

Full Length Research Paper

Impact of job embeddedness on leave intention: An understanding from higher education (HE) system

Muhammad Shafique¹, Faisal Qadeer^{1*}, Munir Ahmad¹ and Rashid Rehman²

¹National College of Business Administration and Economics, Lahore, Pakistan.

²Al-Ghurair University, Dubai, UAE.

Accepted 24 August, 2011

Most of the researchers have focused on work-related attitudes and employment alternatives to explain leave intention (or turnover intention) of employees. Job embeddedness framework integrates both work and non-work related factors to explain employee's turnover rather than only work related dimension. This paper presents the results of an empirical survey conducted in higher education institutions to validate job embeddedness construct in a new context. Out of the two types of embeddedness, our findings fully supports that organization embeddedness has a negative impact on leave intention, however, there is no impact of community embeddedness. In addition, job alternative positively relates to leave intention. Some items of community and organization link dimensions of the composite measure have also been improved.

Key words: Job embeddedness, leave intention, employee turnover, job alternative, higher education institutions, Pakistan.

INTRODUCTION

Human resource (HR) systems of an organization are no more static but considered to be dynamic systems that consist of stocks and flows (Bartholomew et al., 1991). Organizational turnover is one of the most fundamental flows of this system. In this context, an important responsibility of HR professionals is to control employee's turnover and retain the high performers in the organization for a longer period (Alam, 2009; Naris and Ukpere, 2010).

Leave intention is "the extent to which an employee plans to leave an organization". Stronger feelings of withdrawal intentions typically result in an increased likelihood that the employee will leave (Steel and Ovalle, 1984). Various terms that are synonymous with leave intention have been used in management literature. These synonymous terms are "withdrawal intentions and cognitions" (Maertz and Campion, 1998), "intent to leave" (Barak et al., 2001), "turnover intention" (Wayne et al., 1997), and "propensity to leave" (Murray and Murray, 1998). For purposes of uniformity, the phrase "leave intention" is adopted in this study to describe the extent to

which employees feel they will leave an organization.

Alternative job is the "availability of equivalent or better jobs in the immediate area outside the organization". This assumes a certain level of 'visibility' or an employee's level of awareness of other available jobs and consistently has been found to have effect on intent to quit (Griffeth and Hom, 1988).

Organizations are interested in decreasing employee turnover because of the high replacement costs (Ramlall, 2003; Richard et al., 1995; Hom and Griffeth, 1995; Tang, 2005). The total cost of employee withdrawal to organization (including turnover, absence, lateness and withholding of effort, as well as new recruitment, selecting and training costs) is 17% pretax annual income (Sagie et al., 2002). Another study concludes that the aggregate impact of turnover on American business is \$ 11 billion annually (Abbasi and Hollman, 2000). One of the world's largest management and information technology consulting firm estimates that an experienced consultant while leaving from an organization takes away an intellectual value of over \$ 1 million (Oz, 2002). Dess and Shaw (2001) have proposed a supplemental perspective of turnover, that is, human capital that is valuable in terms of organizational social capital.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: mfaisalqr@gmail.com.

According to Holtom et al. (2006), the social relationships formed by employees inside and outside the organization are believed to create social capital, a source that is being increasingly recognized crucial for success in today's organization. When a valued person leaves a firm, the social network is disrupted and some of the social capital leaves as well. It is a fact that an individual propensity to leave a job depends upon many personal, organizational and environmental factors. An early attempt to figure out these causes is made in by Silcock (1954). Griffeth et al. (2000), Kirschenbaum and Weisberg (2002), Price (2001) and Zeffane (1994) identify various variables that fall into the categories of employee characteristics, job nature, organization nature and external condition. Iverson and Roy (1994) identify economic, psychological, and sociological perspectives of leave intention. Lambert et al. (2001) and Rosemary and Monique (2003) tries to investigate turnover phenomenon in terms of HR practices. Normative pressure by family and friends (Maertz and Campion, 1998), kinship responsibility (Price, 2001), work/family conflict (Frone et al., 1992; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985), financial responsibilities, and community relations (Flowers and Hughes, 1973; Iverson and Roy, 1994) are other variables that may be considered cogent reasons to explain turnover phenomenon.

This study makes an empirical investigation to explain leave intention in higher education setting. Job embeddedness framework has already been tested in various contexts to explain leave intention. However, to the best of our knowledge, hardly any study in higher education system has been conducted that uses this framework. The second important variable that is used to explain is job alternatives.

In order to understand the phenomenon of employee turnover, that is, why they leave organizations, several models have been presented in literature. Further, this paper briefly discusses the traditional turnover models and the job embeddedness approach to employee turnover (or leave intention). Subsequent discussion covers the research methodology followed by data analysis and interpretations about the empirical survey. Then the paper includes a discussion and conclusions. Lastly, the limitations and directions are presented.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leave intention is behavioral in nature and most researchers now accept that leave or stay intention with a particular employer is the final cognitive step in the decision making process of voluntary turnover. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) believe that the best single predictor of an individual's behavior is his intention to perform that behavior. There are empirical and theoretical evidence that leave intentions are very good predictors of actual turnover (Ajzen, 2002). Steel and Ovalle (1984) report

that meta-correlation between intent to leave and employee turnover is 0.50. Dalessio et al. (1986) argue that in future more attentions should be given to the direct and indirect influences of variables on intention to quit as opposed to the actual act of turnover. From the employer's standpoint, intention to quit may be more important variable than the actual act of turnover. If the precursors to intentions to quit are better understood, the employer could possibly institute changes to affect this intention.

In majority of turnover studies, researchers focus on work-related attitudes and employment alternatives. This traditional wisdom (as named by Mitchell et al., 2001) remains relatively unchanged for the last 50 years. According to these approaches, job satisfaction is considered to be an important and principal determinant of leave intention. The model of March and Simon (1958) is frequently cited by this school of thought. Many studies have proved job satisfaction as a reliable predictor of turnover (Oktay, 1992; Hellman, 1997; Manlove and Guzell, 1997; Feng and Angeline, 2010) and shown to have a direct effect on leave intention as well (Klenke-Hamel and Mathieu, 1990; Liou, 1998; Harrington et al., 2001; Lambert et al., 2001).

However, some researchers contend that job satisfaction is a precursor to organizational commitment, higher levels of commitment leads to a lower leave intention (Lachman and Aranya, 1986; Good et al., 1988; DeConinck and Bachmann, 1994; Lum et al., 1998). Organizational commitment is a useful measure of organizational effectiveness that has the potential to predict organizational outcomes such as performance, turnover and absenteeism (Meyer and Allen, 1997). It provides the most consistent, direct relationship with leave intention across a wide variety of samples (Bishop et al., 2000). Leave intention negatively associates with perceived organizational support and commitment (Tumwesigye, 2010). Similarly, Ponnu and Chuah (2010) suggest to improve employees' commitment to their organizations and to reduce their leave intentions.

Traditional turnover models depict that employees leave their organization because of negative job attitudes, though this is not true in all turnover cases. Rusbult and Farrell (1983), and Rusbult et al. (1988) show that before changing the job, people make comparison between the investment they made in their job or organization, the rewards, quality of alternative, and associated costs dispensed for working with a particular organization and these comparisons are flexible. Hom and Greiffeth (1995) and Greiffeth et al. (2000) in their meta-analysis to find determinants of turnover, also support this opinion that work attitudes play only a small role in overall turnover and there is need for new theory.

Unfolding model of employee turnover is an effort in search of an alternative theory. Lee and Mitchell (1994) present a model to explain the mechanism of voluntary turnover. This model describes four paths that employees

follow while considering to leave an organization. Three of the paths require some kind of “shock” or outside force to cause the employee to reconsider staying with an employer (Alam et al., 2010). Shocks are not limited to work factors and may include any factor, which causes an employee to consider leaving a current job. Later Lee et al. (1996) demonstrate that these four paths explain 63% of the leaving process in their sample. The unmatchable responses of 27% respondents prompt Lee et al. (1999) to re-theorize and extend the unfolding model so that the conceptual ambiguities may be removed. These studies have emphasized that many people leave their jobs not just because of negative effect (that is, job dissatisfaction and weak organizational commitment) but also due to “shocks”. Holtom et al. (2005) also report the same finding.

Mitchell et al. (2001) have introduced organizational attachment construct ‘job embeddedness’ to help address the effect of both work and non-work related factors on employee’s stay in an organization which discourage their voluntary turnover. The critical aspects of job embeddedness are (1) the links that an individual has on and off their job, (2) the fit s/he perceives with environment where s/he lives and work and (3) the sacrifice that s/he has to make by giving up their job in terms of how this action would affect the other aspects of their life that are linked with their job. These three dimensions of job embeddedness are important in the organizational and community context and these are perceived to have negative relation with leave intention. The more embedded an individual is, the greater the inertia, the greater the force required for inducing the person to leave.

Following the research direction of Mitchell et al. (2001), a longitudinal study was conducted by Holtom and O’Neill (2004) to assess the predictive validity of the job embeddedness in healthcare setting. The findings suggest that job embeddedness is a valuable lens to evaluate employee’s retention. A meaningful variance in turnover can be explained through job embeddedness in excess of all the major variables included in the major models of turnover. Lee et al. (2004) disaggregated job embeddedness into two major sub-dimensions i.e. on the job and off the job. Their study reveals that off the job embeddedness significantly predicts the subsequent “voluntary turnover” whereas on the job embeddedness does not. Cunningham et al. (2005) revise the original multi-item scale and used it with newly developed global-item measure in randomly selected intercollegiate softball coaches and athletic department employees. Results demonstrate the efficacy of the job embeddedness construct in explaining why people choose to stay in their organizations. Tanova (2006) uses the new framework to find determinants of voluntary turnover in Europe. Results of this study are in conformance with the finding of Mitchell et al. (2001). Mallol et al. (2007) have conducted research in a culturally diverse population for two leading

southeast Florida banks and examine the predictive value of job embeddedness. Their findings also suggest that job embeddedness is a predictor of employee retention.

METHODOLOGY

Objective and hypotheses

The current study focuses on finding the impact of job embeddedness on leave intention. It develops multi item measure of job embeddedness and then validates it as has been proposed by Mitchell et al. (2001). The following hypotheses are formulated for testing through empirical investigation:

- H₁: Leave intention negatively relates to the Job embeddedness.
H₂: Leave intention positively relates to the Job alternatives.

Population and sample characteristics

The teaching faculty in the higher education institutions (HEIs) situated in Lahore, the capital of Punjab and the second largest metropolitan city of Pakistan constitutes the population. These are 25 HEIs, 11 are public and 14 are private institutions in Lahore having 3356 permanent faculty members. These institutions represent about 20% of the total number of institutions in Pakistan.

The cross-sectional study is conducted on opinion based questionnaire survey from a sample of teaching faculty. Multi-stage sampling design is used. At first stage, a sample of 10 HEIs is randomly selected (5 public and 5 private). There are 1368 permanent faculty members in the 10 sampled HEIs (826 in the public and 542 in the private institutions). At the second stage, a sample of 80 faculty members is randomly selected from this sampling frame of the faculty. The calculation of the sample size is explained thus.

According to Hanif and Munir (2004: 62), “optimal sample minimizes sampling error. Although sampling error is decreased by the increase of sample size but without optimal sample size, there is a danger of a large non-sampling error.” The selection of formula for sample size depends upon the type of data, categorical or continuous, that is playing a primary role in data analysis (Bartlett et al., 2001). Here, continuous data is playing the primary role in the data analysis. Therefore, the Cochran’s (1977) sample size formula may be used; $n = (Z^2 \times S^2) / D^2$. There are three components of this formula. First is Z (standard normal variable), its value depends upon the selected alpha level (confidence level). For 90% confidence level, the value of Z is 1.65. Second, S (estimate of variance), for a scaled variable, number of points on the scale is divided by the number of standard deviations that would include all possible values in the range. For a seven-point scale and given that six standard deviations (three to each side of the mean) would capture 98% of all responses (Bartlett et al., 2001). Dividing 7 by 6, the value of S is 1.167. Third, D (margin of error), for continuous data the acceptable margin of error is 3% (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970). Therefore, $D = 0.30 \times 7 = 0.21$. Putting values of the three components, the sample size $n = 84$. This sample size is about 6.14% (of 1368), which exceeds 5% of the population; therefore, Cochran’s (1977) correction (iteration) formula applies to calculate the optimal sample size. $n = 84 / (1+84/1368) = 79.17$ or 80.

Randomly selected 80 (56 public and 24 private) faculty members from strata of public and private institutions participated in the survey. About 68% faculty members have permanent and about 32% have contractual employment status. Bachelor and Master degree holder are 46% whereas M.Phil and PhD qualified are 36 and 11% respectively and the remaining has other qualifications. About 71% respondents are married and female representation is

Table 1. Revised multi items job embeddedness construct.

Link to community	<p>I feel great sense of belonging to house where I live.</p> <p>My family roots are in the community, where I live.</p> <p>I have reasonable number of family members living nearby.</p> <p>I have reasonable number of close friends living nearby.</p>
Link to organization	<p>I have served in present position for a long time.</p> <p>I have served in present organization for a long time.</p> <p>I have served in present profession for a long time.</p> <p>I have many coworkers who regularly interact with me.</p> <p>I have many coworkers who are highly dependent upon me.</p> <p>I am a part of many work committees/teams.</p>
Fit to community	<p>I really love the place where I live.</p> <p>The weather of the place, where I live is suitable for me.</p> <p>I think of the community where I live as home.</p> <p>This area where I live offers leisure activities that I like (for example, sports, outdoors, cultural, arts).</p> <p>I have family oriented environment where I live.</p>
Fit to organization	<p>I like the members of my work group.</p> <p>My coworkers are similar to me.</p> <p>My job utilizes my skills and abilities well.</p> <p>I like the culture that the organization has.</p> <p>I like the authority and responsibility I have in this organization.</p> <p>I can reach my professional goal working for this organization.</p> <p>I feel good about my professional growth and development.</p> <p>I feel personally valued by the name of organization.</p> <p>My values are compatible with organization's value.</p>
Sacrifice to community	<p>Leaving the community where I live would be very hard.</p> <p>People of the community where I live respect me a lot.</p> <p>My neighborhood is safe.</p>
Sacrifice to organization	<p>I have a lot of freedom on this job to decide how to pursue my goal.</p> <p>The perks and benefits of this job are outstanding.</p> <p>I feel that people at work respect me.</p> <p>My promotional opportunities are excellent here.</p> <p>I am well compensated for my level of performance.</p> <p>The health care benefits provided by this organization are excellent.</p> <p>The retirement benefits provided by this organization are excellent.</p> <p>The prospects for continuing employment with this organization are excellent.</p> <p>I would sacrifice a lot if I left this job.</p>

21%. Lecturers, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors are common designations that are used in these institutions. About 79% faculty members have urban background. Average age of respondents is 39 years (s.d = ± 12.04).

Measures

Job embeddedness is measured through a customized version of

the multi-item construct of Mitchell et al. (2001). Seven point Likert scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (to a great extent) is adopted to record the responses. The mean of scales of all items in each dimension represent the score for that dimension and mean of all dimensions is the score of job embeddedness. Table 1 presents the revised version of the construct.

It is worth mentioning that some items of multi-item construct of Mitchell et al. (2001) have been rephrased and reworded with the purposes to convert all nominal or categorical items into Likert scale

Table 2. Impact of job embeddedness on leave intention.

Variable	B	R ²	Adj. R ²
Block 1		0.138	0.102
Gender	-0.727		
Job category	0.926*		
Marital status	0.771		
Block 2		0.326	0.234
Community link	-0.014		
Community fit	-0.158		
Community sacrifice	-0.116		
Organization link	-0.012		
Organization fit	-0.410**		
Organization sacrifice	-0.344**		

items. For example, the original construct contain a dichotomous item "do you own a home?" (Yes or No) and an item "how many of your close family members live nearby (a numbers) for the community link dimension. Cunningham et al. (2005) point out low internal consistency of these items because of non-uniformity of the scale and different interpretation of question related to family members. Regarding 'close members living nearby' some might consider immediate family while some might consider immediate and extended family members. Such differences in interpretation could influence the results (Alam and Hoque, 2010). By revising these items, the alpha value is now in the acceptable range.

Similarly, with respect to organization links, respondents are asked to indicate, among other things, the number of years they have worked in the organization and the number of coworkers who highly depend on them. It is conceivable, and likely, that responses to the items would vary greatly, thereby, diminishing the internal consistency. Following the directions of Cunningham et al. (2005), some items of community link and organization link have been rephrased. Similarly, a few items are combined and some unnecessary items are omitted. Community and organization link dimensions of multi-item construct of Mitchell et al. (2001) are improved in this way. A pilot study is also conducted to test reliability of the revised multi-item measures (Table 1).

For the measurement of leave intention, three items are adapted from Home et al. (1984). Seven point Likert scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (to a great extent) is used. The mean of means of all three items is the final score, which depicts leave intention.

Two questions are adopted from Lee and Mowday's work (1987) and were rephrased to measure alternative job opportunity. Four items from Kopelman et al. (1992) are used to measure job search behaviour. Participants were given yes or no response options (Yes = 1, No = 2).

ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATION

This study is conducted on Likert scales; so the Cronbach's alpha is used which is the most suitable test for testing reliability of the measure. Internal reliability test was performed on each scale to check the value of reliabilities. All scales met or exceeded the minimum level of reliability estimates. Other underlying assumptions are examined and no major violations are found (for example,

outlier, major deviations from normality, etc.). The basic descriptive statistics is applied to all the data. In descriptive statistics, mean and standard deviation have been calculated whereas bivariate analysis has been applied. Means, standard deviations, bivariate correlations, and reliability estimates are presented in Table 2.

Hypothesis testing

In order to test H₁, regression analysis with leave intention as dependent variable has been run. Gender, job category and marital status are entered in the first block and job embeddedness is entered in second block. On the basis of outcome of this test following set of regression equations are deduced:

$$\text{Model 1: } Y_1 = 1.366 - .727X_1 + .926X_2 + .771X_3$$

$$\text{Model 2: } Y_2 = 3.795 - .742X_1 + .919X_2 + .592X_3 - .459X_4$$

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001; Y = leave intention, X₁ = gender, X₂ = job category, X₃ = marital status, X₄ = job embeddedness.

Model 1 show that only job category significantly explains the variance in leave intention, whereas gender and marital status do not. Model 2 show that job embeddedness has a negative impact on leave intention. With every unit change in job embeddedness, leave intention changes by 0.459 units. Therefore, H₁ is accepted and leave intention of the teaching faculty is negatively related to their job embeddedness.

This may also be observed from Table 2 that job category and job embeddedness significantly relates to leave intention. It may further be observed from this table that only two organization related facets out of the six facets of job embeddedness are significant predictor of leave intention. Detail results of this analysis are shown in Table 2. As seen in this table, job embeddedness contributed 23.4% (p < 0.03) variance beyond the control variables.

Similar to the finding of correlation analysis, in regression analysis, it is observed that the three community related facets and one organizational related of job embeddedness does not significantly explains leave intention. It might be possible that only two organization specific facets (fit and sacrifice) be the stronger predictor of individual's leave intention in this sample or context, which needs further exploration. However, all the six facets of job embeddedness significantly interrelated. Table 3 demonstrate that positive significant correlation exist between job alternative and leave intention (r = 0.54, p = 0.000). This means that faculty who perceives high job alternatives would be more leave intended. To check the strength of influence for this variable in leave prediction, regression analysis is also performed. In this analysis leave intention is again taken as a dependent variable, job alternative is entered in the first block and

Table 3. Means, standard deviations, reliability and bivariate correlations estimates.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1 Sector															
2 Gender	-0.07														
3 Background	-0.07	-0.20													
4 Work nature	0.07	-0.08	-0.08												
5 Job category	0.01	0.16	0.10	-0.13											
6 Link to community	-0.04	-0.07	-0.04	-0.07	-0.04										
7 Fit to community	0.13	-0.09	0.04	-0.09	0.01	0.67**									
8 Sacrifice to community	0.10	0.09	-0.06	-0.20	-0.14	0.44**	0.50**								
9 Link to Org.	0.13	-0.33**	-0.07	0.10	-0.20	0.34**	0.32**	0.23*							
10 Fit to Org.	0.10	-0.02	0.11	-0.19	0.04	0.12	0.42**	0.45**	0.36**						
11 Sacrifice to Org.	-0.09	0.04	0.13	-0.17	-0.01	0.29**	0.45**	0.42**	0.28*	0.76**					
12 Leave intention	-0.01	-0.11	-0.03	0.14	0.30**	-0.03	-0.13	-0.18	-0.08	-0.41**	-0.37**				
13 Job alternatives	0.00	-0.07	-0.07	0.34**	0.11	0.04	0.05	0.09	-0.02	-0.22	-0.24*	0.54**			
14 Job search	-0.01	0.05	-0.07	-0.24*	-0.13	0.04	0.08	0.05	0.00	0.19	0.27*	-0.46**	-0.25*		
15 Job embeddedness	0.07	-0.10	0.01	-0.15	-0.09	0.70**	0.81**	0.71**	0.61**	.71**	0.74**	-0.28*	-0.08	0.15	
Mean	1.30	1.21	1.21	1.41	1.33	4.77	4.59	4.61	5.08	5.16	4.14	2.70	4.00	1.58	4.71
Standard deviation	0.46	0.41	0.41	0.77	0.47	1.41	1.17	1.32	1.16	1.22	1.22	1.68	1.76	0.34	0.89
Reliability						0.76	0.81	0.69	0.78	0.90	0.89	0.86	0.77	0.76	0.93

Correlation is significant at *0.05 level and **0.01 level (2-tailed).

job embeddedness is entered in the second block. The following regression equations are drawn from this test's outcome, which depicts that positive relation exist between job alternative and is useful predictor of leave intention (Model 3).

The second regression equation (Model 4) shows that with every unit change in job alternative the respective change in leave intension is 0.504 units. Therefore, H_2 is also accepted and job alternative is positively related to leave intention. In other words, the perception about job availability in market does have a positive influence upon leave intention of the faculty:

$$\text{Model 3: } Y_1 = .628 + .522X_1^{***}$$

$$\text{Model 4: } Y_2 = 2.654 + .504X_1^{***} - .455X_2^*$$

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$; Y = leave intention, X_1 = job alternative, X_2 = job embeddedness

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Mitchell et al. (2001) and others have recommended the improvement and development of job embeddedness framework. They have observed low reliability estimates for link to community and link to organization dimensions of the construct. Cunnigham et al. (2005) has opined that low internal consistency in these dimensions is due to non-uniformity of scales and different interpretation of questions. Prior to investigation

some changes in six elements of these two dimensions were suggested and finally incorporated after pilot testing. Due to these changes, improvements were recorded in reliability estimates of community and organization link dimensions. Reliability estimates of all measure were higher than the cut off score 0.70 except one. The observed values of reliability estimates of this study are higher as compared with the values recorded in previous studies. These revisions and changes improved the reliability of the construct - so this is the contribution, which this study made.

Secondly this study has contributed in academic literature in a way that it is an extension of the unique work of Mitchell et al. (2001) in new context.

They have developed the construct and proposed new attachment framework called – job embeddedness. The construct emphasizes that attitudinal variables like job satisfaction and organizational commitment can only predict very small amount of employee's turnover, and job embeddedness is better lens for its prediction. Later on, many researchers validated their Mitchell et al. (2001) study findings. But all these research studies were conducted in USA context. So, current study contributes to academic literature in a way that new framework has been empirically investigated in academic setting of Pakistan, which is a new context.

This research presents evidence concerning the relationship between job embeddedness (aggregate) and leave intention. From the correlation analysis presented in the previous section, it is shown that job embeddedness is negatively co-related to employee's leave intention. This result is consistent with previous research work (Mitchell et al., 2001; Cunningham et al., 2005). However, detail analysis shows that this relationship is significant only for organization embeddedness and not for community embeddedness. This is the “*Half Truth*” that has support from results of this study. Partial disagreement with Mitchell et al. (2001) and others may be due to contextual difference or sample specific/ likely reasons. Other likely reason for this may be that all chartered institutions are housed in the same city and no question of community change arises.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTION

Sector specificity, cross-sectional design and male domination sample are the potential limitations of the study. For generalization, responses from diversified backgrounds would have been better. Also, a longitudinal study is may be more suitable to predict leave intention.

As discussed in the analysis, several areas need further empirical investigation. We know that six dimensions of job embeddedness construct are community link, community fit, community sacrifice, organization link, organization fit and organization sacrifices. First three dimensions are community specific and last three dimensions are organization specific. However, Mitchell et al. (2001) conceptualized job embeddedness as reflecting the totality of these forces that constraint people from leaving their current employment. Especially, off the job embeddedness represent a new perspective on “why people stay” on their job and initial findings of their research verifies that at least in one of the samples of their study, all components of job embeddedness are correlated to turnover. Results of this study also support the Mitchell et al. (2001) finding which provided that job embeddedness has taken aggregate of all these forces. However, if it is disintegrated into its two major parts, we find that organization embeddedness has full support from our findings but no support is available for community embeddedness. This aspect needs to be

empirically investigated in further research studies.

REFERENCES

- Abbasi SM, Hollman KW (2000). “Turnover: the real bottom line”. *Pub. Person. Manage.*, 2(3): 333-334.
- Ajzen I (2002). “Residual effects of past on later behavior: Habituation and reason action perspective”. *Personal. Soc. Psych. Rev.*, 16(2): 107-122.
- Alam GM (2009). “Can governance and regulatory control ensure private higher education as business or public goods in Bangladesh?” *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 3(12): 890-906.
- Alam GM, Hoque KE (2010). “Who gains from “brain and body drain” business -developing/developed world or individuals: A comparative study between skilled and semi/unskilled emigrants”. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4(4): 534-548.
- Alam GM, Ismail L, Mishra PK (2010). “Do developing countries need education laws to manage its system or are ethics and a market-driven approach sufficient?” *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4(15): 3406-3416.
- Barak MEM, Nissly JA, Levin A (2001). “Antecedents to retention and turnover among child welfare, social work, and other human service employees: What can we learn from past research? A review and meta-analysis”. *Soc. Serv. Rev.*, 75(4): 625-661.
- Bartlett JE, Kotrlik JW, Higgins CC (2001). “Organisational research: determining appropriate sample size in survey research”. *Inform. Technol. Learn. Perform. J.*, 19(1): 43-50.
- Bartholomew DJ, Forbes AF, McClean SI (1991). *Statistical Techniques for Manpower Planning*. 2nd Edition.
- Bishop JW, Scott KD, Burroughs SM (2000). “Support, commitment, and employee outcomes in a team environment”. *J. Manage.*, 26(6): 1113-1132.
- Cochran WG (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Cunningham GB, Fink JS, Saga M (2005). “Extension and Further Examination of the Job Embeddedness Construct”. *J. Sports Manage.*, 19(3): 319-335.
- Dalessio A, Wakefield W, Schunk J (1986). “Path to turnover: A re-analysis and review of existing data on the Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth's turnover model”. *Hum. Relat.*, 39(3): 245-264.
- DeConinck JB, Bachmann DP (1994). “Organizational commitment and turnover intentions of marketing managers”. *J. Appl. Bus. Res.*, 10(3): 87-95.
- Dess GG, Shaw JD (2001). “Voluntary turnover, social capital and organizational performance”. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 26(3): 446-45.
- Feng WC, Angeline T (2010). “Turnover intention and job hopping behaviour of music teachers in Malaysia”. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4(4): 425-434.
- Fishbein M, Ajzen (1975). *Belief, Attitudes, intention and behavior*. Reading MA. Addison-Wesley.
- Flowers VS, Hughes CL (1973). “Why employees stay?” *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, 51(4): 49-60.
- Frone MR, Russell M, Cooper ML (1992). “Antecedents and outcomes of work family conflict: Testing a model of the work family interface”. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 77: 65-78.
- Good LK, Sisler GF, Gentry JW (1988). “Antecedents of turnover intentions among retail management personnel”. *J. Retail.*, 64(3): 295-314.
- Greenhaus JH, Beutell NJ (1985). “Sources of Conflict between work and family roles”. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 10(1): 76-88.
- Griffeth RW, Hom PW (1988). “A comparison of different conceptualization of perceived alternatives in turnover research”. *J. Organ. Behav.*, 9(2): 103-111.
- Griffeth RW, Hom PW, Gaertner S (2000). “A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium”. *J. Manage.*, 26(3): 463-488.
- Hanif M, Munir A (2004). *Biostatistics for Health Students*. ISSOS Publication, Lahore, Pakistan.
- Harrington D, Bean N, Pintello D, Mathews D (2001). “Job satisfaction

- and burnout: Predictors of intentions to leave a job in a military setting". *Adm. Soc. Work*, 25(3): 1-16.
- Hellman CM (1997). "Job satisfaction and intent to leave". *J. Soc. Psychol.*, 137(6): 677-689.
- Holtom, BC, O' Neill BS (2004). "Job Embeddedness: A theoretical foundation for developing a comprehensive nurse retention plan". *J. Nurs. Adm.*, 34(5): 216-227.
- Holtom BC, Mitchell TR, Lee TW, Inderrrieden EJ (2005). "Shocks as causes of turnover: what they are and how organization can manage them". *Hum. Resource Manage.*, 44: 337-352.
- Holtom BC, Mitchell TR, Lee TW (2006). "Increasing human and social capital by applying job embeddedness theory". *Organ. Dynam.*, 35(4): 316-331.
- Hom PW, Griffeth RW (1995). *Employees Turnover*. Cincinnati, OH: South Western College Publishing.
- Hom PW, Griffeth RW, Sellaro (1984). "The validity of Mobley's 1977 model of employee turnover", *Organization. Behav. Hum. Perform.*, 34: 141-174.
- Iverson RD, Roy P (1994). "Causal model of behavioral commitment: Evidence from a study of Australian blue-collar employees". *J. Manage.*, 20(1): 15-41.
- Kirschenbaum A, Weisberg J (2002). "Employee's turnover intentions and job destination choices". *J. Organ. Behav.*, 23(1): 109-125.
- Klenke-Hamel KE, Mathieu JE (1990). "Role strains, tension, and job satisfaction influences on employees' propensity to leave: A multi-sample replication and extension". *Hum. Relat.*, 43(8): 791-807.
- Krejcie RV, Morgan DW (1970). "Determining sample size for research activities", *Educ. Psychol. Meas.*, 30(3): 607-610.
- Kopelman RE, Rovenpor JL, Millsap RE (1992). "Rationale and construct validity evidence for the Job Search Behavior Index: Because intentions (and New Year's resolutions) often come to naught", *J. Vocat. Behav.*, 40(3): 269-287.
- Lachman R, Aranya N (1986). "Job attitudes and turnover intentions among professionals in different work settings". *Organ. Stud.*, 7(3): 279-293.
- Lambert EG, Hogan NL, Barton SM (2001). "The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: A test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers". *Soc. Sci. J.*, 38(2): 233-250.
- Lee TW, Mowday RT (1987). "Voluntary leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steers and Mowday's model of turnover". *Acad. Manage. J.*, 30(4): 721-743.
- Lee TW, Mitchell TR (1994). "An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employees turnover". *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 19(1): 51-89.
- Lee TW, Mitchell TR, Wise L, Fireman S (1996). "An unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover". *Acad. Manage. J.*, 39(1): 5-36.
- Lee TW, Mitchell TR, Holtom BC, McDaniel LS, Hill JW (1999). "The unfolding model of voluntary turnover: A replication and extension", *Acad. Manage. J.*, 42(4): 450-462.
- Lee TW, Chris JS, James PB, Holtom BC (2004). "The effects of job embeddedness on organizational citizenship, job performance, volitional absences, and voluntary turnover." *Acad. Manage. J.*, 47(5): 711-722
- Liou KT (1998). "Employee turnover intention and professional orientation: A study of detention workers." *Pub. Adm. Q.*, 22(2): 161-175.
- Lum L, Kervin J, Clark K, Reid F, Sirola W (1998). "Explaining nursing turnover intent: Job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, or organizational commitment?" *J. Organ. Behav.*, 19(3): 305-320.
- Maertz CP, Campion M (1998). *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Volume 13, Chapter 2). CL Cooper, IT Robertson (eds.). John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Mallol CM, Holtom BC, Lee TW (2007). "Job Embeddedness in a culturally diverse environment". *J. Bus. Psychol.*, 22(1): 35-44.
- Manlove EE, Guzell JR (1997). "Intention to leave, anticipated reasons for leaving, and 12-month turnover of child care center staff". *Early Childhood Res. Q.*, 12(2): 145-167.
- March JG, Simon HA (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Meyer JP, Allen NJ (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mitchell TR, Holtom BC, Lee TW, Erez M (2001). "Why people stay: Using Job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover", *Acad. Manage. J.*, 44(6): 1102-1121.
- Murray JP, Murray JI (1998). "Job satisfaction and the propensity to leave an institution among two-year college division chairpersons". *Comm. College Rev.*, 25(4): 45-59.
- Naris NS, Ukpere IW (2010). "Developing a retention strategy for qualified staff at the Polytechnic of Namibia". *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4 (6): 1078-1084.
- Oktay JS (1992). "Burnout in hospital social workers who work with AIDS patients". *Soc. Work*, 37(5): 432-439.
- Oz E (2002). "Managing Information Systems, MA: Thomson Learning, Boston.
- Ponnu CH, Chuah CC (2010). "Organizational commitment, organizational justice and employee turnover in Malaysia. *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4(13): 2676-2692.
- Price J (2001). "Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover". *Int. J. Manpower*, 22(7): 600-624.
- Ramlall S (2003). "Managing employees retention as strategy for increasing organization competitiveness". *Appl. HRM. Res.*, 8(2): 63-72.
- Richard MD, LeMay SA, Taylor GS (1995). "A factor analytic logic approach to truck driver turnover". *J. Bus. Log.*, 16: 281-298.
- Rosemary B, Monique VP (2003). "Human resources practices as predictors of work-family outcomes and employee turnover". *Ind. Relat.*, 42(2): 189-220.
- Tanova C (2006). Using job embeddedness factors to explain voluntary turnover in five European countries. IRISS Working Paper 2006-4, CEPS/INSTEAD, Differdange, Luxembourg. Retrieved from <http://idead.repec.org/p/irs/iriswp/2006-04.html>
- Tumwesigye G (2010). "The relationship between perceived organizational support and turnover intentions in a developing country: The mediating role of organizational commitment". *Afr. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4(6): 942-952
- Wayne SJ, Shore LM, Liden RC (1997). "Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective". *Acad. Manage. J.*, 40(1): 82-111.
- Zeffane RM (1994). "Understanding employee turnover: The need for a contingency approach". *Int. J. Manpower*, 15(9): 22-37.