

JOB EMBEDDEDNESS IN RELATION WITH DIFFERENT SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Melek B RSEL¹, Deniz BÖRÜ², Güler SLAMO LU³, E.Serra YURTKORU⁴,

¹Marmara Üniversitesi, .B.F., ngilizce letme Bölümü, Yardımcı Doçent Dr.

²Marmara Üniversitesi, .B.F., letme Bölümü, Doçent Dr.

^{3,4}Marmara Üniversitesi, .B.F., ngilizce letme Bölümü, Doçent Dr.

JOB EMBEDDEDNESS IN RELATION WITH DIFFERENT SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARCTERISTICS

Abstract: This study aims to analyze job embeddedness in terms of its relationship with demographic variables. Embeddedness in sociology refers to interaction between people whereas it refers to intent to leave or stay in organization studies. Moreover, job embeddedness refers to all the factors that lead people to stay in their organizations. In theory it is considered in three dimensions namely, fit, links and sacrifice. In this study, the job embeddedness inventory developed by Mitchell and his colleagues [5] is used. The exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses are conducted. As a result of the analysis, four factors "Organization related sacrifice", "Fit to community & Community related sacrifice", "Fit to organization and Management Philosophy" and "Fit to organization and task" have been revealed. As a result of analyses with demographic variables, for males "Organization related sacrifice" and for singles "Fit to community & Community related sacrifice" have been found to be more significant. Employees were found to show more "fit to community & community related sacrifice" when their family roots were in the same community. However, employees were found to show higher "job embeddedness", "higher fit to community & community related sacrifice" and "fit to organization - management philosophy" if only a few or none of their close friends were nearby.

Keywords: Job Embeddedness, Exploratory Factor Analysis, Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

E GÖMÜLMÜ LÜK KAVRAMININ FARKLI SOSYO DEMOGRAF K DE KENLERLE L K S

Özet: Bu çalı mada " e Gömülmü lük" kavramı ele alınarak demografik de ikenlerle ili kisi incelenmi tir. Gömülmü lük sosyolojide ki iler arasındaki etkile imleri açıklarken, kurum açısından bireyin kalma ya da ayrılma niyeti ile ili kilendirilebilir. e gömülmü lük ise, çalı anları halen çalı maktadırları i te devamlarını sa layan tüm unsurlar olarak tanımlanabilir. Teoride üç boyut içerisinde ele alınmaktadır: ba lantı, uyma ve fedakarlık. Çalı mada Mitchell, ve arkada larının [5] i e gömülmü lük ölçe i kullanılmı tir. Öncelikle ölçe in tanımlayıcı ve do rulayıcı faktör analizleri yapılmı tir. Analizlerde "kuruma ba lı fedakarlık", "toplulu a uyma & toplulu a ba lı fedakarlık", "kuruma uyma & yönetim felsefesi" ve "kuruma-i e uyma" olarak adlandırılan dört boyuta ula lı mı tir. Demografik de i kenler açısından yapılan analizlerde "kuruma ba lı fedakarlık" boyutunun erkekler, "toplulu a uyma & toplulu a ba lı fedakarlık" boyutunun bekarlar açısından daha anlamlı oldu u ortaya çıkmı tir. Ayrıca aile kökleri ya adıkları toplulukta olanların "toplulu a uyma & toplulu a ba lı fedakarlık"; yakın çevresinde arkada ları olmayan ya da çok az olanların da genel olarak "i e gömülmü lük", "toplulu a uyma & toplulu a ba lı fedakarlık" ve "kuruma uyma & yönetim felsefesi" faktörlerine daha çok anlam yükledikleri görülmü tür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: e Gömülmü lük, Ke işsel Faktör Analizi, Do rulayıcı Faktör Analizi.

I. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

I.1. Introduction

In order to understand the job embeddedness concept, many articles and authors have referred to the "voluntary turnover" or "intention to leave" concepts [1]. Most of the theories and research on voluntary turnover is rooted in the ideas of March and Simon [2] who related the concept with the perceived ease and desirability of leaving one's job [3]. The perceived ease of movement is

explained by different job alternatives, while the perceived desirability of movement is usually considered as job satisfaction. The traditional wisdom suggests that when people become unhappy with their current job, they search for alternatives, compare them with their present job using an expected value like decision process and intend to leave if any of these options are judged better than their current employment [4,5]. Job attitudes integrated with job alternatives predict intent to leave which is the direct antecedent to turnover.

The concept "Embeddedness" has been used in the sociology discipline to explain the process by which social relations influence and constrain economic actions [6]. Based on the sociological perspective of embeddedness, Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, Erez [5] first defined job embeddedness as the strength of individuals' links to other people, team and groups. Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, Erez [5] also suggest that *job embeddedness* may associate with one's intentions to stay or leave an organization. Specifically, job embeddedness was accepted as representing the sum of effects that keep employees in their current employment.

Two research related ideas that help in understanding the core of this construct are the embedded figures test and Kurt Lewin's field theory. Embedded figures are immersed in their background. They are attached to it and are hard to separate. They become part of the surroundings. Similarly, [7] Lewin's field theory asserts that people have a perceptual life space in which the conditions of their lives are represented and connected. These connections can be few or many, as well as close or distant. Job embeddedness can be accepted as a net or a web in which a person can feel "fixed". Highly embedded individual has many links that are close together (a low level of differentiation). Moreover, the content of the parts may vary considerably, suggesting that one can be enmeshed or embedded in many *different* ways [5].

Mitchell et al. [5] categorized *job embeddedness* in three dimensions: link, fit and sacrifice. The three dimensions are important both on and off the job. These dimensions can be defined as follows:

Links

Links are characterized as formal or informal connections between a person and institutions or other people. Embeddedness suggests that a number of strands connect an employee and his or her family in a social, psychological, and financial web that includes work and non-work friends, groups, the community, and the physical environment in which he or she lives. The higher the number of connections between the person and the web, the more an employee is attached to the job and the organization. A variety of research results put forward that there is normative pressure to stay on a job, which derives from family, team members and other colleagues Mitchell et al. [5] [8] use the term social integration to describe the "at-work" part of the link process. As mentioned in Mitchell et al.'s study [5] people who are older, are married, have more tenure and/or have children requiring care are more likely to stay than to leave. Thus, people have both on and off the job links among the various aspects of their lives. Leaving their job and

perhaps their home can sever or require the rearrangement of some of these links.

Fit

Fit is defined as an employee's perceived compatibility or comfort level with an organization and with his or her environment. An employee's plans for his or her future in current organization, career goals and personal values are important components of the fit between an employee and the organization. Another crucial dimension of the fit between an employee and the organization includes the demands (knowledge, skill and abilities) of the current job. This attribute also concerns the fit between the employee and surrounding community. The weather, location, amenities, political or religious climate, and entertainment activities have been accepted as related parts of fit between an employee and community [9]. The weather, amenities and general culture of the location in which one resides are further examples. Most important, these assessments of fit may be independent of job or organization fit (I love IBM, I hate New York). Relocation would obviously require a recalibration of fit, but even a new job without relocation could disturb one's general patterns with new hours of work or a different commute. Individuals with a poor person-organization fit were more likely to leave an organization than those with a good person-organization fit. Chan [10] suggests that having one's personal attributes fit with one's job may decrease turnover, and Villanova, Bernardin, Johnson and Dahmus [11] found that a concept related to fit, was also found to have a negative relationship to turnover. Initial job choice and socialization are related to perceived fit which in turn affects turnover. Thus, a person's fit with the job and organization relates to attachments to the organization. There are similar community dimensions of fit as well.

Sacrifice

Sacrifice captures the perceived cost of material or psychological benefits that may be forfeited by leaving one's job. For example, leaving an organization likely promises personal losses (e.g., giving up colleagues, interesting projects or pleasant perks). The more an employee gives up when leaving, the more difficult it is to sever employment with the organization [12]. Though comparable salary and benefits may be easily found in an environment of low unemployment, the switching costs (e.g., new health care or pension plans) are real and relevant. Moreover, non-portable benefits like stock options or defined benefit pensions may involve sacrifices. These latter factors have been shown to be related to turnover [5]. Less visible, but still important, potential sacrifices incurred by leaving an organization include opportunities for job stability and advancement. In addition, various advantages accrue to an individual who stays. Time in rank can determine your order in picking an office. Sabbaticals are granted after six years

of employment at many universities. Taking a new job means giving up these accrued advantages. Community sacrifices (as well as links and fit to some extent) are mostly an issue if one has to relocate. Leaving a community that is attractive, safe and where one is liked or respected can be hard. The football tickets or ballet seats that took 20 years of seniority to obtain might be needed to be given up. Of course, one can change jobs but stay in the same home. But even then, various conveniences like an easy commute or the ability to be at home during certain times due to flextime (e.g., when kids come home from school) may be lost by changing jobs. Perks that effect one's private life such as day care or vehicles provided by the company may also disappear. Although off the job embeddedness may be more crucial when relocation is involved, we suspect it will be important even for situations only requiring a change in jobs. In addition, if people are embedded they may remove job alternatives that require relocation from the set of job options they consider.

I.2. Factors Effecting Job Embeddedness

Non-work factors

First, a body of empirical research suggests that many off-the-job factors are important for attachment and embeddedness concept. The original turnover models mention "non-work" influences and they include family attachments or conflicts between work and family roles. More recent research on spillover models explains how family and work lives are related. It was stated that how non-work commitments like family, hobbies and church influence job attitudes and attachment. Moreover, it was found that having children at home and a spouse were better predictors of leaving a job than organizational commitment [5].

Other organization-focused predictors

Second, there are now a variety of factors that have been empirically associated with retention that are not attitudes but are organizational in nature. Inducements to stay can derive from working with groups or on certain projects that create types of commitment other than the attraction one has for his or her job or organization. For example, many companies use teams to induce attachments [13].

New turnover theory

Third, there is the research on the Unfolding Model [14]. These authors describe different ways people decide to leave organizations (i.e., four distinct paths). The interesting points are that many people who leave (1) are relatively satisfied with their job, (2) don't search for other jobs before leaving, and (3) leave because of some sort of precipitating event (which they call a shock) rather than a negative attitude. In addition, the content or issues

involved with the shock frequently occur off the job (e.g., spouse relocates). Thus, these results provide clues as to why the attitude-search models only predict modestly well who leaves. In many cases, negative attitudes or job search are simply not associated with leaving. Collectively these different and nontraditional ideas helped to develop the job embeddedness construct.

Many studies on the job embeddedness demonstrate the relation with the demographic variables such as gender, age, tenure, marital status, having children etc. It has been suggested by Schwartz [16] that women are twice as likely as men are to quit their jobs. Recent research analyzing the turnover of managers in organizations demonstrated that 26 % of the women left their companies while only 14 % of the men departed over a two-year period [17]. Female workers traditionally have been observed as having a lower commitment to the labor force than men. However, in their meta-analysis, Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner [18] show only an insignificant difference between men and women in terms of turnover (women are slightly more apt to leave their jobs than men). Further, Royalty [19] discovered that gender differences in turnover are because of the behavior of less educated women (many of whom leave the labor force when they leave a job). As a result, educated women and men are alike in their turnover behavior. A study by Abelson [20] analyzed variables related to both on and off the job links. Abelson [20] discovered that people who are older, are married, have more tenure and/or have children in need of care are more likely to stay than to leave. Cohen [21], on the other hand, specifically mentions hobbies and church-related activities as factors that can influence commitment. Thus, people have many links among the various facets of their lives. Younger employees are more probably to take risks at the beginning of their careers. They can accept positions that are below their abilities and expectations at the beginning of their career and when those better jobs become available they move on to these jobs. Meta-analytic research supports the negative age-turnover relationship [18]. Feldman and Tompson [22] have found that younger workers have fewer restraints and obligations in terms of moving geographically. In a study of 535 salespeople, Ornstein, Cron, and Slocum [23] have discovered that individuals who are "entering the adult world" are more willing to relocate than any other age group. Moreover, compared with those in relatively stable periods, individuals in transitional periods usually reevaluate their life goals and values, trying to build up a better life structure. Therefore, they may be more prepared to leave a company or actively look for external career opportunities when they feel less embedded in the organization and/or have a more difficult time adapting to their original environment, especially when they are at the earlier life stages [24].

Higher levels of education might lead to an increase in an individual's turnover probability by increasing his/her opportunities. Moreover, an unobservable characteristic called "career mindedness" could be related with higher levels of education [19]. A career-minded individual might take the risk of changing a job for future improvements in his/her career.

Armknrecht and Early [25] found that up to 78 % of the variance in total quit rate could be explained on the basis of present and expected economic conditions. Obviously, labor markets build up the quality and quantity of alternative opportunities [26] and, thus, an individual's behavior or even attitudes would change in times of high versus low unemployment [27].

As a person's income from a job increases, the probability of him/her leaving the job decreases. This result has been shown in various occupations, demographic groups and across gender. Although the effect is typically moderate [18], it is enduring.

Among workers in multiple industries and job types with widely varied demographic characteristics, job embeddedness has been found to significantly improve the prediction of turnover [28].

Super [29-31] describes an individual's lifelong career cycle as made up of four sequential stages—trial (exploration), establishment, maintenance, and decline (disengagement)—each of which includes three substages with different career developmental concerns. A person's career stage can strongly influence one's social behavior and attitudes [15]. For example, individuals at the exploration stage are more willing to learn, are usually less committed and involved in their jobs, and are more flexible with changes. At the establishment stage, people are more involved in their competence and professional identity, striving to combine their skills and build specialized career niches for future promotion and growth. Individuals at the maintenance stage usually hold onto accomplishments achieved earlier and begin to reevaluate and reconsider previous career choices from a value driven perspective. Those at the disengagement stage usually psychologically move away from their current company or occupation and search for changes and new career opportunities [15,29-34]. Traditional career stage theories imply a basic assumption of long-term employment in a stable environment and a close relationship between a person's biological age and his or her career stage. In the new career environment, however, more turbulence, job dislocation, and personal change are observed. For example, Sullivan [35] points out that most Americans change jobs every 4.5 years. Therefore, either multiple, shorter "minicycles" over the working life years or persistent exploration and trial activity throughout one's career are observed [15], regardless of one's chronological age or organizational tenure.

Based on the previous research findings, this study aims to analyze the job embeddedness in relation with different socio demographic characteristics such as gender, age, education, marital status, having a child, total tenure, tenure in the current organization and working sector.

II. RESEARCH DESIGN

II.1. Instrument

To measure job embeddedness Mitchell et al.'s [5] 27 item scale was used. This instrument has link, fit, and sacrifice dimensions for both on and off the job situations. Therefore, it has six factors; fit to community, fit to organization, community related sacrifice, organization related sacrifice, links to community and links to organization. However, the link dimensions consisted of demographic questions like marital status, whether the family roots are from the same community, how long the person has been working, with how many coworkers one is interacting during the day, etc. For this reason items related to link dimensions were considered separately and as a part of demographic questions. 27 item scale is made up of fit and sacrifice factors and measured on a five-point interval scale, ranging from 1=totally disagree to 5=totally agree.

Demographic questions included in the questionnaire were gender, marital status, age, level of education and working sector (public or private). Links to community questions were: "Do you own the home you live in?", "Are your family roots in this community?", "How many of your family members live nearby? (not at all/a few or majority)", and "How many of your close friends live nearby? (not at all/a few or majority)".

Finally, links to community questions included items, such as, "How long have you been working in your present position for this company?," "How long have you been working for this company", "How long have you been working in this industry?", "How many coworkers do you interact with (none/a few or many)?", "How many coworkers are highly dependent on you (none/a few or many)?", "How many work teams are you on (none/a few or many)?", and "How many work committees are you on (none/a few or many)?".

II.2. Sampling and data collection

Data for the study were collected from employees working in public and private companies in Istanbul (37.2 % and 62.8 % respectively). Participation in the study was voluntary. 200 questionnaires were distributed and with a 78 % return rate 156 questionnaires were obtained. 55.8 % of the sample consisted of females and 44.2 % consisted of males. Age of the sample ranged between 20 to 56 with a mean of 30.98 and a standard

deviation of 8.44, respondents were highly educated (75 % university graduates).

III. ANALYSES

III.1. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Construct

As the initial step, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was employed to identify and test the underlying structure of the job embeddedness scale, since it was applied in a different culture than where the scale was originally developed. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett test of sphericity tests were conducted to test the appropriateness of data for factor analysis [36].

The results of the tests were satisfactory (KMO=0.83, $\chi^2_{Bartlett\ test} (136)=1430.61, p=0.00$). And then principal component analysis and varimax rotation were employed. Factors with eigen values over one were retained and items with factor loadings below 0.50 and items with high cross loadings were excluded [37,38].

Table.1. Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analyses Results of Job Embeddedness

Job embeddedness	EFA load.	CFA load.	t value
Organization related sacrifice (VE=21.80; $\alpha=0.90$; CR=0.89; AVE=0.62)			
The health care benefits provided by this organization are excellent.	0.896	0.74	a
The retirement benefits provided by this organization are excellent.	0.858	0.76	12.93***
The prospects for continuing employment with this company are excellent.	0.809	0.87	10.45***
The benefits are good on this job.	0.802	0.85	10.25***
The perks on this job are outstanding.	0.709	0.70	8.47***
Fit to community & Community related sacrifice (VE=21.56; $\alpha=0.87$; CR=0.86; AVE=0.52)			
I really love the place where I live.	0.838	0.74	A
This community is a good match for me.	0.828	0.84	9.81***
Leaving this community would be very hard.	0.774	0.67	9.78***
The area where I live offers the leisure activities that I like.	0.749	0.71	8.45***
I think of the community where I live as home.	0.727	0.74	8.78***
My neighborhood is safe.	0.684	0.60	7.05***

Table.1. Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analyses Results of Job Embeddedness (cont.)

Job embeddedness	EFA load.	CFA load.	t value
Fit to Organization - Management philosophy (VE=16.60; $\alpha=0.85$; CR=0.84; AVE=0.58)			
I feel good about my professional growth and development.	0.812	0.90	A
I have a lot freedom on this job to decide how to pursue my goals.	0.798	0.58	7.70***
I like the authority and responsibility I have at this company.	0.776	0.66	9.07***
I can reach my professional goals working for this organization	0.711	0.85	12.69***
Fit to Organization - Task (VE=9.47; $\alpha=0.75$; CR=0.75; AVE=0.60)			
My job utilizes my skills and talents well.	0.871	0.73	A
I feel like I am a good match for this company.	0.851	0.82	4.62***
(KMO=0.83, $\chi^2_{Bartlett\ test} (136)=1430.61, p=0.00$) $\chi^2(110, N=156)=159.01, p=0.00$; GFI=0.90; AGFI=0.86; CFI=0.96, RMSEA=0.05			
Note. α = Cronbach's Reliability; VE= Variance Explained CR= Construct Reliability; AVE=Average variance extracted; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ a=scale item fixed to 1; GFI=Goodness of Fit; AGFI=Adjusted Goodness of Fit; CFI=Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA=Root Mean Square Error Approximation			

As a result of the EFA of job embeddedness scale four factors were obtained. 10 items were dropped during the factor analysis. Minimum variance extracted around 60 % range with each factor explaining at least 5 % of total variance is advocated in social sciences [37,38]. Here four factors explained the 69 % of the total variance where individually factors explained 9.47 to 21.80 % which were satisfactory. The results of EFA, items under each factor and factor loadings are given in Table 1. Although there were some differences in the items, on the overall "fit to community" and "organization related sacrifice" dimensions were found as indicated by Mitchell et al. [5]. To test the internal consistency of factors, Cronbach's coefficient alpha reliabilities were estimated. Reliabilities were 0.90, 0.87, 0.85 and 0.75 respectively and were over the 0.70 threshold suggested by Nunnally [39].

To validate the factors proposed by EFA and investigate the dimension structure more deeply, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using AMOS program. Chi-square test statistics are usually quite sensitive to sample size [37,40], therefore, Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Root Mean Square Error Approximation (RMSEA) were considered during the analysis. There is no standard for acceptable GFI and AGFI, but rule of thumb is GFI greater than .90 and AGFI greater than .80 [41] and RMSEA values of .08 and less have been advocated as indicative of acceptable fit. But some authors propose a value of 0.06 or less as desirable [41,42].

Consequently, confirmatory analysis verified the findings ($\chi^2(110, N=156)=159.01, p=0.00; GFI=0.90, AGFI=0.86, CFI=0.96, RMSEA=0.05$).

To check convergent and discriminant validity [43,44] Fornell and Larcker (1981), some other procedures were employed. The loadings were all significant at 0.01 level and the range of loadings seemed reasonable providing evidence for convergent validity [45]. Construct reliabilities of factors have values higher than 0.60, which is an acceptable level [37,38]. Average variance extracted (AVE) values, which reflect the overall amount of variance accounted for by the latent constructs, ranged between 0.52 to 0.62; Fornell and Larcker [44] favors level of 0.50 or above for AVE. To assess the discriminant validity of the scales Fornell and Larcker [44] criterion were checked where the discriminant validity is established when the AVE for the two constructs is greater than the squared correlation between the two constructs, and then parameter estimate for the two constructs to unity was constrained and compared with factor model where parameter is freely estimated [43]. For each pair, the constrained CFA produced an increase in the chi-square statistic ($\Delta\chi^2$ with 1 df) that was significant at $p<.01$. Findings supported both the convergent and discriminant validity.

III.2. Analyses of the Construct by Demographic Variables

To further analyze the respondents' job embeddedness scores a series of independent sample t-tests were conducted first with demographic and then with links to community and links to organization questions.

Results of the t-tests with demographic questions can be found in Table.2. Organization related sacrifice differs significantly by gender.

Male employees have higher organization related sacrifice scores than female employees ($mean_{female}=2.70, mean_{male}=3.12, t=-2.49, p=0.01$). Fit to community differed with regard to marital status. However interestingly, single employees showed higher fit to community than married employees ($(mean_{married}=3.24, mean_{single}=3.58, t=-2.25, p=0.01)$). Other dimensions did not show statistically significant differences.

When job embeddedness scores with regard to categorical links to community questions were analyzed, it was found that the number of close friends that lived nearby and the family roots being in the same community had significant effect on job embeddedness (See Table.3).

Table.2. Results of t-test Analyses of Demographic Questions

		n	Mean	Std. Dev.	t value	df	p value
Organization related sacrifice	Female	87	2.70	1.05	-2.49	154.00	0.01 *
	Male	69	3.12	1.07			
Fit to community & Community related sacrifice	Married	65	3.24	0.96	-2.25	152.00	0.03 *
	Single	89	3.58	0.90			

Note. N=156; * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$

Table.3. Results of t-test Analyses of Links to Community Questions

How many of your close friends live nearby?		n	Mean	Std. Dev.	t value	df	p value
Job embeddedness	Not at all/a few	70	3.51	0.69	2.87	153.00	0.01 *
	Majority	85	3.20	0.64			
Fit to community & Community related sacrifice	Not at all/a few	70	3.63	1.01	2.27	133.94	0.03 *
	Majority	85	3.29	0.84			
Fit to Organization - Management philosophy	Not at all/a few	70	3.69	0.84	2.83	152.26	0.01 *
	Majority	85	3.24	1.09			
Is your family roots in this community?							
Fit to community & Community related sacrifice	Yes	58	3.46	0.90	2.15	125.45	0.03 *
	No	95	3.31	0.95			

Note. N=156; * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$

Employees showed higher job embeddedness if their close friends were not nearby ($\text{mean}_{\text{not at all}}=3.51$, $\text{mean}_{\text{few}}=3.20$, $t=2.87$, $p=0.01$). They also showed higher fit to community & community related sacrifice and fit to organization - management philosophy ($\text{mean}_{\text{not at all}}=3.63$, $\text{mean}_{\text{few}}=3.29$, $t=2.27$, $p=0.03$; ($\text{mean}_{\text{not at all}}=3.69$, $\text{mean}_{\text{few}}=3.24$, $t=2.83$, $p=0.01$ respectively). However they showed more fit to community & community related sacrifice when their family roots were in the same community ($\text{mean}_{\text{yes}}=3.46$, $\text{mean}_{\text{no}}=3.31$, $t=2.15$, $p=0.03$). None of the “links to organization” questions were found to be statistically significant, so as the other “links to community” questions.

Age and some of the links to organization questions like tenure were measured with ratio scale. To find if there were relations between them and job embeddedness dimensions Pearson correlations coefficient analyses were performed, but none of the questions showed significant relations.

IV. RESULTS and DISCUSSION

In this study job embeddedness and its relation with different socio demographic characteristics is analyzed. To measure job embeddedness Mitchell et al.’s [5] construct made up of fit and sacrifice factors was used. Links to community questions were added as socio demographic characteristics with gender, marital status, age, level of education and working sector.

As the first step of the study, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted. Four factors explaining the 69 % of the total variance were obtained using principal component analysis. These factors were named “*organization related sacrifice*”, “*fit to community & community related sacrifice*”, “*fit to organization - management philosophy*” and “*fit to organization - task*”.

Then, to investigate the factor structure more deeply, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted. Findings obtained from exploratory factor analysis (EFA) were verified by using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).

Moreover, independent sample t-tests were conducted with socio demographic variables and links to community and links to organization questions. According to our findings,

- organization related sacrifice differs significantly by gender while male employees have higher organization related sacrifice scores than female employees

- fit to community and community related sacrifice differs with regard to marital status while single employees having higher scores than married employees

Other factors did not show statistically significant differences.

Although, it’s not very usual to find direct studies on job embeddedness, Mitchell et al. [5] stated that job embeddedness has some similarities with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Mitchell et al. [5] found that job embeddedness significantly predicted subsequent voluntary turnover after controlling for gender, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job search and perceived alternatives. Additional research has demonstrated the utility of job embeddedness as a predictor of voluntary turnover [46-49].

While many demographics are related with job embeddedness in the literature [17-20], only gender and marital status indicated significant relationship in this research.

Cotton and Tuttle [50], Miller and Wheeler [51], Brush, Moch and Pooyan [52] found out that gender had an effect on intention to leave, organizational commitment and organizational fit.

Studies have shown that females are more susceptible to withdrawal behaviors due to family work concerns, inflexible work hours, and overall dissatisfaction with current work environments [53-56].

Males and females interact with their work environments differently due to the fact that women’s work lives ostensibly involve two parallel worlds, work and family. Women traditionally take care of their families in addition to working, sometimes creating a more volatile situation in regards to their ability to stay with an organization for a prolonged period of time. Women’s work behavior is often related to their family responsibilities and not the perceived work opportunities or need for career advancement or achievement [57].

Women’s employment often reflects the life stages of being single, getting married, having children, and dealing with the empty nest [17,58]. Life events, such as starting a family and getting married may play a larger role in a female leaving an organization than an attitudinal variable. Griffeth, Hom and Gaertner [18] provided results which indicate that women are more likely to remain than men as they age. However, there may be a simple economic reason for this.

Lee and Maurer [59] found that marital status and the presence of children at home were predictors of leaving than organizational commitment. Price and Mueller’s [60] notion about kinship responsibility assesses one’s marital status, number of children and

relatives living nearby. Cotton and Tuttle [50] performed a meta-analysis on the relationship between marital status and turnover. They found that married respondents demonstrated a negative correlation to turnover. Viscusi [61] also found that married participants demonstrated a lower quit probability. Martin [62] performed a study on marital status and its effect on job satisfaction. Martin [62] found marital status to be moderately correlated to job satisfaction, and had almost no correlation with intent to leave. Waters, Roach, and Waters [63] found a weak positive correlation between marital status and job satisfaction. This would suggest that married respondents are more satisfied than single respondents, and therefore marital status affects job satisfaction such that married couples are less likely to leave compared to single. This relationship will hold true between marital status and job embeddedness because of the similar relationship between job satisfaction and the organizational factors of job embeddedness.

Unlikely, in this study single employees were found to show more fit to community and community related sacrifice than married employees. This may be because of their life styles. This may also be related to other factors provided by organizations like compensation.

Number of close friends that lived nearby and the family roots being in the same community had significant effect on job embeddedness. It was found that if close friends were not nearby then employees had higher job embeddedness. Similarly, it has been observed that fit to community & community related sacrifice and fit to organization - management philosophy factors have higher scores for those whose close friends were not nearby.

Finally, employees whose family roots were in the same community had higher fit to community & community related sacrifice.

Research related to the link dimension of job embeddedness suggests that pressure from family and work colleagues are important factors that determine employees' attachment to their job [64]. Pressure from family may include demands to keep or change jobs and may be both overt and subtle in nature [64]. Fishbein's [5] notion about subjective norm concerns the effect of other people's (e.g. family and coworkers) beliefs about whether one should quit.

Having close relations with the family and being respectful and closely tied to family are among the characteristics of collectivist cultures. The sample being chosen from Turkey having a collectivist culture might be representing these characteristics.

Having close friends nearby might be important in terms of support. If the individual aims to accomplish certain goals in the organization, he might need the support of others to realize his aim. If close friends are not nearby, he might adopt to the community for self-actualization. On the other hand, this might bring the informal groups into attention. The individual might be involved more with work if not closely related to a certain group.

As an alternative to traditional attitudinal predictors of turnover intentions, job embeddedness offers a way for human resource managers and organizational leaders to consider a wider range of forces which keep individuals from leaving their current jobs and may help predict turnover better than attitudinal indicators alone.

Literature suggests that job embeddedness can be increased through a series of organizational measures, such as instituting a mentorship system or increasing the number of work teams an individual participates in [5]. Since embeddedness is directly related to actual turnover, implementing measures that increase embeddedness will have a negative effect on turnover.

It may be more beneficial for individuals and organizations to seek ways to increase the links and fit of individuals, and to highlight the sacrifices inherent in job change. Empowering individuals with special projects, creating teams, and engaging mentors are just a few of the ideas available to organizational leaders to develop links. Non-work links can be enhanced through community work and social ties [65].

For managers in general, it is helpful to think of job embeddedness as a beneficial system of connections which enhances personal and organizational well-being. Being embedded may help reduce the effect of individual stressful events or temporary dissatisfactions which may lead to snap decisions to leave an organization. Being embedded may make it more difficult to search for a new job and/or leave an organization [65]. Barney [66] suggests that managers should be accountable for their role in retention. If that is to be the case, managers should be armed with adequate knowledge about what causes turnover, and how they may work to reduce it.

REFERENCES

- [1] Harris, K.J.; Wheeler, A.R. & Kacmar, K.M. (2011). The Mediating Role of Organizational Job embeddedness in the LMX- Outcomes Relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(2), 271-281.
- [2] March, J.G. & Simon HA. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- [3] Lee, T.W.; Mitchell, T.R.; Sablinski, C.J.; Burton, J.P., & Holtom, B.C. (2004). The Effects of Job Embeddedness on Organizational Citizenship, Job Performance, Volitional

- Absences, and Voluntary Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 711-722.
- [4] Mobley W.H. (1977). Intermediate Linkages in the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(2), 237-240.
- [5] Mitchell T.R.; Holtom, B.C.; Lee, T.W.; Sablinski, C.J. & Erez, M. (2001). Why People Stay: Using Job Embeddedness to Predict Voluntary Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6), 1102-1121.
- [6] Sekiguchi, T.; Burton, J.P. & Sablinski, C.J. (2008). The Role of Job Embeddedness on Employee Performance: The Interactive Effects with Leader-Member Exchange and Organization – Based Self Esteem. *Personnel Psychology*. 61(4), 761-793.
- [7] Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory in Social Science*. NewYork: Harper.
- [8] O'Reilly III, C.A.; Caldwell, D.F. & Barnett, W.P. (1989). Work Group Demography, Social Integration, and Turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34(1): 21-37.
- [9] Reitz, O.E. & Anderson, M.A. (2011). An Overview of Job Embeddedness. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 27(5), 320-327.
- [10] Chan, D. (1996). Cognitive Misfit of Problem-Solving Style at Work: A Facet of Person-Organization Fit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 68(3), 194-207.
- [11] Villanova, P.; Bernardin, H.; Johnson, D. & Dahmus, S. (1994). The Validity of a Measure of Job Compatibility in the Prediction of Job Performance and Turnover of Motion Picture Theater Personnel. *Personnel Psychology*, 47(1), 73-90.
- [12] Shaw, J.D.; Delery, J.E.; Jenkins, G.D. & Gupta, N. (1998). An Organization-Level Analysis of Voluntary and Involuntary Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(5), 511-525.
- [13] Cohen, S.G. & Bailey, D.E. (1997). What Makes Teams Work: Group Effectiveness Research from the Shop Floor to the Executive Suite. *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 239-290.
- [14] Lee, T.W. & Mitchell, T.R. (1994). An Alternative Approach: The Unfolding Model of Voluntary Employee Turnover. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(1), 51-89.
- [15] Hall, D.T. (2002). *Careers In And Out of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [16] Schwartz, E.N., (1989). Executives and Organizations: Management Women and the New Facts of Life. *Harvard Business Review*, 67(1), 65-76.
- [17] Stroh, L.K.; Brett, J.M. & Reilly, A.H. (1996). Family Structure, Glass Ceiling, and Traditional Explanations for the Differential Rate of Turnover of Female and Male Managers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(1), 99-118.
- [18] Griffeth, R.W.; Hom, P.W. & Gaertner, S. (2000), A Meta-analysis of Antecedents and Correlates of Employee Turnover, Update, Moderator Tests, and Research Implications for the Next Millennium, *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 463-488.
- [19] Royalty, A.B. (1998). Job-to-Job and Job-to-Nonemployment: Turnover by Gender and Education Level, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16(2), 392-443.
- [20] Abelson, M.A. (1987). Examination of Avoidable and Unavoidable Turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(3), 382-386.
- [21] Cohen, A. (1995). An Examination of the Relationships Between Work Commitment and Nonwork Domains. *Human Relations*, 48(3), 239-263.
- [22] Feldman, D.C. & Tompson, H.B. (1993). Expatriation, Repatriation, and Domestic Geographical Relocation: An Empirical Investigation of Adjustment to New Job Assignments. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24(3), 507-529.
- [23] Ornstein, S.; Cron, W.L. & Slocum, J.W. (1989). Life Stage Versus Career Stage: A Comparative Test of the Theories of Levinson and Super. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10(2), 117-133.
- [24] Shen, Y. & Hall, D.T. (2009). When Expatriates Explore Other Options: Retaining Talent through Greater Job Embeddedness and Repatriation Adjustment, *Human Resource Management*, 48(5), 793-816.
- [25] Armknecht, P.A. & Early, J.F. (1972), Quit in Manufacturing, a Study of Their Causes, *Monthly Labor Review*, 95(11), 31-37.
- [26] Mano-Negrin, R. & Tzafirir, S.S. (2004), Job Search Modes and Turnover, *Career Development International*, 9(5), 442-458.
- [27] Trevor, C. (2001), Interactive Effects among Actual Ease of Movement Determinants and Job Satisfaction in the Prediction of Voluntary Turnover, *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 621-638.
- [28] Holdom, B.C. & Inderrieden, E.J. (2006) Integrating the Unfolding Model and Job Embeddedness Model to Better Understand Voluntary Turnover. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 18(4), 435-452
- [29] Super, D.E. (1957). *The psychology of careers*. New York: Harper & Row.

- [30] Super, D.E. (1980). A Life-Span, Life-Space Approach to Career Development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 16(3), 282-298.
- [31] Super, D.E. (1992). Toward A Comprehensive Theory of Career Development. (Eds.: Montross, D.H. & Shinkman, C.J.). *Career Development: Theory and Practice*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas, 35-64.
- [32] Kram, K.E. & Isabella, L.A. (1985). Mentoring Alternatives: The Role of Peer Relationships in Career Development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(1), 110-132.
- [33] Levinson, D.J. (1996). *The Seasons of a Woman's Life*. New York: Knopf.
- [34] Levinson, D.J.; Darrow, C.N.; Klein, E.B.; Levinson, M.H. & McKee, B. (1978). *The Seasons of a Man's Life*. New York: Knopf.
- [35] Sullivan, S.E. (1999). The Changing Nature of Careers: A Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 457-484.
- [36] Sharma S. (1996). *Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis*. Newyork, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- [37] Hair Jr. F.J.; Black, C.W.; Babin, J.B. & Anderson, E.R. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc.
- [38] Netemeyer, R.G.; Bearden, W.O. & Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling Procedures: Issues and Applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- [39] Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. 2nd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [40] Hoyle, R.H. (1995). *Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues, and Applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- [41] Lattin, J.; Carroll, D.J. & Green, P.E. (2003). *Analyzing Multivariate Data*. Pasific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Thomson Learning.
- [42] Hu, L. & Bentler, P.M. (1995). Evaluating Model Fit. In (Ed. Hoyle, R.). *Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues, and Applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, 76-99.
- [43] Anderson, J.C. & Gerbing, D.W. (1988). Structural equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(May), 411-423.
- [44] Fornell, C. & Larcker F.D. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(2), 39-50.
- [45] Bagozzi, R.P. & Yi, Y. (1988). On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(2), 74-94.
- [46] Allen, D.G. (2006). Do Organizational Socialization Tactics nfluence Newcomer Embeddedness? *Journal of Management*, 32(2), 237-257.
- [47] Crossley, C.D.; Bennett, R.J.; Jex, S.M. & Burnfield, J.L. (2007). Development of a Global Measurement of Job Embeddedness and Integration into a Traditional Model of Turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1031-1042.
- [48] Trevor, C.O. & Nyberg, A.J. (2008). Keeping Headcount When All About You Are Losing Theirs: Downsizing, Voluntary Turnover Rates, and the Moderating Role of HR Practices. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2), 259-276.
- [49] Felps, W.; Hekman, D.R.; Mitchell, T.R.; Lee, T.W.; Harman, W.S. & Holtom, B.C. (2009). Turnover Contagion: How Coworkers' Job Embeddedness and Coworkers' Job Search Behaviors Influence Quitting. *Academy of Management Journal*. 52(3), 545-561.
- [50] Cotton, J.L. & Tuttle, J.M. (1986). Employee Turnover: A Meta-Analysis and Review with Implications for Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 55-70.
- [51] Miller, J.G. & Wheeler, K.G. (1992). Unraveling The Mysteries of Gender Differences in Intentions to Leave The Organization. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(5), 465-478.
- [52] Brush, D.H.; Moch, M.K. & Pooyan, A. (1987). Individual Demographic Differences and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 8(2), 139-155.
- [53] Phelan, J.E.; Bromet, J. & Schwartz, J.E. (1994). The Work Environment of Male and Female Professionals: Objective and Subjective Characteristics. *Work and Occupations*, 20(1), 63-89.
- [54] Rosin, H. & Korabik, K. (1995). Organizational Experiences and Propensity to Leave: A Multivariate Investigation of Men and Women Managers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 46(1), 1-16.
- [55] Weisberg, J. & Kirschenbaum, A. (1993). Gender and Turnover: A Reexamination of the Impact of Sex on Intent and Actual Job Changes. *Human Relations*, 46(8), 987-1006.

- [56] Wenk, D. & Rosenfeld, R. (1992). Women's Employment Exit and Reentry: Job Leaving Reasons and Their Consequences. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, (11), 127-150.
- [57] Steir, H.; Lewin-Epstein, N. & Braun, M. (2001). Welfare Regimes, Family-supportive Policies, and Women's Employment along the Life-Course. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(6), 1731-1760.
- [58] Felmler, D. (1995). Causes and Consequences of Women's Employment Discontinuity. *Work and Occupations*, 22(2), 167-187.
- [59] Lee, T.W. & Maurer, S. (1999). The Effects of Family Structure on Organizational Commitment, Intention to Leave and Voluntary Turnover. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 11(4), 493-513.
- [60] Price, J.L. & Mueller, C.W. (1981). A Causal Model of Turnover For Nurses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3), 543-565.
- [61] Viscusi, K.W. (1980) Sex Differences in Worker Quitting. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 62(3), 388-398.
- [62] Martin, T.N.Jr. (1979). A Contextual Model of Employee Turnover Intentions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22(2), 313-324.
- [63] Waters, L.K.; Roach, D. & Waters, C.W. (1976) Estimates of Future Tenure, Satisfaction, and Biographical Variables as Predictors of Termination. *Personnel Psychology*, 29(1), 57-60.
- [64] Prestholdt, P.H.; Lane I.M. & Mathews, R.C. (1987) Nurse Turnover as Reasoned Action: Development of a Process Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(2), 221-227.
- [65] Valle, M.; Leupold, C.R. & Leupold, K.L. (2006) Holding Holding on and Letting Go: The Relationship between Job Embeddedness and Turnover Among PEM Physicians. *Journal of Business Inquiry*, 5(1), 3-10.
- [66] Barney, S.M. (2002). Retaining our workforce, regaining our potential. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 47(5), 291-295.



Melek B RSEL

(mbirsel@marmara.edu.tr)

She has PhD degree in Organizational Behavior. She is working in Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Organizational Behavior, Marmara University as Assistant Professor. Her research areas are ethics at work life, trust, culture, and psychological contracts.



M. Deniz BÖRÜ

(denizboru@marmara.edu.tr)

She has a Ph.D. degree in Management and Organization.. She is Associate Professor Doctor in Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Management and Organization, Marmara University. Her research areas are trust, small business management, and entrepreneurship.



Güler SLAMO LU

(gislamoglu@marmara.edu.tr)

She has PhD degree in Organizational Behavior. She is Associate Professor Doctor in Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Organizational Behavior, Marmara University. Her research areas are ethics, trust, culture, team working.



E. Serra YURTKORU

(syurtkoru@marmara.edu.tr)

She has a Ph.D. of Business Administration at Marmara University Social Sciences Institute. She is an Associate Professor of Quantitative Methods at Marmara University. Her research areas are multivariate statistics, data mining, leadership, consumer behavior and higher education.