

Appendix A

Data Transparency Appendix - Manuscript Descriptions

| MS1 (Pieper, 2015) | MS2 (Main study in current manuscript) |
|---|--|
| <u>Sample</u> | <u>Sample</u> |
| Referral Hires | Referrers ($N = 265$) |
| In Baseline Prediction Test ($N = 566$) | Non-Referrers ($N = 1,774$) |
| In Main Hypotheses ($N = 386$) | |
| Non-Referral Hires | |
| In Baseline Prediction Test ($N = 1,116$) | |
| In Main Hypotheses ($N = 0$) | |
| <u>Dependent Variables</u> | <u>Dependent Variables</u> |
| Referral Hire Voluntary Turnover | Referrer Voluntary Turnover |
| Referral Hire Performance – Calls/Hour | Referrer Performance – Calls/Hour |
| Referral Hire Performance – Quality | |
| <u>Independent Variables</u> | <u>Independent Variables</u> |
| Referral Hire (yes/no) | Referral Hire Presence (RHP) |
| Referrer Performance at Hire – Calls/Hour | Job-Similar RHP |
| Referrer Performance at Hire – Quality | Job-Dissimilar RHP |
| Referrer Tenure at Hire | Pre-RHP vs. Post-RHP |
| Referrer Employment | |
| Referrer-Referral Hire Job Congruence | |
| <u>Covariates</u> | <u>Covariates</u> |
| Call Volume | Call Volume |
| Hours per Week | Hours per Week |
| Tenure | Tenure |
| Pay Rate | Pay Rate |
| \$15 Bonus Plan | \$15 Bonus Plan |
| New Client | New Client |
| | Gender |
| | Recruitment Source |

Appendix B

Data Structure and Aggregate-Level Correlations

Table 1. Examples of Data Structure and Variables

| Week | Vol. Turn. | Calls per Hour | RHP | Job-Similar RHP | Job-Dissim. RHP | Pre-RHP | Post-RHP | Description |
|-------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|---------|----------|--|
| <u>Employee A</u> | | | | | | | | |
| ... | | | | | | | | |
| 2009w41 | 0 | 5.21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2009w42 | 0 | 5.02 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2009w43 | 0 | 4.98 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | <i>Job-dissimilar RHP for referred referrer</i> |
| 2009w44 | 0 | 5.87 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w45 | 0 | 5.95 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w46 | 0 | 6.01 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w47 | 0 | 5.85 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w48 | 0 | 5.95 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w49 | 0 | 5.21 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w50 | 0 | 6.70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | <i>Referral Hire terminated</i> |
| 2009w51 | 0 | 5.84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 2009w52 | 0 | 6.41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | <i>End of observation window (right-censored case)</i> |
| <u>Employee B</u> | | | | | | | | |
| ... | | | | | | | | |
| 2009w27 | 0 | 5.74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2009w28 | 0 | 7.41 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <i>Job-similar RHP for non-referred referrer</i> |

Table Continued

Table 1 (Continued)

| Week | Vol. Turn. | Calls per Hour | RHP | Job-Similar RHP | Job-Dissim. RHP | Pre-RHP | Post-RHP | Description |
|-------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|---------|----------|--|
| 2009w29 | 0 | 7.25 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w30 | 0 | 6.76 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w31 | 0 | 8.15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| ... | | | | | | | | |
| 2009w44 | 0 | 8.46 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w45 | 0 | 8.25 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w46 | 1 | -- | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <i>Referrer voluntarily quit</i> |
| <u>Employee C</u> | | | | | | | | |
| ... | | | | | | | | |
| 2009w33 | 0 | 4.39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2009w34 | 0 | 3.54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2009w35 | 0 | 3.06 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <i>Job-similar RHP for non-referred referrer</i> |
| 2009w36 | 0 | 4.55 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w37 | 0 | 5.26 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w38 | 0 | 4.95 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w39 | 0 | 4.81 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| ... | | | | | | | | |
| 2009w44 | 0 | 4.28 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w45 | 0 | 5.18 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w47 | 0 | 5.22 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2009w48 | 0 | 5.19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | <i>Referral Hire terminated</i> |
| 2009w50 | 1 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | <i>Referrer voluntarily quit</i> |

Note. For non-referrers (in the turnover analyses), RHP and job-similar and job-dissimilar RHP are all coded as 0. Also, pre-RHP is always 1 and post-RHP is always 0 for non-referrers.

Table 2. Aggregate-Level Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Analysis of Voluntary Turnover

| Variable | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|--|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|
| 1 Voluntary Turnover | .51 | .50 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Control Variables</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Male | .34 | .47 | -.01 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 Tenure | 18.04 | 19.98 | -.22 | -.01 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Pay Rate | 8.62 | .90 | -.08 | .16 | .45 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 Hours Per Week | 36.75 | 4.40 | -.26 | -.01 | .04 | -.08 | | | | | | | | |
| 6 Recruitment Source | .34 | .47 | -.04 | .09 | -.01 | -.04 | .01 | | | | | | | |
| 7 \$15 Bonus Plan | .66 | .43 | -.45 | .00 | -.15 | -.10 | .27 | .00 | | | | | | |
| 8 New Client | .48 | .46 | -.45 | .00 | -.26 | -.07 | .26 | -.02 | .78 | | | | | |
| <u>Independent Variables^a</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 Pre-RHP | .92 | .23 | .07 | .02 | -.20 | -.06 | -.05 | -.06 | .04 | .07 | | | | |
| 10 RHP | .06 | .19 | -.07 | -.02 | .15 | .04 | .05 | .06 | -.03 | -.05 | -.93 | | | |
| 11 Post-RHP | .02 | .09 | -.04 | -.02 | .20 | .06 | .04 | .02 | -.03 | -.10 | -.56 | .21 | | |
| 12 Job Dissimilar RHP | .04 | .16 | -.07 | -.04 | .15 | .02 | .05 | .08 | -.04 | -.07 | -.78 | .82 | .23 | |
| 13 Job Similar RHP | .02 | .11 | -.02 | .03 | .04 | .04 | .01 | .00 | .00 | .02 | -.49 | .57 | .04 | -.01 |

Note. $N_{\text{individuals}} = 2,039$ (265 referrers and 1,774 non-referrers). Correlations are based on $N_{\text{individuals}}$ and data were averaged within-individuals before collapsed (averaged) across individuals. Correlations whose absolute values are greater than .04 are statistically significant at $p < .05$.

^a Means for independent variables, when aggregated, represent the average percent of time (weeks) individuals spent in the condition.

Table 3. Aggregate-Level Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Analysis of Performance

| Variable | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|--|--------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1 Performance (Calls/Hour) | 8.13 | 2.88 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Control Variables</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Call Volume | 148.49 | 47.92 | .64 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 Tenure | 57.99 | 36.26 | .35 | .29 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Male | .30 | .46 | -.02 | -.03 | -.13 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 Pay Rate | 8.83 | .87 | .20 | .15 | .47 | .16 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 Hours Per Week | 37.66 | 3.60 | -.05 | .00 | -.06 | .00 | -.24 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 Recruitment Source | .43 | .50 | -.04 | -.06 | -.08 | .00 | -.04 | .01 | | | | | | | |
| 8 \$15 Bonus Plan | .66 | .35 | -.22 | -.08 | -.00 | -.06 | -.10 | .15 | -.09 | | | | | | |
| 9 New Client | .38 | .36 | -.37 | -.26 | -.27 | -.08 | -.24 | .24 | .00 | .78 | | | | | |
| <u>Independent Variables^a</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 Pre-RHP | .45 | .27 | .00 | .01 | .09 | -.08 | .01 | .12 | .04 | .01 | .01 | | | | |
| 11 RHP | .43 | .28 | -.16 | -.11 | -.26 | .03 | -.07 | -.17 | -.02 | -.07 | .06 | -.75 | | | |
| 12 Post-RHP | .12 | .19 | .22 | .14 | .26 | .06 | .09 | .08 | -.03 | .09 | -.09 | -.32 | -.39 | | |
| 13 Job Dissimilar RHP | .34 | .29 | .01 | -.02 | -.17 | -.10 | -.14 | -.03 | .05 | -.07 | -.01 | -.51 | .67 | -.25 | |
| 14 Job Similar RHP | .09 | .23 | -.21 | -.11 | -.12 | .18 | .08 | -.16 | -.09 | .00 | .08 | -.24 | .35 | -.15 | -.46 |

Note. $N_{\text{referrers}} = 191$. Correlations are based on $N_{\text{referrers}}$. Correlations whose absolute values are greater than .14 are statistically significant at $p < .05$.

^a Means for independent variables, when aggregated, represent the average percent of time (weeks) referrers spent in the condition.

Appendix C

Decision Scenario, Treatments, and Manipulation Check Questions

Decision Scenario and Treatments

“For the past 3 months you have been working for a U.S.-based call center. This call center employs about 500 qualified customer service representatives who spend most of their time taking incoming calls. Customer service representatives are physically located in one of many working groups. Employees in each working group work in close proximity to each other and have similar job tasks and duties. Working groups consist of 15 employees on average. You have **[no // 2]** coworkers that you consider to be friends within your working group (though you do have a few coworker friends outside of your working group). Your manager just announced that **[a new hire // an acquaintance that you referred // a close friend that you referred]** will be joining the company **[and will be in your working group // but will not be in your working group].”**

Manipulation Check Questions (embedded later in the survey)

Which of the following describes the hire in the scenario you read earlier?

- The person was a close friend that I referred.
- The person was an acquaintance that I referred.
- The person was a new hire only (i.e., you did not know this person previously).

Where was the hire going to be working at based on the scenario you read earlier?

- In your working group
- In a different working group

Prior to the hire, how many coworker friends were in your working group as indicated in the scenario?

- No coworkers
- 2 coworkers

Appendix D

Scale Items

Social Enrichment (adapted from [a] Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006; [b] Kirchmeyer, 1992; [c] author developed)

1. The hire would give me support in my work life. [b]
2. The hire would put me in a good mood. [a]
3. The hire would improve my work life. [c]
4. The hire would enrich my work life. [c]
5. The hire would make me feel happy. [a]
6. The hire would make my work life more enjoyable. [c]
7. The hire would make me cheerful. [a]

Constituent Attachment (adapted from Ellingson, Tews, & Dachner, 2016)

1. I would want to continue working with my coworkers here.
2. I would enjoy working here because of the people I work with.

Job Embeddedness (adapted from Crossley, Bennett, Jex, & Burnfield, 2007)

1. I would feel tied to this organization.
2. I would feel attached to this organization.

Socialization (adapted from Jones, 1986)

1. I would help this person understand the job requirements.
2. I would help this person adjust in the organization.
3. I would give guidance to this person as to how to perform the job.

Job Engagement (adapted from Rich, Lepine, Crawford, 2010)

1. I would exert my full effort in this job.
2. I would try my hardest to perform well in this job.

Turnover Intention (adapted from Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999)

1. I would plan to look for a new job.
-

Appendix E

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Table 1. Goodness-of-Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analyses

| Sample and Model | χ^2 | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | AIC | SRMR |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----|-----|-------|-----------|------|
| <u>Student Sample (N = 158)</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Single-Factor Model | 729.30 | 119 | .000 | .67 | .63 | .18 | 5,419.83 | .12 |
| Six-Factor Model | 197.59 | 105 | .000 | .95 | .94 | .08 | 4,912.03 | .04 |
| <u>Qualtrics Sample (N = 329)</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Single-Factor Model | 1381.57 | 119 | .000 | .68 | .63 | .18 | 12,566.68 | .11 |
| Six-Factor Model | 403.97 | 105 | .000 | .92 | .90 | .09 | 11,613.08 | .05 |
| <u>Pooled Sample (N = 487)</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Single-Factor Model | 1942.28 | 119 | .000 | .68 | .64 | .18 | 18,291.76 | .11 |
| Six-Factor Model | 424.49 | 105 | .000 | .94 | .93 | .08 | 16,797.96 | .04 |

Note. CFI = comparative fit index. TLI = Tucker-Lewis index. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation. AIC = Akaike's information criterion. SRMR = standardized root mean squared residual.

Table 2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for Six-Factor Model

| Factors and Items | Standardized Weights [95% Confidence Interval] | | |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Student Sample (N = 158) | Qualtrics Sample (N = 329) | Pooled Sample (N = 487) |
| <u>Social Enrichment</u> | | | |
| Item 1 | .74 [.66, .81] | .72 [.66, .77] | .72 [.67, .76] |
| Item 2 | .80 [.74, .86] | .72 [.74, .83] | .78 [.75, .82] |
| Item 3 | .86 [.82, .91] | .84 [.80, .88] | .85 [.83, .88] |
| Item 4 | .81 [.75, .87] | .77 [.72, .81] | .77 [.73, .81] |
| Item 5 | .91 [.87, .94] | .85 [.81, .88] | .83 [.80, .86] |
| Item 6 | .86 [.81, .91] | .88 [.85, .91] | .88 [.86, .91] |
| Item 7 | .85 [.80, .90] | .86 [.83, .90] | .86 [.83, .89] |
| <u>Constituent Attachment</u> | | | |
| Item 1 | .81 [.73, .88] | .78 [.72, .84] | .81 [.77, .85] |
| Item 2 | .82 [.75, .90] | .82 [.76, .87] | .83 [.79, .87] |
| <u>Job Embeddedness</u> | | | |
| Item 1 | .85 [.78, .92] | .65 [.57, .73] | .68 [.62, .74] |
| Item 2 | .94 [.88, 1.01] | .97 [.88, 1.05] | .98 [.93, 1.04] |
| <u>Socialization</u> | | | |
| Item 1 | .79 [.72, .86] | .91 [.89, .94] | .88 [.86, .91] |
| Item 2 | .81 [.74, .88] | .90 [.87, .92] | .88 [.85, .91] |
| Item 3 | .91 [.85, .96] | .87 [.84, .90] | .88 [.85, .90] |
| <u>Job Engagement</u> | | | |
| Item 1 | .94 [.82, 1.05] | .80 [.73, .87] | .85 [.80, .90] |
| Item 2 | .70 [.59, .82] | .85 [.78, .92] | .82 [.77, .87] |

Appendix F

Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Scale Reliabilities

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Student and Qualtrics Samples.

| Variable | <u>Student Sample (N = 169)</u> | | | | <u>Qualtrics Sample (N = 329)</u> | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|------|------|------|-----------------------------------|-------|------|------|
| | Mean | SD | Min. | Max. | Mean | SD | Min. | Max. |
| Age | 20.89 | 1.66 | 19 | 29 | 40.26 | 13.49 | 19 | 73 |
| Male | .72 | .45 | 0 | 1 | .42 | .51 | 0 | 1 |
| Has been employed ^a | .91 | .29 | 0 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Manages others ^a | -- | -- | -- | -- | .49 | .50 | 0 | 1 |
| Has worked in a call center | .18 | .39 | 0 | 1 | .25 | .43 | 0 | 1 |
| Was referred to their job | .52 | .50 | 0 | 1 | .18 | .38 | 0 | 1 |
| Has made a referral | .47 | .50 | 0 | 1 | .46 | .50 | 0 | 1 |
| Could relate to the scenario | 3.13 | 1.04 | 1 | 5 | 3.56 | 1.08 | 1 | 5 |
| Could envision working in a call center | 3.61 | 1.02 | 1 | 5 | 4.00 | 1.02 | 1 | 5 |
| Social enrichment | 3.48 | .72 | 1.71 | 5 | 3.68 | .80 | 1 | 5 |
| Job embeddedness | 3.00 | .88 | 1 | 5 | 3.31 | .97 | 1 | 5 |
| Job engagement | 3.81 | .81 | 1 | 5 | 4.32 | .76 | 1 | 5 |
| Constituent attachment | 3.53 | .78 | 1 | 5 | 4.09 | .82 | 1 | 5 |
| Socialization | 4.20 | .53 | 2 | 5 | 4.30 | .79 | 1 | 5 |
| Turnover intention | 2.70 | 1.13 | 1 | 5 | 2.25 | 1.25 | 1 | 5 |

^a Variable only measured in relevant sample.

Table 2. Correlations and Scale Reliabilities for Student Sample

| | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1 New Hire | .40 | .49 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Acquaintance | .24 | .43 | -.46 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 Friend | .36 | .48 | -.61 | -.42 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Two Existing Ties | .51 | .50 | -.02 | .02 | .00 | | | | | | | |
| 5 In Working Group | .54 | .50 | .03 | -.03 | -.01 | .05 | | | | | | |
| 6 Social Enrichment | 3.48 | .72 | -.60 | .11 | .51 | .11 | .30 | .94 | | | | |
| 7 Job Embeddedness | 3.00 | .88 | -.23 | .03 | .20 | .16 | .32 | .52 | .87 | | | |
| 8 Job Engagement | 3.81 | .81 | .05 | -.06 | .00 | .20 | .20 | .25 | .41 | .78 | | |
| 9 Constituent Attachment | 3.53 | .78 | -.14 | .02 | .12 | .43 | .24 | .50 | .54 | .49 | .76 | |
| 10 Socialization | 4.20 | .53 | -.30 | .09 | .22 | .20 | .31 | .56 | .35 | .31 | .46 | .86 |
| 11 Turnover Intention | 2.70 | 1.13 | .09 | -.03 | -.06 | -.29 | -.11 | -.32 | -.36 | -.42 | -.55 | -.23 |

Note. $N = 169$. Correlations whose absolute values are greater than .13 are statistically significant at $p < .05$. Scale reliabilities (Cronbach alphas) are reported in diagonal.

Table 3. Correlations and Scale Reliabilities for Qualtrics Sample

| | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|
| 1 New Hire | .36 | .48 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Acquaintance | .27 | .44 | -.46 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 Friend | .36 | .48 | -.57 | -.46 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Two Existing Ties | .49 | .50 | .05 | .00 | -.05 | | | | | | | |
| 5 In Working Group | .52 | .50 | .01 | -.03 | .01 | .16 | | | | | | |
| 6 Social Enrichment | 3.68 | .80 | -.45 | .09 | .37 | .10 | .19 | .93 | | | | |
| 7 Job Embeddedness | 3.31 | .97 | -.17 | .07 | .11 | .16 | .13 | .57 | .78 | | | |
| 8 Job Engagement | 4.32 | .76 | -.11 | .08 | .04 | -.01 | .01 | .37 | .25 | .81 | | |
| 9 Constituent Attachment | 4.09 | .82 | -.18 | .07 | .12 | .31 | .12 | .52 | .41 | .53 | .78 | |
| 10 Socialization | 4.30 | .79 | -.29 | .11 | .18 | .06 | .18 | .61 | .31 | .50 | .46 | .92 |
| 11 Turnover Intention | 2.25 | 1.25 | .08 | .02 | -.10 | -.12 | -.01 | -.02 | .00 | -.20 | -.41 | -.18 |

Note. $N = 329$. Correlations whose absolute values are greater than .09 are statistically significant at $p < .05$. Scale reliabilities (Cronbach alphas) are reported in diagonal.

Table 3. Correlations and Scale Reliabilities for Pooled Sample

| | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1 New Hire | .38 | .49 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Acquaintance | .26 | .44 | -.46 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 Friend | .36 | .48 | -.59 | -.45 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Two Existing Ties | .50 | .50 | .02 | .01 | -.03 | | | | | | | |
| 5 In Working Group | .52 | .50 | .02 | -.03 | .01 | .12 | | | | | | |
| 6 Social Enrichment | 3.61 | .78 | -.50 | .10 | .41 | .10 | .22 | .93 | | | | |
| 7 Job Embeddedness | 3.21 | .95 | -.19 | .06 | .14 | .15 | .18 | .56 | .80 | | | |
| 8 Job Engagement | 4.15 | .81 | -.06 | .04 | .03 | .06 | .07 | .35 | .33 | .81 | | |
| 9 Constituent Attachment | 3.90 | .85 | -.17 | .06 | .12 | .32 | .15 | .52 | .47 | .56 | .79 | |
| 10 Socialization | 4.27 | .71 | -.29 | .11 | .19 | .10 | .21 | .59 | .33 | .44 | .45 | .91 |
| 11 Turnover Intention | 2.40 | 1.23 | .09 | .00 | -.09 | -.17 | -.04 | -.12 | -.13 | -.30 | -.48 | -.20 |

Note. $N = 498$. Correlations whose absolute values are greater than .08 are statistically significant at $p < .05$. Scale reliabilities (Cronbach alphas) are reported in diagonal.

Appendix G

Estimation Results for the Student Sample, Qualtrics Sample, and Pooled Sample

Table 1. OLS Regression Results for Student Sample

| Variable | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| | Social Enrichment | Constituent Attachment | Job Embeddedness | Socialization | Job Engagement | Turnover Intention |
| Intercept | 2.65*** (.08) | 2.89*** (.11) | 2.32*** (.13) | 3.73*** (.08) | 3.54*** (.13) | 3.27*** (.18) |
| Acquaintance (vs. New Hire) | .68*** a (.10) | .15 (.14) | .31 (.16) | .29** (.09) | -.13 (.16) | -.18 (.21) |
| Close Friend (vs. New Hire) | 1.03*** a (.09) | .25* (.12) | .49*** (.14) | .36*** (.08) | -.04 (.14) | -.22 (.19) |
| Two Existing Ties (vs. No Existing Ties) | .12 (.08) | .65*** (.11) | .25* (.12) | .19* (.07) | .31* (.12) | -.64*** (.17) |
| In Working Group (vs. Not in Working Group) | .45*** (.08) | .34** (.11) | .56*** (.12) | .33*** (.07) | .30* (.12) | -.22 (.17) |
| <i>Df</i> | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| <i>R</i> ² _{adjusted} | .49 | .23 | .16 | .20 | .06 | .08 |

Note. *N* = 169. Standard errors in parentheses.

p* < .05; *p* < .01; ****p* < .001. Two-tailed tests reported.

a Wald Test of coefficient equality significant at *p* < .01

Table 2. OLS Regression Results for Qualtrics Sample

| Variable | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| | Social Enrichment | Constituent Attachment | Job Embeddedness | Socialization | Job Engagement | Turnover Intention |
| Intercept | 2.98*** (.08) | 3.57*** (.09) | 2.84*** (.11) | 3.82*** (.09) | 4.19*** (.09) | 2.46*** (.17) |
| Acquaintance (vs. New Hire) | .60*** ^a (.10) | .31** (.11) | .33* (.13) | .46*** (.10) | .21 (.11) | .24 (.20) |
| Close Friend (vs. New Hire) | .87*** ^a (.09) | .36*** (.10) | .37** (.12) | .49*** (.10) | .15 (.10) | .11 (.18) |
| Two Existing Ties (vs. No Existing Ties) | .15 (.08) | .50*** (.09) | .29** (.11) | .08 (.08) | -.01 (.08) | .19 (.16) |
| In Working Group (vs. Not in Working Group) | .28*** (.08) | .12 (.09) | .20 (.11) | .28*** (.08) | .03 (.08) | .21 (.16) |
| <i>Df</i> | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| R^2_{adjusted} | .26 | .13 | .05 | .11 | .00 | .00 |

Note. $N = 329$. Standard errors in parentheses.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. Two-tailed tests reported.

^a Wald Test of coefficient equality significant at $p < .01$

Table 3. OLS Regression Results for Pooled Sample

| Variable | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| | Social Enrichment | Constituent Attachment | Job Embeddedness | Socialization | Job Engagement | Turnover Intention |
| Intercept | 2.87*** (.06) | 3.34*** (.08) | 2.67*** (.09) | 3.79*** (.06) | 3.98*** (.08) | 2.77*** (.12) |
| Acquaintance (vs. New Hire) | .64*** a (.07) | .28** (.09) | .34** (.10) | .41*** (.08) | .12 (.09) | -.14 (.14) |
| Close Friend (vs. New Hire) | .93*** a (.07) | .34*** (.08) | .41*** (.09) | .45*** (.07) | .10 (.08) | -.29* (.13) |
| Two Existing Ties (vs. No Existing Ties) | .13* (.06) | .53*** (.07) | .26** (.08) | .11 (.06) | .08 (.07) | -.41*** (.11) |
| In Working Group (vs. Not in Working Group) | .34*** (.06) | .19** (.07) | .32*** (.08) | .29*** (.06) | .10 (.07) | -.04 (.11) |
| <i>Df</i> | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| <i>R</i> ² _{adjusted} | .32 | .14 | .08 | .13 | .00 | .03 |

Note. *N* = 498. Standard errors in parentheses.

p* < .05; *p* < .01; ****p* < .001. Two-tailed tests reported.

a Wald Test of coefficient equality significant at *p* < .01

Table 4. Job Engagement and Turnover Intention Regressed (OLS) on Alternative Mediators (Student Sample)

| | <u>Job Engagement</u> | | | | | <u>Turnover Intention</u> | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | M8 | M9 | M10 |
| Intercept | 2.83*** (.30) | 2.01*** (.30) | 2.56*** (.29) | 1.80*** (.47) | 1.48*** (.43) | 4.43*** (.41) | 5.67*** (.40) | 4.70*** (.41) | 4.86*** (.66) | 5.33*** (.58) |
| Social Enrichment | .28** (.08) | .01 (.09) | .06 (.09) | .12 (.10) | -.15 (.10) | -.50*** (.12) | -.08 (.12) | -.28* (.13) | -.43** (.14) | -.09 (.14) |
| Constituent Attachment | | .50*** (.08) | | | .38*** (.09) | | -.76*** (.11) | | | -.74*** (.12) |
| Job Embeddedness | | | .35*** (.08) | | .21** (.08) | | | -.34** (.11) | | -.10 (.11) |
| Socialization | | | | .38** (.13) | .20 (.13) | | | | -.15 (.19) | .14 (.17) |
| <i>Df</i> | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| <i>R</i> ² _{adjusted} | .06 | .23 | .16 | .09 | .27 | .09 | .30 | .14 | .09 | .30 |

Note. *N* = 498. Standard errors in parentheses.

p* < .05; *p* < .01; ****p* < .001. Two-tailed tests reported.

Table 5. Job Engagement and Turnover Intention Regressed (OLS) on Alternative Mediators (Qualtrics Sample)

| | <u>Job Engagement</u> | | | | | <u>Turnover Intention</u> | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | M8 | M9 | M10 |
| Intercept | 3.01*** (.18) | 2.09*** (.20) | 2.98*** (.19) | 2.14*** (.21) | 1.54*** (.21) | 2.35*** (.33) | 4.13*** (.34) | 2.34*** (.33) | 3.23*** (.39) | 4.44*** (.38) |
| Social Enrichment | .35*** (.05) | .12* (.05) | .32*** (.06) | .11 (.06) | -.04 (.06) | -.03 (.09) | .42*** (.09) | -.04 (.11) | .22* (.11) | .45*** (.11) |
| Constituent Attachment | | .43*** (.05) | | | .37*** (.05) | | -.83*** (.09) | | | -.81*** (.09) |
| Job Embeddedness | | | .05 (.05) | | .01 (.04) | | | .01 (.09) | | .12 (.08) |
| Socialization | | | | .41*** (.06) | .33*** (.05) | | | | -.42*** (.11) | -.21* (.10) |
| <i>Df</i> | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| <i>R</i> ² _{adjusted} | .14 | .29 | .14 | .25 | .36 | -.00 | .21 | -.01 | .04 | .22 |

Note. *N* = 329. Standard errors in parentheses.

p* < .05; *p* < .01; ****p* < .001. Two-tailed tests reported.

Table 6. Job Engagement and Turnover Intention Regressed (OLS) on Alternative Mediators (Pooled Sample)

| | <u>Job Engagement</u> | | | | | <u>Turnover Intention</u> | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | M8 | M9 | M10 |
| Intercept | 2.82*** (.16) | 1.91*** (.16) | 2.70*** (.16) | 1.90*** (.20) | 1.31*** (.19) | 3.11*** (.26) | 4.62*** (.26) | 3.20*** (.26) | 3.86*** (.34) | 4.82*** (.31) |
| Social Enrichment | .37*** (.04) | .08 (.05) | .25*** (.05) | .15** (.05) | -.09 (.05) | -.20** (.07) | .27*** (.07) | -.11 (.09) | -.02 (.09) | .28** (.09) |
| Constituent Attachment | | .50*** (.04) | | | .43*** (.04) | | -.82*** (.07) | | | -.82*** (.07) |
| Job Embeddedness | | | .17*** (.04) | | .08 (.04) | | | -.12 (.07) | | .07 (.06) |
| Socialization | | | | .40*** (.06) | .29*** (.05) | | | | -.33*** (.09) | -.11 (.09) |
| <i>Df</i> | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| <i>R</i> ² _{adjusted} | .12 | .32 | .15 | .20 | .36 | .01 | .25 | .02 | .03 | .25 |

Note. *N* = 498. Standard errors in parentheses.

p* < .05; *p* < .01; ****p* < .001. Two-tailed tests reported.

Appendix H

Estimation Results for Qualtrics Sample’s Survey about Past Referral Hiring Experience

Table 1. OLS Regression Results for Referral Hiring Experience

| Variable | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 |
|---|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Social Enrichment | Job Embed- edness | Constituent Attachment | Job Satisfact- ion | Job Engage- ment | Turnover Intention |
| Intercept | 2.93*** (.39) | 3.84*** (.49) | 3.33*** (.38) | 2.57*** (.45) | 2.55*** (.25) | 5.31*** (.58) |
| Full-time (vs. Part-time) | -.04 (.15) | -.24 (.19) | .03 (.15) | -.19 (.18) | -.02 (.10) | .03 (.23) |
| Salary - Less than \$30,000 | -- -- | -- -- | -- -- | -- -- | -- -- | -- -- |
| Salary - \$30,001 to \$60,000 | .01 (.15) | .05 (.19) | -.09 (.15) | -.03 (.17) | -.06 (.09) | .17 (.23) |
| Salary - \$60,001 to \$90,000 | -.03 (.17) | -.12 (.22) | .01 (.17) | .00 (.20) | .02 (.11) | .12 (.26) |
| Salary - Greater than \$90,000 | -.01 (.18) | .20 (.23) | -.04 (.18) | .04 (.21) | -.03 (.12) | -.27 (.28) |
| Supervises Others (vs. Individual Contributor) | .09 (.10) | .17 (.13) | .09 (.10) | .12 (.12) | -.03 (.07) | .02 (.16) |
| Tenure - Less than 1 year | -- -- | -- -- | -- -- | -- -- | -- -- | -- -- |
| Tenure - 1 year to less than 3 years | .25 (.17) | .15 (.22) | .03 (.17) | .35 (.20) | .19 (.11) | -.20 (.26) |
| Tenure - 3 years to less than 5 years | .41* (.18) | .44 (.24) | .15 (.18) | .51* (.21) | .10 (.12) | -.54 (.28) |
| Tenure - 5 years to less than 10 years | .11 (.17) | .33 (.22) | .04 (.17) | .41* (.20) | .24* (.11) | -.38 (.26) |
| Tenure - 10 years or more | .13 (.17) | .53* (.22) | .19 (.17) | .34 (.20) | .17 (.11) | -.99*** (.26) |
| Referred to Own Job (1 = Yes) | .02 (.13) | -.00 (.17) | -.11 (.13) | -.12 (.15) | .06 (.08) | .38 (.20) |
| Extraversion | .14** (.05) | .09 (.06) | .14** (.05) | .19*** (.06) | .06* (.03) | -.17* (.07) |
| Conscientiousness | .02 (.08) | -.20* (.10) | -.00 (.08) | .09 (.09) | .35*** (.05) | -.38** (.12) |
| Referrer (1 = Yes) | .34*** (.10) | 0.39** (0.13) | 0.34*** (.10) | .31** (.12) | .09 (.06) | .09 (.15) |
| <i>Df</i> | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| <i>R</i> ² _{adjusted} | .07 | .06 | .05 | .08 | .17 | .12 |

Note. *N* = 329. Standard errors in parentheses.
p* < .05; *p* < .01; ****p* < .001. Two-tailed tests reported.

Table 2. Job Engagement and Turnover Intention Regressed (OLS) on Alternative Mediators (Qualtrics Survey)

| | <u>Job Engagement</u> | | | | | <u>Turnover Intention</u> | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 | M7 | M8 | M9 | M10 |
| Intercept | 3.99*** (.14) | 3.63*** (.15) | 3.89*** (.15) | 3.73*** (.15) | 3.56*** (.15) | 4.48*** (.32) | 5.60*** (.33) | 4.91*** (.32) | 5.56*** (.30) | 5.95*** (.31) |
| Social Enrichment | .14*** (.04) | -.04 (.05) | .08* (.04) | .01 (.04) | -.07 (.05) | -.45*** (.08) | .10 (.11) | -.23* (.09) | .07 (.09) | .26* (.10) |
| Constituent Attachment | | .26*** (.05) | | | .19*** (.06) | | -.80*** (.11) | | | -.43*** (.11) |
| Job Embeddedness | | | .08* (.03) | | -.02 (.04) | | | -.35*** (.07) | | .02 (.07) |
| Job Satisfaction | | | | .19*** (.04) | .14** (.04) | | | | -.77*** (.07) | -.64*** (.09) |
| <i>Df</i> | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| R^2_{adjusted} | .04 | .11 | .05 | .11 | .13 | .08 | .21 | .14 | .31 | .33 |

Note. $N = 329$. Standard errors in parentheses.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. Two-tailed tests reported.