likely due to the extremely low sample size of voluntary leavers.

Overall, these results evoke several theoretical and practical implications. For example, networking behaviors represent a previously unrecognized antecedent to the turnover process (Steel & Lounsbury, 2009). Identifying networking as a precursor to turnover, in general, provides new insights into how people turnover. Furthermore, the
differential relationships that exist between internal and external networking behaviors and attitude- and opportunity-driven turnover enable researchers to empirically distinguish between types of quitting. Previous research has proposed “reasons”, “motives” and “shocks” to explain “why” people engage in different types of turnover (Woo & Maertz, 2012). However, these explanatory mechanisms are often assessed after turnover has occurred. Networking behavior is a potential turnover antecedent that can be evaluated before turnover has taken place to distinguish between different types of turnover. Moreover, these findings suggest that practitioners may be more successful in reducing turnover if they respond to withdrawal with targeted interventions rather than blanket interventions. Specifically, interventions targeted at reducing opportunity-driven turnover may be more effective if they differ from interventions targeted at reducing traditional turnover. Furthermore, this study provides additional evidence of the existence of multiple forms of voluntary turnover. Acknowledging types of networking behaviors as antecedents to particular turnover types expands the nomological network surrounding each of these types of turnover, strengthening the construct validity evidence for turnover types.

In addition to the theoretical implications, a number of practical implications should be noted. For example, the positive relationship between internal networking behaviors and job satisfaction suggests that organizations concerned with employee attitudes and commitment can benefit from implementing programs that provide organization-wide networking opportunities. At the same time, our data also suggest that internal networkers may be approached by other organizations, presumably due to their success within the current organization. Therefore, organizations trying to
cultivate internal support networks amongst employees should also be mindful of losing good performers to their competitors; managers might consider providing these employees with opportunities for career advancement within the organization as a retention strategy. Alternatively, organizations with a limited hierarchical structure may consider job rotation as a strategy for employee development and retention. Job rotation leads to the acquisition of new skills and feelings of personal development (Campion, Cheraskin, & Stevens, 1994). As such, job rotation provides the career development opportunities that internal networkers may be searching for.

In addition, employers should be aware that employees who choose to network externally are at risk of leaving. In order to retain top talent, organizations should consider implementing initiatives designed to increase job embeddedness, such as the provision of mentors or more flexible work schedules (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, & Graske, 2001). Finally, this study has implications for individual workers; employees can self-direct their careers by engaging in different types of networking behaviors (Hall, 2004). For example, employees may engage in internal networking behaviors to improve morale or external networking behaviors when interested in organizational mobility.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

As with any study, a few limitations must be noted. First, no causality can be inferred from these results because cross-sectional and retrospective designs were used to assess “stayers” and “leavers.” To generate evidence for inferring a causal role of networking behaviors in the turnover process, a longitudinal design should be used. Second, due to a small sample size, I was unable to examine relationships that may
exist between internal and external networking behaviors and other turnover types, preplanned and impulsive turnover (e.g., Maertz & Campion, 2004). These types of turnover are much less frequent than attitude- and opportunity-driven turnover and are, therefore, more difficult to capture (Lee, et al., 1999). Although this study does not cover the full range of turnover types, it does examine relationships among the types of turnover that are frequent, avoidable, and dysfunctional, and therefore, of primary concern to organizations. Furthermore, the omitted forms of turnover have less theoretical relevance. Impulsive or preplanned quitters leave organizations without a (paid) job alternative (Hom et al., 2012). It is unlikely that individuals who engage in career management behaviors, such as networking, would leave without a job alternative. Therefore, these types hold little practical or theoretical value in relation to the networking predictor. Third, the “opportunity-driven” turnover category may be contaminated by nascent turnover types (i.e., “optimizer”; Maertz & Kmita, 2012).

Future research should replicate and extend these findings by examining the relations between networking behaviors and theoretically relevant turnover types omitted from this study, such as “optimizers”. Further, despite opportunity-driven turnover being recognized as frequent, avoidable, and dysfunctional, little research addresses its causes or identifies likely interventions. Future research should consider proposing antecedents or interventions that function to detect or reduce opportunity-driven turnover, specifically.

The current study investigates the relationship between types of networking behaviors and types of turnover; however, other aspects of networking behaviors may influence turnover outcomes. For example, the purpose of networking (i.e., building vs.
using) may be better able to predict types of turnover. In terms of the turnover process, building connections may be behaviors used in preparation for future needs (e.g., when one intends to quit in one or two years), whereas using connections is done when searching for next opportunities (e.g., actively searching for alternative job opportunities) and, as such, may be a better predictor of turnover. In addition, this study provides preliminary evidence for the relationship between career development behaviors (i.e., networking) and different types of turnover. However, questions remain as to what motivates employees to engage in different types of networking behaviors and how these motivations may affect the type of turnover they enact. Perhaps modern career attitudes such as the boundaryless or protean career mindset may help to further explain variance in these different types of turnover.

**Conclusions**

Networking behaviors are generally considered to be a career self-management strategy used to achieve a competitive advantage. As such, they have been relegated to the realm of career management and development research. However, this study suggests that networking behaviors are no longer only of concern to individuals. Rather, organizations should be aware of the career management behaviors of their employees because these behaviors may have an effect on costly organizational outcomes, most notably, voluntary turnover.
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**Table 1**

*Items Included in the Internal and External Networking Behaviors Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Networking Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I use company events to make new contacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At company events or gatherings, I approach colleagues I haven’t met before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If I have just met someone new within the company, I use my breaks to develop the contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When I meet members of my company for the first time at meetings, I introduce myself personally before or after the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I catch up with colleagues from other departments about what they are working on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I discuss problems with colleagues from other departments that they are having with their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I receive confidential advice in business matters from my contacts in other departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When I need answers to sensitive questions, I turn to reliable colleagues to find out more about the matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. At informal gatherings, I exchange professional tips and hints with colleagues from other departments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
External Networking Behaviors

1. I develop informal contacts with professionals outside the organization in order to have personal links beyond the company.

2. I am an active member of a professional association (e.g., trade union, Chamber of Commerce, American Financial Association).

3. I use business trips or training programs to build new contacts.

4. I meet with colleagues from other organizations that could be of professional importance to me at casual gatherings.

5. For business purposes, I keep in contact with former colleagues.

6. I use business events outside of the organization (trade shows, conferences) to talk to business acquaintances on a personal level.

7. If I meet colleagues from other organizations, I approach them to catch up on news and changes in their professional lives.

8. I exchange professional tips and hints with colleagues from other organizations.

9. I confide in colleagues outside of the organization about job-related matters.
Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations of Study Variables for Stayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional Mean</th>
<th>Professional SD</th>
<th>Academic Mean</th>
<th>Academic SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>-0.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organization Size</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perceived Employment</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job Offer</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Internal Networking</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. External Networking</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scale reliabilities in parentheses with professional sample first. Gender was coded as female = 0, male = 1. Organizational tenure was recorded in years. Organizational size was recorded using a 7-point scale (1 = 1-50, 2 = 51-100, 3 = 101-250, 4 = 250-500, 5 = 501-1000, 6 = 1001-3000, 7 = 3000). Professional sample is the lower diagonal; academic sample is the upper diagonal.

**p < .01, *p < .05
Table 3

Hierarchical Linear Regression of Networking Behaviors on “Push” and “Pull” Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Perceived Employment</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Perceived Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Networking</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Networking</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$, †$p < .10$. 
Table 4
Hierarchical Logistic Regression of Networking Behaviors on Job Offer Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th></th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$Exp(B)$</td>
<td>95% Lower</td>
<td>95% Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Networking</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Networking</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $B$ = log odds; $Exp(B)$ = odds ratio; $R^2_N$ = Nagelkerke $R^2$.  
**$p < .01$, *$p < .05$, †$p < .10$.  

Table 5
Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations of Study Variables for Leavers

|                     | Professionals | Academics |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                     | Mean          | SD        | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     |       |       | Mean  | SD    |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 1. Age              | 38.12         | 9.38      | .08   | .67** | .17   | .02   | .47   | .16   | 40.25 | 11.06 |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 2. Gender           | 0.37          | .48       | .22** | .10   | -.10  | .17   | -.09  | -.32  | .50   | .52   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 3. Years of Work Experience | 2.20         | 1.51      | .77** | .13** | .06   | .02   | .50   | .59   | 10.60 | 9.69  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 4. Number of Employees in Former Organization | 6.87         | 2.48      | .08   | -.03  | .17   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 5. Attitude-Driven Turnover | 0.40         | .10       | -.21**| .01   | -.12† | .11   | -.38* | -.33† | .15   | .25   | .45   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 6. Opportunity-Driven Turnover | 0.59         | .17       | .22** | .03   | .12†  | -.12† | -.45**|       | .15   | .06   | .69   | .48   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 7. Internal Networking | 2.38         | .50       | -.09  | .01   | -.01  | .03   | .03   | (.88, .83) | .68** |       | 2.55  | .59   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 8. External Networking | 2.66         | .49       | .04   | .08   | .17   | -.11† | .13†  | -.05  | .51** | (.90, .95) | 2.77  | .78   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

Note. Scale reliabilities in parentheses with professional sample first. Gender was coded as female = 0, male = 1. Former organizational size was recorded using a 7-point scale (1 = 1-50, 2 = 51-100, 3 = 101-250, 4 = 250-500, 5 = 501-1000, 6 = 1001-3000, 7 = > 3000). Professional sample is the lower diagonal; academic sample is the upper diagonal.

** p < .01, * p < .05 † p < .10. Intercorrelations of attitude-driven and opportunity-driven turnover are biserial correlations.
Table 6
Summary of Hierarchical Logistic Regression of Networking on Turnover Types for Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitude-Driven Turnover</th>
<th></th>
<th>Opportunity-Driven Turnover</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>95% Lower</td>
<td>95% Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.11 †</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>-.19 †</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.13 †</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td>-.21 †</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Networking</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Networking</td>
<td>1.09*</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total $R^2$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 67$. $B = \log$ odds; $\text{Exp}(B) =$ odds ratio; $R_N^2 =$ Nagelkerke $R^2$.

*p < .05, †p < .10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Lower</th>
<th>95% Upper</th>
<th>∆R²</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% Lower</th>
<th>95% Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Networking</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Networking</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>339.32</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>339.32</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>339.32</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 16. B = log odds; Exp(B) = odds ratio; ΔR² = Nagelkerke R².

*p < .05, †p < .10.