**ONLINE SUPPLEMENT**

Hypothesis 2 predicted that boomerang managers whose initial turnover was voluntary would demonstrate better post-rehire performance than boomerang managers whose initial turnover was involuntary. Table 1 presents results from the multivariate regression model, which indicated that reason for initial turnover was not a significant predictor when controlling for other factors (*β* = .07, *t* = .92, *p* = .36). This analysis confirms the findings in our main analysis, such that although there was a bivariate relationship between turnover reason and rehire performance, these variables were not related when controlling for other factors in our model.

Table 2 presents the organization’s turnover reasons and our coding of each reason’s valence to the organization. In addition to assessing intercoder agreement to evaluate the validity of these categorizations, we considered whether they predicted likelihood of rehire. If the categorizations capture the valence of the turnover reasons, then employees who initially turned over for more negatively-valanced reasons should be less likely to be rehired than employees who initially turned over for more positively-valenced reasons. To evaluate this, we first summed the performance- and turnover-related valences to form an overall valence that represented 15 negative (*n* = 3,464), 1 somewhat negative (*n* = 99), 11 neutral (*n* = 5,190), and 3 somewhat positive (*n* = 671) turnover reasons. We then used survival analysis to examine the likelihood of rehire for these overall categories.

Table 3 shows that results were consistent with the theoretical categorizations. When compared to negative reasons, employees who turned over for somewhat negative reasons were 1.59 times more likely to be rehired (*p* = .14), for neutral reasons were 2.38 times more likely to be rehired (*p* < .01), and for positive reasons were 5.53 times more likely to be rehired (*p* < .01). This resulted in rehiring 4% (*n* = 152) of managers who turned over for negative reasons, 11% (*n =* 11) who turned over for somewhat negative reasons, 12% (*n =* 620) who turned over for neutral reasons, and 30% (*n =* 200) who turned over for positive reasons. Overall, these results provide additional support for the valence categories identified in our coding.

Finally, Table 4 presents details of the latent growth model, including parameters that were fixed and the results of those that were estimated. This model included six observed variables, resulting in 21 observations in the variance-covariance matrix and six observations of means. In comparison, the table shows that there were 24 parameters estimated, which resulted in three degrees of freedom. This table also illustrates the coding of time for paths from the latent slope and curve to the performance ratings. Centering the models on each year enabled us to assess the dynamic relationships that hire type had with the latent intercepts and the latent slopes.

Table 1

Multiple Regression Analysis of Mean Rehire Performance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Variable | *B* | *SE* | *β* | *t* | *p* |
|  | Mean initial performance | .36 | .08 | .33 | 4.46 |  .00  |
| Initial tenure | .03 | .02 | .09 | 1.29 |  .20 |
| Time away | -.04 | .03 | -.08 | -1.15 | .25 |
|  | Reason for initial turnover | .14 | .15 | .07 | .92 | .36 |

*Note.* *N* = 188. Multiple *R* = .38. *F* = 7.82 (*p* < .001). *B* = unstandardized coefficient. *SE* = standard error of the unstandardized coefficient. *β =* standardized coefficient.Initial tenure was measured as years from the hire date to the initial turnover date. Time away was measured as years from initial turnover to the rehire date. Reason for initial turnover was coded 0 = involuntary and 1 = voluntary. Using pairwise deletion did not change the conclusions of this analysis, although the effect size associated with mean initial performance was larger (*β* = .42).

Table 2

Turnover Reasons and Codes of their Valence to the Organization

| Turnover reason | Valence with performance as the criteria | Valence with turnover as the criteria | Overall valencea |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Quit: for personal reasons | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
| Quit: for another job | Positive | Negative | Neutral |
| Retired | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
| Quit: to attend school | Positive | Neutral | Somewhat positive |
|  | Quit: without notice or explanation | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Quit: moved to another city/neighborhood | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
|  | Resigned, don't hire | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Quit: dislike duties, schedule or work conditions | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Quit: failure to return from approved leave | Neutral | Negative | Somewhat negative |
|  | Quit: walk off job | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Quit: for self-employment | Positive | Neutral | Somewhat positive |
|  | Quit: to stay home | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
|  | Quit: entered the armed services | Positive | Neutral | Somewhat positive |
|  | Quit: for lack of transportation | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
|  | Employee not eligible for leave of absence | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
|  | Discharged: inattention to duties | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Discharged: violation of company policy | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Discharged: failure to notify manager when absent | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Discharged: confidential, not rehireable | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Discharged: discourteous to customer | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Discharged: excessive tardiness or absenteeism | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Discharged: drug testing program | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Discharged: insubordination | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Permanent reduction in force | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
|  | Discharged: under influence of drugs or alcohol while on duty | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Discharged: substandard work performance | Negative | Negative | Negative |
|  | Discharged: failure to complete immigration forms (i-9) | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
|  | Discharged: invalid i-9/ssn, not rehirable | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
|  | Store or department closed | Neutral | Neutral | Neutral |
|  | Discharged: product quality issue, not rehirable | Negative | Negative | Negative |

a Overall valence to the organization was determined by summing together the performance- and turnover-related valences. In particular, negative, neutral, and positive valence with performance as the criteria and valence with turnover as the criteria were coded as 1, 2, and 3, respectively. These were summed to create a four-point scale of overall valence that included negative (2), somewhat negative (3), neutral (4), and somewhat positive (5).

Table 3

Results of Survival Analysis Using Turnover Reason Valence to Predict Rehire

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Turnover Reason Valence | $$χ^{2}$$ | *df* | *N* | *B* | *SE* | Wald | Exp(*B*) |
| Model | 279.04\*\* | 3 | 9,423 |  |  |  |  |
|  Negative v. somewhat negative |  |  |  |  .46 | .31 |  2.17 | 1.59a |
|  Negative v. neutral |  |  |  |  .87 | .09 |  91.27\*\* | 2.38b |
|  Negative v. somewhat positive |  |  |  | 1.71 | .11 | 244.17\*\* | 5.53ab |

*Note*. $χ^{2} $= chi-square statistic. *B* = unstandardized coefficient. *SE* = standard error of the unstandardized coefficient. Exp(*B*) = odds ratio.

\*\**p* < .01. \**p* < .05.

a, b indicate estimates that are significantly different from one another.

Table 4

Latent Growth Model Parameter Estimates with Standard Errors

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variance, covariance, or mean |  Year 1  |  Year 2 |  Year 3  |  Year 4 |
| Performance rating 1 variancea |  .16 (.02)\* |  .16 (.02)\* |  .16 (.02)\* |  .16 (.02)\* |
| Performance rating 2 variancea |  .29 (.01)\* |  .29 (.01)\* |  .29 (.01)\* |  .29 (.01)\* |
| Performance rating 3 variancea |  .30 (.01)\* |  .30 (.01)\* |  .30 (.01)\* |  .30 (.01)\* |
| Performance rating 4 variancea |  .22 (.02)\* |  .22 (.02)\* |  .22 (.02)\* |  .22 (.02)\* |
| Internal hire type variancea |  .21 (.00)\* |  .21 (.00)\* |  .21 (.00)\* |  .21 (.00)\* |
| External hire type variancea |  .22 (.00)\* |  .22 (.00)\* |  .22 (.00)\* |  .22 (.00)\* |
| Latent intercept variance |  .22 (.02)\* |  .18 (.01)\* |  .19 (.01)\* |  .28 (.02)\* |
| Latent slope variance |  .21 (.02)\* |  .06 (.01)\* |  .07 (.01)\* |  .23 (.03)\* |
| Latent curve variance |  .02 (.00)\* |  .02 (.00)\* |  .02 (.00)\* |  .02 (.00)\* |
| Internal hire type path to latent intercept | -.02 (.03) |  .09 (.03)\* |  .14 (.03)\* |  .13 (.05)\* |
| Internal hire type path to latent slope |  .14 (.04)\* |  .08 (.02)\* |  .02 (.03) |  -.04 (.06) |
| Internal hire type path to latent curve | -.03 (.02) | -.03 (.02) | -.03 (.02) |  -.03 (.02) |
| External hire type path to latent intercept | -.039 (.024) |  .07 (.03)\* |  .11 (.03)\* |  .10 (.05)\* |
| External hire type path to latent slope |  .14 (.04)\* |  .08 (.02)\* |  .02 (.03) |  -.04 (.06) |
| External hire type path to latent curve | -.03 (.02) | -.03 (.02) |  -.03 (.02) |  -.03 (.02) |
| Latent intercept with latent slope covariance | -.09 (.02)\* |  .01 (.00)\* |  .00 (.00) |  .13 (.02)\* |
| Latent intercept with latent curve covariance |  .01 (.005)\* |  -.03 (.00)\* |  -.02 (.00)\* |  .02 (.01)\* |
| Latent slope with latent curve covariance | -.06 (.01)\* |  -.02 (.00)\* |  .02 (.00)\* |  .06 (.01)\* |
| Internal to external hire type covariance | -.20 (.00)\* |  |  |  |
| Internal hire mean  |  .30 (.00)\* |  .30 (.00)\* |  .30 (.00)\* |  .30 (.00)\* |
| External hire mean |  .67 (.00)\* |  .67 (.00)\* |  .67 (.00)\* |  .67 (.00)\* |
| Latent intercept mean (intercept) | 3.17 (.02)\* | 3.23 (.03)\* | 3.25 (.03)\* | 3.21 (.05)\* |
| Latent slope mean (intercept) |  .09 (.04)\* |  .04 (.02)\* |  -.01 (.03) |  -.06 (.05) |
| Latent curve mean (intercept) | -.02 (.02) |  -.02 (.02) |  -.02 (.02) |  -.02 (.02) |
| Latent intercept path to performance rating 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Latent intercept path to performance rating 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Latent intercept path to performance rating 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Latent intercept path to performance rating 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Latent slope path to performance rating 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 |
| Latent slope path to performance rating 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | -2 |
| Latent slope path to performance rating 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| Latent slope path to performance rating 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Latent curve path to performance rating 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 |
| Latent curve path to performance rating 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Latent curve path to performance rating 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Latent curve path to performance rating 4 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 |

*Note.* *N*s for boomerang, internally hired, and externally hired managers were 732, 6,015, and 13,600, respectively. The hire type predictors were coded as boomerang managers = 0 and internal/external managers = 1. Whole digits (e.g., 1) in the lower half of the table are fixed regression weights.

a These six variables were observed, resulting in 21 observations in the variance-covariance matrix and 6 observations of means for 27 total observations.