Journal of Social Sciences of Mus Alparslan University

anemon

Derginin ana sayfası: http://dergipark.gov.tr/anemon

Araştırma Makalesi ● Research Article

Job Embeddedness: A Study On White Collar Employees

İşe Gömülmüşlük: Beyaz Yakalılar Üzerine Bir Çalışma

Burcu Yiğit*

Abstract: The aim of this study is to examine whether job embeddedness varies according to demographic variables or not. 301 white-collar employees working in different sectors were included to the study. Survey form was distributed to the participants, and data were collected from October to December 2019. In the evaluations of variables that are not distributed normally between two groups, Mann-Whitney U test was used. For variables' evaluations that are not distributed normally between two and more groups, Kruskal-Wallis test was used. To determine the source of significance, if the significance was observed, Dunn-Bonferroni test was used. Statistical significance was accepted as $p < 0.05$.In line with the findings of the study, it was found that there is a statistically significant difference for participants' age, working year in this profession, and the working year in the institution (respectively, $p = 0.001$; $p = 0.017$; $p = 0.009$). And there is no significant difference according to participants' gender, marital status, and education levels ($p > 0.05$). Because no study was found on job embeddedness with demographic variables and also with white-collar employees, the study is original.

Keywords: Job Embeddedness, Embeddedness, White-Collar Employees

Öz: Bu çalışmada, işe gömülmüşlüğün demografik değişkenlere göre değişiklik gösterip göstermediğini incelemek amaçlanmıştır. Farklı sektörlerde çalışan 301 beyaz yakalı çalışmaya dahil edilmiştir. Çalışma verileri anket yoluyla dağıtılmış, veriler Ekim-Aralık 2019 arasında toplanmıştır. Verilerin normallik dağılımı incelenmiş olup, normallikNormal dağılım göstermeyen değişkenler içinin iki grup arası değerlendirmelerinde Mann-Whitney- U ve testi kullanılmıştır. Normal dağılım göstermeyen değişkenlerin ikiden fazla grup arası değerlendirmelerinde Kruskal-Wallis testii kullanılmıştır. İstatistiki olarak ve anlamlılık gözlenmesi durumunda anlamlılığın varolması durumunda kaynağını belirlemek amacıyla Dunn-Bonferroni testi kullanılmıştır. İstatistiksel anlamlılık $p<0,05$ olarak kabul edilmiştir. Elde edilen çalışma bulguları doğrultusunda, katılımcıların yaşları, meslekte çalışma süreleri, mevcut iş yerinde çalışma sürelerine göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklar belirlenmiş olduğu saptanmıştır (sırasıyla, $p=0,001$; $p=0,017$; $p=0,009$). Katılımcıların cinsiyetleri, medeni durumları ve eğitim düzeylerine göre ise, istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılık saptanmamıştır ($p>0,05$). Çalışma gerçekleştirildiği an itibariyle ilgili literatürde ilgili konuda demografik değişkenler ve beyaz yakalılar üzerinde çalışmaya rastlanmadığı için çalışma özgündür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İşe Gömülmüşlük, Gömülmüşlük, Beyaz Yakalı Çalışanlar

* Dr., Bağımsız Araştırmacı ORCID: 0000-0002-2071-0099. brcygt@hotmail.com

Cite as/ Atıf: Yiğit, B. (2022). Job embeddedness: A study on white collar employees. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *10*(3), 1163-1175. http://dx.doi.org/10.18506/anemon.1052356
Received/Geliş: *02 January/Ocak 2022*
Accepted/Kabul: *09 October/Ekim 2022*
Published/Yayın: 30 December/Aralık 2022

e-ISSN: 2149-4622. © 2013-2022 Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi. TÜBİTAK ULAKBİM DergiPark ev sahipliğinde. Her hakkı saklıdır.

Introduction

In today's dynamic business world, it is important that the employee wants to stay in the company. Every organization want loyal, highly commited, permanance employees in the organization. This is very normal and expected situation. Retaining employees is very important for organizations. Employee who wants to stay and continue to the organization provides an advantage to the institutions. At this point, the job embeddedness (JE) concept that explains the employee desire to stay arises.

JE term was firstly developed by Mitchell et al. (2001). They determined that it affects employees' decisions for staying or leaving their organizations (Takawira vd., 2014: 1; Mitchell et al., 2001). Before that time, the concept of embeddedness was used in sociology and economics literature (Wijayanto and Kismono, 2004: 337).

For a long time, management scientists investigate voluntarily leaving jobs or voluntary employee turnover's causes in management literature (Lee et al., 2004: 711). The causes of employees' voluntary turnover behavior are the concept that researchers mention in management scholars. JE has an extention attribute of it (Cho and Ryu, 2009: 53). Unlike traditional turnover models, JE focus on the choice of workers for staying in the organization (Ringly, 2013: 11).

JE theory plays an important role to understand voluntary decisions of employees (Rubenstein et al., 2020). JE theory focuses on employee-retention. JE theory contains both on-the-job and off-the- JE focusing on the reasons that people stay in the organization (Park et al., 2011: 5).

JE is force that make it difficult to leave his/her job for a person (Dirican ve Erdil, 2021: 703). When workers attach to their jobs and organizations, they are peaceful and happy. Also, their commitment is positively affected (Elshaer ve Azazz, 2022: 4). JE is the continuity of employee at work (Kanten vd., 2021: 195). JE is situations that are tying the person to his/her job and preventing him/her from leaving the job. Even if people find a better job than current job, they do not go to other institution (Toker and Kalıpçı, 2020: 890). JE motivates people to keep their organization and jobs (Kanten et al., 2016: 69). If employees are motivated and happy in their job, the institution does not lose these employees.

JE is important to understand and determine why people prefer to continue to their jobs (Mitchell et al., 2001: 1102). As long as employees are happy with their jobs, they continue to their institutions. Otherwise, they quit their institutions (Bergiel et al., 2009: 206). Desiring to continue to the organization is considerable for both organizations and individuals.

When JE is low, they have tendency to change their work. JE and job search behavior of employees are indicators for the intention to quit (Felps et al., 2009: 548). JE affects employees' intention to stay in the organization (Cunningham et al., 2005).

JE can be in two sides; good relationships with managers and co-workers (work-related side) and also non-business reasons for example family working in the same organization (non-work related side) (Gong et al., 2010: 222; Kanten vd., 2021: 195). Mitchell et al. (2001) determined three components of links, fit, sacrifice (Mitchell, 2001: 1102; Feldman and Ng, 2007: 352; Wheeler et al., 2010; Chan et al., 2019; Gosh and Gurunathan, 2015). Link defines the connection between enterprises' operatör and workers; fit defines organization and workers' harmony; and sacrifice defines enterpreneurs' profits that enhance their self-esteem and also self-respect (Wen et al., 2021: 1439).

When links increase, employees become more embeddeded. If employees fit to the organization, they will attach to their work. So, JE will increase. In sacrifice dimension, employees have a difficulty to leave their organizations because of financial and also social costs and reasons (Halbesleben and Wheeler, 2008: 243; Mitchell et al., 2001: 1103). Fit affects positively task performance, links have an positive influence on creativity, and sacrifice have normally positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior (Ng and Feldman, 2009: 865).

JE is an interaction with job satisfaction to foresee voluntary turnover and decrease voluntary turnover (Mitchell et al., 2001: 1104; Crossley et al., 2007: 1032). Besides turnover, job embeddedness has an effect on job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, innovation (Lee et al., 2014: 200).

Employees' JE depend on age, gender and other variables. Training, career opportunities, supervisor support, and also job characteristics predict the employees' JE (Dyk et al., 2013: 57). There are positive relationship between job embeddedness and organizational commitment; negative relationship between JE and intention to leave (Robinson et al., 2014).

Researches claim that employees who want to stay in the organization, they have high level of JE (Ferreira and Coetzee, 2013: 241). Some studies indicate that JE forecast turnover, job satisfaction, quit intentions (Nafei, 2015: 197; Crossley vd., 2017: 1033). Also, when employees were embedded to their job, their work and life qualities increase (Dedeoğlu vd., 2016: 137). According to Lee et al. (2004), JE is predictive of organizational citizenship behavior and job performance (Lee et al., 2004: 713).

Research Methodology

*****The data of this study was collected in 2019.

Sample of The Study

The universe of the study consists of white-collar employees only in İstanbul. The online survey form was sent to the employees who are suitable for inclusion and exclusion criteria. Questionnaire were sent on a voluntary basis. Totally, 316 employees were accepted to answer. 15 survey forms were excluded from the study due to the missing data. 301 white collar employees were included to this study as a sample size. When sending survey forms, it was used random sampling method.

In the random sampling technique, the researcher chooses his sample without creating any criteria. For example, the researcher chooses the first 20 students that sees on campus. It has been chosen randomly. The researcher can not know that this technique represents the universe or not. This method is also used in street interviews on TV (Lin, 1976). Because the questionnaire forms in the study are based on volunteerism, it is clear that sample bias cannot be avoided (Özen ve Gül, 2007).

Hypotheses

H1: According to age, job embeddedness has a difference

H2: According to gender, job embeddedness has a difference.

H3: According to marital status, job embeddedness has a difference.

H4: According to education level, job embeddedness has a difference.

H5: According to working year in the profession, job embeddedness has a difference.

H6: According to working year in the institution, job embeddedness has a difference.

Measures

It was used survey method in this study. Participants' working year education level, marital status, working year in the profession, age, gender, in the institution were recorded as demographic data. 7 items "Job Embeddedness scale" (developped by Crossley vd., 2007; adapted by Akgündüz and Cin, 2015). Answers of items were evaluated with 5-point Likert scale (1: Strongly Disagree, 5: Strongly Agree).

Analyses

It was used SPSS 21.0 program for statistical analyses. Minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation, median, first quartile, third quartile, frequency and percentage were used. The suitability to the normal distribution were evaluated with Shapiro-Wilk test and graphical analysis. It was found that the data of this study is non-normally distributed. Because the data distributed non-normally, Mann-Whitney U test was used between two groups evaluations. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used for more than two group evaluations,,and Dunn-Bonferroni test was used to determine the source of significance if the significance was observed. Cronbach alpha coefficient was used to determine the internal consistency levels of the questionnaire. Statistical significance was accepted as $p < 0.05$.

Findings

Table 1: Distribution of Descriptive Characteristics

	n	**%**
Age		
25 age and under	32	10.6
26-35 age	175	58.1
36-45 age	74	24.6
46 age and above	20	6.6
Total	301	100
Gender		
Female	115	38.2
Male	186	61.8
Total	301	100
Marital Status		
Single	143	47.5
Married	158	52.5
Total	301	100
Education Level		
Undergraduate Degree	21	7.0
Bachelor's Degree	157	52.2
Graduate Degree	123	40.9
Total	301	100
Working Year in This profession		
< 1 year	13	4.3
1-5 year	74	24.6
6-10 year	100	33.2
11-15 year	42	14.0
≥ 16 year	72	23.9
Total	301	100
Working Year in the Institution		
< 1 year	62	20.6
1-5 year	151	50.2
6-10 year	53	17.6
≥ 11 year	35	11.6
Total	301	100

10.6 % (n = 32) of the participants were 25 age and under, 58.1 % (n = 175) from 26 to 35 years, 24.6% (n = 74) from 36 to 45 years, and 6.6% (n = 20) of the participants were 46 age and above.

When the gender of participants were studied, 38.2% (n = 115) of the participants were female and 61.8% (n = 186) were male.

According to the marital status, 47.5% (n = 143) of the participants were single and 52.5% (n = 158) were married.

When educational level of participants were examined, 7% (n = 21) of the participants were undergraduate degree level, 52.2% (n = 157) bachelor's degree level, and 40.9% (n = 123) were graduate degree level.

According to working year in this profession, 4.3% of the participants (n = 13) were less than 1 year in the profession, 24.6% (n = 74) 1-5 years, 33.2% (n = 100) 6-10 years, 14% (n = 42) 11-15 years, and 23.9% (n = 72) 16 years and above.

When we examined the working year in the institution, it was found that 20.6% of the participants (n = 62) worked less than a year, 50.2 % (n = 151) 1-5 years, 17.6% (n = 53) 6-10 years, and 11.6 % (n = 35) 11 years and above (Table 1).

Table 2: Answers to Job Embeddedness Scale

	Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Undecided**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
	n (%)	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**	**n (%)**
Item 1	19 (6.3)	36 (12)	50 (16.6)	125 (41.5)	71 (23.6)
Item 2	28 (9.3)	81 (26.9)	63 (20.9)	88 (29.2)	41 (13.6)
Item 3	54 (17.9)	95 (31.6)	71 (23.6)	57 (18.9)	24 (8)
Item 4	48 (15.9)	98 (32.6)	65 (21.6)	69 (22.9)	21 (7)
Item 5	43 (14.3)	81 (26.9)	75 (24.9)	82 (27.2)	20 (6.6)
Item 6	35 (11.6)	77 (25.6)	58 (19.3)	101 (33.6)	30 (10)
Item 7	6 (2)	14 (4.7)	45 (15)	165 (54.8)	71 (23.6)

The responses of the participants to the scale items were indicated in Table 2. The cronbach alpha (for testing reliability of the scale) was determined 0.829.

Table 3: Distribution of Participants' Age

		Age				p
		25 age and under	**26-35 age**	**36-45 age**	**46 age and above**	
Item 1	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (3, 4.5)	4 (3, 4)	4 (3, 5)	4 (3.5, 5)	0.404
	Mean±standart deviation	3.81±1	3.55±1.16	3.73±1.14	3.8±1.32	
Item 2	Median (Q1, Q3)	3.5 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3.5 (2, 4)	4 (3.5, 5)	0.001**
	Mean±standart deviation	3.31±1.18	2.9±1.16	3.28±1.23	3.95±1.19	
Item 3	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	2 (2, 3)	3 (2, 4)	3.5 (2.5, 4)	0.001**
	Mean±standart deviation	3.22±1.1	2.47±1.15	2.77±1.26	3.25±1.16	
Item 4	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	2 (2, 3)	3 (2, 4)	3.5 (2, 4)	0.029*
	Mean±standart deviation	3.09±1.2	2.57±1.15	2.82±1.19	3.15±1.23	
Item 5	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	4 (3, 4)	0.001**
	Mean±standart deviation	3.13±1.13	2.66±1.17	2.95±1.1	3.7±0.98	
Item 6	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (3, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.245
	Mean±standart deviation	3.38±1.16	2.95±1.24	3.15±1.15	3±1.17	
Item 7	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (4, 4)	4 (4, 4)	4 (4, 5)	4 (3.5, 5)	0.191
	Mean±standart deviation	3.94±0.8	3.87±0.86	4.11±0.82	3.85±1.14	
Total	Median (Q1, Q3)	24.5 (21, 28)	21 (17, 25)	22 (19, 27)	26 (20.5, 29.5)	<0.001**
	Mean±standart deviation	23.88±4.82	20.97±5.62	22.81±5.31	24.7±6.37	

Kruskal-Wallis test Q1: First Quartile Q3: Third Quartile

*p<0.05 **p<0.01

According to the participants' age, there was no statistically significant difference in 1., 6., and 7. items (p> 0.05).

It was found that there was statistically significant difference for "item 2" scores (p = 0.001). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used and as a result of the dual evaluations performed, it was found that the scores of 46 age and above were higher than the scores of 26-35 age (p = 0.001). There was no significant difference among other age groups (p> 0.05).

It was obtained that there was statistically significant difference for "item 3" (p = 0.001). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used and as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores of participants of 26-35 age were lower than 46 age and above (respectively p=0.006, p=0.028). There was no significant difference among other age groups (p> 0.05).

There was statistically significant difference for "item 4" (p = 0.029). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used and as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores of participants of 26-35 age scores were lower than 46 age and above scores (respectively p=0.044, p=0.048). There was no significant difference among other age groups (p>0.05).

According to the participants' age, there was statistically significant difference for "item 5" (p<0.001). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used and as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores of participants of 26-35 age scores were higher than 36-45 age scores (respectively p=0.001, p=0.049). There was no significant difference among other age groups (p>0.05).

According to the participants' age, there was statistically significant difference for total scores (p=0.001). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used and as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores

of participants of 26-35 age scores were lower than 25 age and under, and 46 age and above (respectively (p=0.028, p=0.018). There was no significant difference among other age groups (p>0.05) (Table 3).

Table 4: Distribution of Participants' Gender

		Gender		p
		Women	**Men**	
Item 1	Meiyan (Q1, Q3)	4 (3, 4)	4 (3, 4)	0.582
	Mean±standart deviation	3.7±1.09	3.6±1.19	
Item	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.320
	Mean±standart deviation	3.2±1.14	3.05±1.26	
Item 3	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	2 (2, 4)	0.267
	Mean±standart deviation	2.77±1.16	2.62±1.22	
Item 4	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	2 (2, 4)	0.399
	Mean±standart deviation	2.8±1.16	2.68±1.2	
Item 5	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.550
	Mean±standart deviation	2.9±1.19	2.82±1.15	
Item 6	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.143
	Mean±standart deviation	3.17±1.28	2.97±1.16	
Item 7	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (4, 4)	4 (4, 5)	0.184
	Mean±standart deviation	3.89±0.78	3.96±0.91	
Total	Median (Q1, Q3)	22 (19, 26)	21 (17, 26)	0.207
	Mean±standart deviation	22.43±5.41	21.7±5.77	

[b]Mann-Whitney U test Q1: First Quartile Q3: Third Quartile

As indicated in Table 4, there was no statistically significant difference in 1., 2., 3., 4., 5., 7. items scores and sum of items (p> 0.05) according to the participants' gender.

Table 5: Distribution of Participants' Marital Status

		Marital Status		p
		Single	**Married**	
Item 1	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (3, 4)	4 (3, 4)	0.182
	Mean±standart deviation	3.56±1.16	3.72±1.14	
Item 2	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.292
	Mean±standart deviation	3.03±1.22	3.18±1.2	
Item 3	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.874
	Mean±standart deviation	2.68±1.16	2.67±1.24	
Item 4	Median (Q1, Q3)	2 (2, 3)	3 (2, 4)	0.191
	Mean±standart deviation	2.63±1.14	2.81±1.22	
Item 5	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.226
	Mean±standart deviation	2.77±1.16	2.92±1.17	
Item 6	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.654
	Mean±standart deviation	3.07±1.22	3.03±1.2	
Item 7	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (4, 4)	4 (4, 4)	0.614
	Mean±standart deviation	3.97±0.83	3.9±0.9	
Total	Median (Q1, Q3)	21 (17, 26)	22 (18, 26)	0.398
	Mean±standart deviation	21.71±5.46	22.23±5.81	

When the participants'marital status were studied in Table 5, it was found that there is no statistically significant difference in 1., 2., 3., 4., 5., 7. items scores and sum of items (p> 0.05).

Table 6: Distribution of Participants' Education Level

		Education Level			p
		Undergraduate	**Bachelor's Degree**	**Graduate Degree**	
Item 1	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (3, 4)	4 (3, 4)	4 (3, 4)	0.736
	Mean±standart deviation	3.71±1.19	3.59±1.19	3.7±1.1	
Item 2	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (3, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.105
	Mean±standart deviation	3.29±1.27	3.22±1.18	2.93±1.23	
Item 3	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	2 (2, 3)	0.064
	Mean±standart deviation	3.1±1.18	2.74±1.23	2.52±1.15	
Item 4	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	2 (2, 4)	0.470
	Mean±standart deviation	2.95±1.32	2.76±1.21	2.64±1.13	
Item 5	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.921
	Mean±standart deviation	2.76±1.14	2.87±1.18	2.84±1.16	
Item 6	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.399
	Mean±standart deviation	3.33±1.32	3.06±1.21	2.98±1.19	
Item 7	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (4, 5)	4 (3, 4)	4 (4, 4)	0.386
	Mean±standart deviation	3.95±0.97	3.87±0.91	4.02±0.79	
Total	Median (Q1, Q3)	23 (17, 28)	22 (18, 26)	21 (18, 25)	0.385
	Mean±standart deviation	23.1±6.13	22.1±5.86	21.63±5.27	

Kruskal-Wallis test Q1: First Quartile Q3: Third Quartile

As showed in Table 6, there was no statistically significant difference in 1., 2., 3., 4., 5., 7. items scores and sum of items (p> 0.05) according to the participants' education levels.

Table 7: Distribution of Participants' Working Year in this Profession

		Working Year in this Profession					p
		< 1 year	**1-5 year**	**6-10 year**	**11-15 year**	**≥ 16 year**	
Item 1	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (3, 4)	4 (3, 4)	4 (3, 4)	4 (3, 4)	4 (3, 5)	0.098
	Mean±standart deviation	3.08±0.95	3.65±1.09	3.59±1.19	3.62±1.06	3.82±1.23	
Item 2	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	4 (2, 4)	4 (3, 4.5)	0.003**
	Mean±standart deviation	2.85±1.07	2.93±1.17	2.9±1.2	3.24±1.16	3.56±1.22	
Item 3	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 3)	2.5 (2, 4)	2 (1, 3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.014*
	Mean±standart deviation	2.62±1.04	2.7±1.12	2.38±1.2	2.79±1.28	3±1.2	
Item 4	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 3)	3 (2, 3)	2 (2, 3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.048*

	Mean±standart deviation	2.62±1.04	2.65±1.1	2.51±1.21	2.86±1.2	3.04±1.19	
Item 5	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.279
	Mean±standart deviation	2.77±1.09	2.7±1.17	2.83±1.25	2.74±1.04	3.11±1.12	
Item 6	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (3, 4)	4 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.410
	Mean±standart deviation	3.31±0.95	3.11±1.24	2.93±1.26	2.83±1.27	3.22±1.09	
Item 7	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (4, 4)	4 (4, 4)	4 (3.5, 4)	4 (3, 5)	4 (4, 5)	0.343
	Mean±standart deviation	3.92±0.49	3.97±0.81	3.82±0.9	3.9±0.93	4.07±0.88	
Total	Median (Q1, Q3)	22 (18, 24)	21.5 (18, 25)	20 (17, 24.5)	22 (18, 26)	23.5 (20, 28)	0.017*
	Mean±standart deviation	21.15±4.6	21.72±5.19	20.96±5.8	21.98±5.63	23.82±5.71	

Kruskal-Wallis test Q1: First Quartile Q3: Third Quartile

*p<0.05 **p<0.01

According to working year in this profession, there was no statistically significant difference in 1., 5., 6., and 7. items scores (p>0.05).

There was statistically significant difference for "item 2" (p=0.003). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores of participants of 16 age and above were higher than 1-5 year and 6-10 year scores (respectively, p=0.016, p=0.004). There was no statistically significant difference among other working year in this profession (p>0.05).

There was statistically significant difference for "item 3" (p=0.014). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores of participants of 16 year and above were higher than 6-10 year scores (p=0.006). There was no statistically significant difference among other working year in this profession (p>0.05).

There was statistically significant difference for "item 4" (p=0.048). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores of participants of 16 year and above were higher than 6-10 year scores (p=0.031). There was no statistically significant difference among other working year in this profession (p>0.05).

According to the participants' working year in this profession, there was statistically significant difference for total scores (p=0.017). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores of participants of 16 year and above were higher than 6-10 year scores (p=0.006). There was no statistically significant difference among other working year in this profession (p>0.05) (Table 7).

Table 8: Distribution of Participants' Working Year in the Institution

		Working Year in the Institution				
		< 1 year	**1-5 year**	**6-10 year**	**≥ 11 year**	**p**
Item 1	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (3, 4)	4 (3, 4)	4 (3, 5)	4 (4, 5)	0.036*
	Mean±standart deviation	3.56±1.08	3.52±1.2	3.75±1.18	4.11±0.87	
Item 2	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	4 (2, 4)	4 (3, 5)	<0.001**
	Mean±standart deviation	2.84±1.15	2.97±1.2	3.38±1.18	3.8±1.16	
Item 3	Median (Q1, Q3)	2.5 (2, 4)	2 (2, 4)	2 (2, 3)	3 (2, 4)	0.239

	Mean±standart deviation	2.66±1.21	2.62±1.21	2.6±1.13	3.06±1.21	
Item 4	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 3)	2 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.174
	Mean±standart deviation	2.6±1.18	2.67±1.2	2.79±1.2	3.09±1.04	
Item 5	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	0.056
	Mean±standart deviation	2.84±1.09	2.67±1.18	3.17±1.1	3.17±1.2	
Item 6	Median (Q1, Q3)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (2, 4)	4 (2, 4)	0.615
	Mean±standart deviation	3.05±1.19	2.98±1.21	3.08±1.24	3.29±1.18	
Item 7	Median (Q1, Q3)	4 (3, 4)	4 (4, 5)	4 (3, 5)	4 (4, 5)	0.079
	Mean±standart deviation	3.77±0.76	3.95±0.94	3.91±0.88	4.17±0.62	
Toplam	Median (Q1, Q3)	21 (17, 26)	21 (17, 25)	22 (19, 26)	24 (21, 28)	0.009**
	Mean±standart deviation	21.32±5.54	21.38±5.83	22.68±5.46	24.69±4.38	

Kruskal-Wallis test Q1: First Quartile Q3: Third Quartile

*p<0.05 **p<0.01

When Table 8 were examined, there was no statistically significant difference in 3., 4., 5., 6., and 7. items (p>0.05) according to the participants' working year in the institution.

There was statistically significant difference for "item 1" (p=0.036). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores of participants of 11 year and above were higher than 1-5 year scores (p=0.049). There was no statistically significant difference among other working year in the institution (p>0.05).

There was statistically significant difference for "item 2" (p<0.001). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores of participants of 11 year and above were higher than <1 year and 1-5 year scores (respectively, p=0.001, p=0.001). There was no statistically significant difference among other working year in the institution (p>0.05).

There was statistically significant difference for total scores (p=0.009). Dunn-Bonferroni test was used as a result of the dual evaluations performed, the scores of participants of 11 year and above were higher than <1 year and 1-5 year scores (respectively, p=0.024, p=0.008). Finally, there was no statistically significant difference among other working year in the institution (p>0.05).

Results, Discussion, and Suggestions

At the present time, employee retention has become more prominent. Employees who desire and continue in the organization take an advantage for institutions. Job embeddedness explains why workers continue to stay in the organization.

When the revelant literature was reviewed, different study results draw attention. Wijayanto and Kismono (2004) determined that there is positive relationship between job embeddedness and organizational citizenship behavior (Wijayanto and Kismono, 2004: 335). Murphy et al. (2013) found that job embeddedness has a mediator role in the relationship between job insecurity and intention to remain (Murphy et al., 2013: 512). It was found that there is positive relationship between job embeddedness, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee performance (Nafei, 2015: 196). Takawira vd. (2014) was found that there is significant relationship among job embeddedness. Researches associated job embeddedness with intention to quit, turnover (Bergiel et al., 2009: 205). There are strong relationship between employee voluntary turnover intentions and intentions to quit (Bergiel et al., 2009: 205).

In this study, it was targeted to investigate that job embeddedness varies with demographic variables or not. when the findings of the study examined, it was found that there is statistically significant difference for participants' age (p = 0.001; p<0.05). Mazıoğlu and Kanbur (2020) determined

that there is no significant difference for age (Mazıoğlu and Kanbur, 2020). In Yüksel (2020) study, there is no significant difference with age (Yüksel, 2020). In Doğantekin and Seçilmiş study (2021), there is no significant difference according to age (Doğantekin and Seçilmiş, 2021: 1099). These studies have different results with my study. In Dirican and Erdil (2021) study, there is significant difference and positive relationship with age (Dirican and Erdil, 2021: 7013). We can say that the result of this study is similar with my study.

It was determined that there is statistically significant difference for participants' working year in this profession ($p = 0.017$; $p < 0.05$). It was revealed that there is statistically significant difference for participants' working year in the institution ($p = 0.009$; $p < 0.05$). Mazıoğlu and Kanbur (2020) determined that there is no significant difference according to working year in the institution (Mazıoğlu and Kanbur, 2020). Ay (2020) found that there is no significant difference according to working year in the institution (Ay, 2020). These results are not the same with this study. Yüksel (2020) revealed that there is significant difference according to working year in the institution (Yüksel, 2020). This result is similar with my study result.

No significant difference was found according to gender of participants ($p = 0.207$; $p > 0.05$). Mazıoğlu and Kanbur (2020) found that there is no significant difference with gender of participants (Mazıoğlu and Kanbur, 2020). Ay (2020) determined that there is no significant difference with gender (Ay, 2020). In Doğantekin and Seçilmiş study (2021), there is no significant difference according to gender (Doğantekin and Seçilmiş, 2021: 1099). This results are similar with my study.

According to the participants' marital status, there is no significant difference ($p = 0.398$; $p > 0.05$). Doğantekin and Seçilmiş (2021) determined that there is significant difference in marital status (Doğantekin and Seçilmiş, 2021: 1099). This is not consistent with my study. But, Ay (2020) revealed that there is no significant difference with marital status (Ay, 2020). This result is consistent with this study.

When the education level of participants was examined, there is no significant difference ($p = 0.385$; $p > 0.05$). Mazıoğlu and Kanbur (2020) reach the result that that there is no significant difference. This result match with my study.

While this study has similar results with some other studies in the literature, on the other hand it also has found different results with other study results.

This study realized with white-collar employees in different sectors. It can be also focus on a specific sector or institution. It was considered that the results of this study will be a guide to other academic studies on job embeddedness in the future.

References

Akgündüz, Y. & Cin, F.M. (2015). Job Embeddedness as a Moderator of the Effect of Manager Trust and Distributive Justice on Turnover Intentions. *Anatolia-An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research,* 26 (4), 549-562.

Ay, P. (2020). Banka Çalışanlarının İşe Gömülmüşlükleri ve Tükenmişlikleri Arasındaki İlişki: Karaman İlinde Bir Araştırma. Karamanoğlu Mehmet Bey Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Kamu Yönetimi ABD. Yüksek Lisans Tezi (Karaman).

Bergiel, E.B., Nguyen, V.Q., Clenney, B.F. & Taylor, G.S. (2009). Human Resource Practices, Job Embeddedness and Intention to Quit. *Management Research News,* 32 (3), 205-219.

Chan, W.L., Ho, J.A., Sambasian, M. & Ng., S.I. (2019). Antecedents of Job Embeddedness: Evidence From Four and Five-Star Hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* 83, 37-45.

Cho, Y. & Ryu, J. (2009). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Relation to Job embeddedness, Organizational Identification, Job Performance, Voluntary Turnover Intention in Korea. *International Business and Economics Research Journal*, 8 (7), 51-68.

Crossley, C.D., Bennett, R.J. & Burnfield, J.L. (2007). Development of a Global Measure of Job Embeddedness and Integration into a Traditional Model of Voluntary Turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (4), 1031-1042.

Cunningham, G.B., Fink, J.S. & Sagas, M. (2005). Extensions and Further Examination of the Job Embeddedness Construct. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 319-335.

Dedeoğlu, T., Özdevecioğlu, M. & Oflazer, S. (2016). Örgütlerde İşe Gömülmüşlüğün Çalışanların İş ve Yaşam Kalitesi Üzerindeki Etkisi: İyimserliğin Rolü. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi,* 47 (Ocak_Haziran), 135-146.

Dirican, A.H., Erdil, O. (2021). Psikolojik Sözleşme İhlalinin İşe Gömülmüşlük Üzerine Etkisinde Algılanan Örgütsel Desteğin Aracılık Rolü. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 13 (1), 701-708.

Doğantekin, A., Seçilmiş, C. (2021). Otel Çalışanlarının Sosyo-Demografik Özelliklerine Göre İşe Gömülmüşlük Düzeyleri, *Abant Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 21 (3), 1099-1119.

Dyk, J. Van., Coetzee, M. & Takawira, N. (2013). Satisfaction With Retention Factors as Predictors of The Job embeddedness of Medical and Information Technology Services Staff. *Southern African Business Review*, 17 (1), 57-75.

Elshaer, İ. A., Azazz, A.M.S. (2022). Amid The COVID-19 Pandemic, Unethical Behavior in The Name of The Company: The Role of Job Insecurity, Job Embeddedness and Turnover Intention, *International Journal of Environmental Research Public Health*, 19, 247, 1-15.

Feldman, D.C. & Ng, T.W.H. (2007). Careers: Mobility, Embeddedness, and Success. *Journal of Management*, 33 (3), 350-377.

Felps, W., Mitchell, T.R., Hekman, D.R., Lee, T.W., Holtom, B.C. & Harman, W.S. (2009). Turnover Contagion: How Coworkers' Job Embeddedness and Job Search Behaviors Influence Quitting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52 (3), 545-561.

Ferreira, N. & Coetzee, M. (2013). The Influence of Job Embeddedness on Black Employees' Organizational Commitment. *Southern African Business Review*, 17 (3), 239-255.

Ghosh, D. & Gurunathan, L. (2015). Do Commitment Based Human Resource Practices Influence Job Embeddedness and Intention To Quit. *IIMB Management Review*, 27, 240-251.

Gong, Y., Chow, I.H. & Ahlstrom, D. (2010). Cultural Diversity in China: Dialect, Job Embeddedness, and Turnover. *Asia Pac. J. Manag.*, 28, 221-238.

Halbesleben, J.R.B. & Wheeler, A.R. (2008). The Relative Roles of Engagament and Embeddedness in Predicting Job Performance and Intention to Leave. *Work&Stress*, 22 (3), 242-256.

Kanten, P., Kanten, S., Dündar, G. (2016). Ücret Tatmininin ve İşin Özelliklerinin İşe Gömülmüşlük Üzerindeki Etkisinde Mutluluğun Rolü, *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 8 (3), 64-88.

Kanten, S., Pazarcık, Y., Gurturk, M., Orak, H. (2021). The Role of Emotional Exhaustion in The Effect of Family Friendly Policies on The Job Embeddedness, *Pressacademia Procedia (PAP)*, 11, 194-200.

Lee, T.W., Mitchell, T.R., Sablynski, 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.

Lee, T.W., Burch, T.C. & Mitchell, T.R. (2014). The Story of Why We Stay: A Review of Job Embeddedness. *Annual Rev. Organ. Psychol. Org. Behav.*, 1, 199-216.

Lin, N. (1976). Foundations of Social Research, USA, Mc-Graw Hill.

Mazıoğlu, V. & Kanbur, E. (2020). Banka Çalışanları Arasındaki Farklılıkların İşe Gömülmüşlük Kapsamında İncelenmesi. 2. Uluslararası İktisat, İşletme ve Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi (Econder).

Mitchell, T.R., Holtom, B.C., Lee, T.W. & Erez, M. (2001). Why People Stay: Using Job Embeddedness to Predict Voluntary Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal,* 44 (6), 1102-1121.

Murphy, W.M., Burton, J.P., Henagan, S.C. & Briscoe, J.P. (2013). Employee Reacctions to Job Insecurity in a Declining Economy: A Longitudinal Study of the Mediating Role of Job Embeddedness. *Group and Organization Management,* 38(4), 512-537.

Nafei, W. (2015). Meta Analysis of the Impact of Job Embeddedness on Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance: A Study on Commercial Banks in Egypt. *International Journal of Business and Management,* 10 (2), 196-213.

Ng, T.W.H. & Feldman, D.C. (2009). Occupational Embeddedness and Job Performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 30, 863-891.

Özen, Y., Gül, A. (2007). Sosyal ve Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmalarında Evren-Örneklem Sorunu. *KKEFD/JOKKEF,* 15, 394-422.

Park, I., Zhu, D., Doan, T. & Kim, P.B. (2021). Stay Away From Fickle Supervisor! Supervisors' Behavioral Fluctuation Diminishing The Effect of Job Embeddedness' Service Behavior. *International of Hospitality Management,* 95, 1-10.

Ringly, R.W. (2013). The Relationship Between Job Embeddedness and Work Engagement. San Jose State University Master's Thesis.

Robinson, R.N.S., Kralj, A., Solnet, D.J., Goh., E. & Callan, V. (2014). Thinking Job Embeddedness not Turnover: Towards a Better Understanding of Frontline Hotel Worker Retention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* 36, 101-109.

Rubenstein, A.L., Peltokorpi, V. & Alleni D.G. (2020). Work-Home and Home-Work Conflict and Voluntary Turnover: A Conservation of Resources Explanation For Contrasting Moderation Effects of On-and Off-The-Job Embeddedness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 119, 1-17.

Takawira, N., Coetzee, M. & Scheureder, D. (2014). Job Embeddedness, Work Engagament and Turnover Intention of Staff in a Higher Education Institution: An Exploratory Study. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 12* (1), 1-10.

Toker, B., Kalıpçı, M.B. (2020). İş Yaşam Dengesinin Yaşam Doyumuna Etkisinde İşe Gömülmüşlüğün Aracılık Rolü: Konaklama İşletmelerinde Bir Uygulama, *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 12 (1), 888-901.

Wen, T., Zhang, Q., Li, Y. (2021). Why Small Tourism Enterprises Behave Responsibly: Using Job Embeddedness and Place Attachment To Predict Corporate Social Responsibility Activities, *Current Issues in Tourism,* 24: 10, 1435-1450.

Wheeler, A.R., Harris, K.J. & Harvey, P. (2010). Moderating and Mediating the HRM Effectiveness – Intent to Turnover Relationship: The Roles of Supervisors and Job Embeddedness. *Journal of Managerial Issues,* 22 (2), 182-196.

Wijayanto, B.R. & Kismono, G. (2004). The Effect of Job Embeddedness on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Role of Sense of Responsibility. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business,* 6 (3), 335-354.

Yüksel, S. (2020). Psikolojik Sözleşme İhlalinin İşe Gömülmüşlük ve İşten Ayrılma Niyetine Etkisi: Afyonkarahisar'daki Beş Yıldızlı Otel İşletmeleri Örneği. Afyonkocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Turizm İşletmeciliği ABD (Afyonkarahisar).