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ABSTRACT
Employees are the key resources of organizational success. Developing and maintaining job embeddedness is a cornerstone success in the workplace. The purpose of this research study is to analyze selected antecedents of job embeddedness. Role ambiguity, training, and demographics (age groups, gender and education) were identified from the extant literature as the selected antecedents for this study. An in-depth statistical analysis of the job embeddedness sub-dimensions was conducted in relation to the selected antecedents. Questionnaires were administered among the employees working in the private banks in Egypt. Results revealed a negative relationship between role ambiguity and job embeddedness, a positive relationship between training and job embeddedness, elder employees held higher level of embeddedness compared to young employees, females possessed higher level of embeddedness compared to males, and no significant differences among the various education levels and job embeddedness.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Why do employees leave their jobs? What makes them willing to stay? What ties them to the organization? What pushes them away? Researchers are still wondering and investigating the reasons behind employees’ decisions to leave or to stay. The costs incurred by organizations as a result of employees leaving their jobs are aggregate. Employees depart organizations carrying the knowledge and experience with them. Accordingly, the costs of workforce mobility are becoming a major issue of concern. Organizations are exerting collective efforts towards the retention of talented and qualified workforce. The consequences of employees quitting their jobs are direct and indirect as; recruitment, selection, training and above all the losses of know-how acquired through the learning curves of work processes. Retaining talent is a key success indicator not only for people oriented organizations but also to all organizations. Employers seize every opportunity to save the direct and the indirect costs of employees’ leaving the organization. Qualified and talented workforce is the organizational critical resource through which competitive advantage is developed. As such uncontrolled employees’ leaves interrupt social and communication networks as well as reducing the level of commitment and unity of those who stay (Mobley, 1982; Staw 1980). This study explores selected antecedents of job embeddedness literature namely; role ambiguity, training, and demographics (age groups, gender and education). Private Banks in Egypt were targeted and self-administered questionnaires were distributed among employees working in the head offices of these banks. Results and discussion as well as managerial implications were addressed.
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2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 JOB EMBEDDEDNESS

The origins of job embeddedness was first addressed by Granovetter (1985) as an emphasis of how social interactions influence economic activities in sociology literature. Sociologists viewed job embeddedness as the process by which social relations influence and constrain economic action (Granovetter, 1985; Uzzi, 1997). According to this perspective, it is a binding barrier that restricts and constraints employees from leaving the organization. It is the tie up force that could keep employees away from leaving the organization. On the contrary, job embeddedness in the Organization Behavior literature focuses on employees staying on the job with the potential of decreasing the opportunity to leave. Job embeddedness is “a broad set of influences on employee's decision to stay on the job” (Holtom & Inderrieden, 2006a, p.319). Job embeddedness represents a mix of variables that influence an employee's decision to remain or leave the organization. It is like a high dam that keeps employees far away from leaving or quitting the organization. In the original conceptualization of job embeddedness (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski & Erez, 2001) expressed the influences of job embeddedness as a web or a net in which a person gets stuck and identified two main sub-dimensions namely; work-related forces that tie an individual to the organization (link, fit, sacrifice) and community-related factors that bind the employee to his/her surrounding community. This 2x3 matrix generated six dimensions of job embeddedness construct (links – organization, fit – organization, sacrifice – organization) and (links – community, fit – community, sacrifice – community). The three dimensions; link, fit and sacrifice determine the extent to which employees are connected to their organizations and community (Oyler, 2007). Shocks were addressed by (Mitchelle et.al. 2001a) as the events and the reasons behind employees leaving their jobs. The readiness to leave the organization when a “shock-event” occurs relies mainly on the level of employee's attachment to the organization and the degree of satisfaction that he/she finds. The researcher defines job embeddedness as a multi-dimensional construct that promotes an employee's retention to the organization. The three main dimensions/influences that constitute job embeddedness are links; fit and sacrifice are explained hereafter.

- **Links**: “formal or informal connections between an employee and institutions or people” (Holtom et al., 2006a, p.319). Links are the employees' formal and informal ties to other individual or groups at work. These ties hold them back from departing (Mitchell et al., 2001). The job links include links that may foster staying (Allen, 2006); through the adoption of normative pressures (Maertz, Stevens & Campion, 2003). Employees suffer from costs of rearrangement of links upon leaving their jobs as they suffer in their homes and lives. Examples of links include; close relationships with family and friends, marital status, number of children who require care, hobbies, tenure in the organization, degree of workplace friendship, and tenure in the current position.

- **Fit**: represents the sense of feeling compatible with the job and the working environment. Oyler (2007) addressed fit as the degree of harmony between the individual and the organization. A better fit means a higher level of satisfaction and commitment (Holtom, Mitchell & Lee, 2006b). In this respect, employees' convictions, career plans and goals as well as future orientation must be consistent with organization culture, job knowledge and skills.

- **Sacrifice**: “the perceived costs of material or psychological benefits that are forfeited by organizational departure (Holtom et al., 2006a, p.319-320). Sacrifice is what holds employees from departing as they are likely to encounter loss of physical and psychological benefits by leaving the organizations or communities. Sacrifice includes personal loss of leaving good connections, compensation offerings, the things that employees give up on like loss of travel opportunities, overseas training, and a supportive boss (Shaw, Delery, Jenkins & Gupta, 1998). Several outcomes of job embeddedness have been addressed in the literature as organization citizenship behavior (Lee, Mitchell, Sablynski, Burton & Holtom, 2004; Sekiguchi, Burton & Sablynski, 2008; Wijayanto & Kismono, 2004), job performance (Holtom et.al., 2006a), in-role and extra-role performance, counterproductive behavior and absenteeism (Lee, Burch & Mitchell, 2014; Lee et al., 2004; Ng & Feldman, 2009), perceived organizational support and supervisor support (Giosan, Holtom & Watson, 2005). It is worth mentioning that intention to leave has been conceptualized as one of the significant outcomes of job embeddedness (Holtom & O’Neil, 2004; Lee et al, 2004; Sun, Zhao, Yang, & Fan, 2012).

2.2 ROLE AMBIGUITY

Role ambiguity is the absence of clear, organized and consistent information to a certain job inside the organization to execute tasks and responsibilities effectively (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosental, 1964). Role ambiguity is a lack of transparency and clarity of an employee's expected outcomes and behavioral requirements to fulfill these outcomes (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970). It has been found that role ambiguity is connected directly with anxiety (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Research results showed that lack of role clarity. This in return would result in
frustrated employees as they tend to feel lost among the required tasks and duties could trap employees into trial and error behavior patterns to meet the desired targets leading to lower levels of performance (Rizzo et al., 1970).

2.3 TRAINING

Training presents a prime opportunity to expand the knowledge base of all employees. Training is an indicator of management commitment to quality performance (Babakus, Yavas, Karatepe & Avci, 2003; Karatepe & Karadas, 2012). Training has been always viewed as the organization continued attempt to enhance the development of its employees on both the personal and the organizational perspectives. It is a common strategy for retention and stability (Shaw, Delery, Jenkins & Gupta, 1998). Providing the necessary training creates knowledgeable staff that possesses new skills which in return improve production, reduce production costs, reduce mistakes, build confidence, and create a better working environment.

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

This study aims to analyze the antecedents of job embeddedness construct namely; role ambiguity, training and demographics (age, gender and education).

3.2 PROCEDURE

The researcher collected data from employees working in the head offices of the private banks in Cairo, Giza and Alexandria governorates, Egypt. The management heads of these banks were contacted through a signed letter that elaborated the purpose of the study and requested the permission of data collection through the questionnaires. Top management agreed to distribute the questionnaires electronically over the emails. In order to minimize the common method variance (CMV) issues, (Podsakoff, Mackenzie & Podsakoff, 2012; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003) ex-ante procedural remedies were adopted. CMV remedies included stating on the questionnaire clearly the reassurance of anonymity and confidentiality of collected information, all the statements were positively stated in order to reduce apprehension, mixing the order of questionnaire questions, and improving the scale items by providing examples and illustrations.

3.3 PARTICIPANTS

The private banks were the selected sector for the purpose of the study as it represents one of the most significant sectors to the Egyptian economy. An insight on previously published data about private banks revealed that most of the employees working in this sector share a relative degree of homogeneity particularly in the educational background as well as relatively similar salaries and compensation packages. The total numbers of employees working in the head offices in Cairo, Giza and Alexandria governorates is 3500 employees. Due to the inability to reach the total population, proportion stratified random sample was used. A number of 800 questionnaires were distributed. The returned complete and valid responses were 600 questionnaires with a response rate 75%.

3.4 RESEARCH MEASURES

All the research constructs were measured by well-established scales used in the extant research. Job embeddedness was measured by (Holtom et al., 2006a) composite scale that combines separate empirical indicators into a single measure. This scale was selected for the purpose of the study as composite measures are good reflectors of complex concepts more adequately than single indicators. Training was measured by (Boshoff & Allen, 2000) scale. While, role ambiguity was assessed by (Rizzo et al., 1970) scale.

3.5 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The research hypotheses were developed based on previous studies findings and direction for future research. Griffeth, Hom and Gaertner’s (2000), meta-analysis study identified four broad categories of job embeddedness antecedents namely; demographic, personality, organizational and external environment. Review of current literature revealed a paucity of studies exploring the antecedents of job embeddedness and demographics specifically in Egypt. The selected antecedents for this study are demographics (age, gender, and education), organizational (training and
role ambiguity). This study focuses on analyzing these selected antecedents of job embeddedness and its sub-dimensions.

**AGE**

Wang and Shi (2007) studied the relationship between age and job embeddedness and found that employees aged (41-50) possessed the lowest levels of job embeddedness, while (Griffeth et al., 2010) found that young people are more likely to enjoy a high level of risk-taking than elder people thus, they hold a lower level of job embeddedness towards their organizations. The researcher agrees with the research findings of (Griffeth et al., 2010); hence the first hypothesis is developed as:

**H1:** *It is expected that young employees will hold a lower level of job embeddedness compared to elder employees.*

**GENDER**

Females have been viewed to be less attached to their organizations than males. Griffeth et al. (2000) found no significant differences held among males and females in terms of the level of job embeddedness they possessed. Ng and Feldman (2011) found that women had higher perceptions of organizational embeddedness than men. The researcher perceives the findings of (Ng & Feldman, 2011) to be more applicable on the Egyptian organizations; hence the second hypothesis is posed as:

**H2:** *It is expected females will enjoy a higher level of job embeddedness than males*

**EDUCATION**

Employees who possessed high levels of education tend to be less attached to their jobs. This is attributed to the likelihood of increasing their opportunities of open career gates. Royalty (1998) explained that education creates broad-minded and career driven employees that in return reduces the level of attachment and ties to a given organization.

**H3:** *It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between education and job embeddedness.*

**ROLE AMBIGUITY**

Role ambiguity is one of the factors that could lead to exasperated employees with a sense of feeling unaware of the expected outcomes. It has been shown to be negatively related to turnover and job embeddedness (Griffeth et al., 2000) specifically the organizational dimension of job embeddedness.

**H4:** *It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between role ambiguity and job embeddedness.*

**TRAINING**

Training is the process of enhancing the skills, capabilities and knowledge of employees for doing a particular job. Training process molds the thinking of employees and leads to enhancing their quality performance. It is continuous and never ending process in nature. Previous studies showed a positive relationship between training and job embeddedness (Bergiel, Nguyen, Clenney & Taylor, 2009; Davidson, McPhail & Barry, 2011; Poulston, 2008; Yang, Wan & Fu, 2012).

**H5:** *It is expected that there will be a positive relationship between training and job embeddedness.*

### 4 STATISTICAL RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This section presents the statistical results of the research hypotheses. All the research hypotheses are analyzed with regard to the dimensions of job embeddedness (Fit, Link and Sacrifice).

**SCALE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY:** a pilot study was conducted on a number of 50 participants to check the validity and reliability of the scales. Results revealed that all the selected scales are valid and reliable with Cronbach Alpha (0.872-0.957) at 0.01 level of significance, and that they are appropriate for the purpose of the study.

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS:** Table 1 shows the collected demographic characteristics of the research sample.
Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>376</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>427</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Diploma Holder</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Holder</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA Holder</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Number One: It is expected that young employees will hold a lower level of job embeddedness compared to elder employees.

One-way ANOVA test results are presented in the Table 2:

Table 2. Results of one-way ANOVA (Age groups and job embeddedness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>20-</th>
<th>30-</th>
<th>40-</th>
<th>Above 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>3.700&lt;br&gt;(0.075)</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>3.529&lt;br&gt;(0.063)</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>3.887&lt;br&gt;(0.095)</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>3.954&lt;br&gt;(0.162)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: denote the mean value for each group  
2: denote the standard error (S.E) for each group  
3: Denote the mean differences between two intersected groups  
4: Denote the existing differences between two groups

- Based on the above results and through running Tukey test, differences among the different age groups are seen specifically within the groups (40-) and (Above 50) with regard to the level of job embeddedness held among them.

Results of Age Groups and Job Embeddedness-Fit Sub-dimension
Table 3: Results of one-way ANOVA (Age groups and job embeddedness-fit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fit - Organization</td>
<td>20-</td>
<td>3.594</td>
<td>4.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-</td>
<td>3.564</td>
<td>4.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-</td>
<td>3.945</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>4.015</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Denote the mean value for each group
2: Denote the standard error (S.E) for each group
3: Denote the mean differences between two intersected groups
4: Denote the existing differences between two groups

- Based on the above results and through running Tukey test, differences among the different age groups are seen specifically within the groups elder age specifically the fit-organization dimension with respect to the age group (above 50)
### Results of Age Groups and Job Embeddedness-Links Sub-dimension

Table 4: Results of one-way ANOVA (Age groups and job embeddedness-links)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>Above 50</th>
<th>F-ratio (d.f)</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-</td>
<td>3.674,</td>
<td>0.161,</td>
<td>0.241,</td>
<td>0.292,</td>
<td>(0.082)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-</td>
<td>3.514,</td>
<td>0.402,</td>
<td>0.452,</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.069)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-</td>
<td>3.915,</td>
<td>0.057,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.100)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>3.972,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.166) (3,596)</td>
<td>5.080, 0.002, p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Links Organization  | 20-       | 3.489, | 0.055, | 0.291, | 0.328, | (0.081)² |        |
|                     | 30-       | 3.433, | 0.347, | 0.384, |          | (0.064)² |        |
|                     | 40-       | 3.780, |          | 0.037, |          | (0.094)² |        |
|                     | Above 50  | 3.817, |          |          |          | (0.153) (3,596) | 4.376, 0.005, p<0.01 |

| Links Community     | 20-       | 3.581, | 0.108, | 0.366, | 0.313, | (0.070)² |        |
|                     | 30-       | 3.473, | 0.374, | 0.421, |          | (0.053)² |        |
|                     | 40-       | 3.847, |          | 0.047, |          | (0.096)² |        |
|                     | Above 50  | 3.934, |          |          |          | (0.150) (3,596) | 4.963, 0.002, p<0.01 |

1: Denote the mean value for each group
2: Denote the standard error (S.E) for each group
3: Denote the mean differences between two intersected groups
4: Denote the existing differences between two groups

- Based on the above results and through running Tukey test, differences among the different age groups are present specifically within the groups (40- and above 50)
Results of Age Groups and Job Embeddedness-Sacrifice Sub-dimension

Table 5: Results of one-way ANOVA (age groups and job embeddedness-sacrifice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacrifice Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>Above 50</th>
<th>F-ratio (df)</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice - Organization</td>
<td>20-</td>
<td>3.783, (0.074)</td>
<td>0.167, (0.064)</td>
<td>0.121, (0.064)</td>
<td>0.392, (0.064)</td>
<td>3.972, (0.099)</td>
<td>2.934, (3, 596)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-</td>
<td>3.616, (0.064)</td>
<td>0.288, (0.064)</td>
<td>0.458, (0.064)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-</td>
<td>3.904, (0.064)</td>
<td>0.057, (0.064)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>3.972, (0.166)</td>
<td>3.972, (0.166)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice - Community</td>
<td>20-</td>
<td>3.667, (0.083)</td>
<td>0.186, (0.071)</td>
<td>0.210, (0.071)</td>
<td>0.326, (0.071)</td>
<td>3.877, (0.106)</td>
<td>4.523, (3, 596)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-</td>
<td>3.481, (0.071)</td>
<td>0.396, (0.071)</td>
<td>0.384, (0.071)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-</td>
<td>3.877, (0.106)</td>
<td>0.037, (0.106)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>3.817, (0.153)</td>
<td>3.817, (0.153)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice</td>
<td>20-</td>
<td>3.725, (0.076)</td>
<td>0.177, (0.065)</td>
<td>0.165, (0.065)</td>
<td>0.210, (0.065)</td>
<td>3.934, (0.170)</td>
<td>3.934, (3, 596)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-</td>
<td>3.543, (0.065)</td>
<td>0.342, (0.065)</td>
<td>0.386, (0.065)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-</td>
<td>3.803, (0.102)</td>
<td>0.044, (0.102)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>3.934, (0.170)</td>
<td>3.934, (0.170)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Denote the mean value for each group
2: Denote the standard error (S.E) for each group
3: Denote the mean differences between two intersected groups
4: Denote the existing differences between two groups

- Based on the above results and through running Tukey test, differences among the different age groups are present specifically within the groups (30- / 40- and above 50).

The statistical results and as presented in Tables (2, 3, 4 & 5) it is concluded that there is a difference among the age groups in the level of job embeddedness held. Accordingly, the first hypothesis can be accepted.

Hypothesis Number Two: It is expected females will enjoy a higher level of job embeddedness than males.

T-test was used to analyze the differences among males and females. The following Table 6 shows the results with regard to job embeddedness construct.
From the previous Table 6 the mean values show that females enjoy a higher level of job embeddedness compared to males.

**Results of Gender and Job Embeddedness-Fit sub-dimension**

Table 7: Results of T-test (gender and job embeddedness-fit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>CI for mean with 95%</th>
<th>T-Value (df)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>UL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit - Organization</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.612</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>3.499</td>
<td>3.725</td>
<td>2.328(401)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.839</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>3.995</td>
<td>3.767(442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit - Community</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.616</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>3.503</td>
<td>3.729</td>
<td>3.767(442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>3.819</td>
<td>4.099</td>
<td>3.767(442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.614</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>3.508</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.767(442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.859</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>3.764</td>
<td>4.039</td>
<td>3.767(442)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All the results show that females possessed a higher level of Job-Embeddedness-Fit sub-dimension compared to males.

**Results of Gender and Job Embeddedness-Links Sub-dimension**

Table 8: Results of T-test (gender and job embeddedness-links)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>CI for mean with 95%</th>
<th>T-Value (df)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>UL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links - Organization</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.574</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>3.461</td>
<td>3.687</td>
<td>3.352(437)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.881</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.022</td>
<td>3.352(437)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links - Community</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.452</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>3.347</td>
<td>3.557</td>
<td>3.426(423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.751</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>3.615</td>
<td>3.888</td>
<td>3.426(423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.513</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>3.407</td>
<td>3.619</td>
<td>3.902(433)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.816</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>3.682</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.902(433)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the results show that females possessed a higher level of Job-Embeddedness-Links sub-dimension compared to males.
Results of Gender and Job Embeddedness-Sacrifice Sub-dimension

Table 9: Results of T-test (gender and job embeddedness-sacrifice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacrifice Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>L.L</th>
<th>U.L</th>
<th>T-Value (df)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice - Organization</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.652</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>3.546</td>
<td>3.757</td>
<td>3.240 (435)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>3.798</td>
<td>4.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice - Community</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.553</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>3.434</td>
<td>3.672</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.839</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>3.695</td>
<td>3.985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.603</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>3.493</td>
<td>3.712</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>3.751</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All the results show that females possessed a higher level of Job -Embeddedness-Sacrifice sub-dimension compared to males.

Based on the statistical results and as shown in Tables (6, 7, 8 & 9) indicate that there is a difference among males and females in the level of job embeddedness held. Accordingly, the second hypothesis can be accepted.

Hypothesis Number Three: It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between education and job embeddedness.

One-way ANOVA test was used to test this hypothesis. Table 10 shows the results of the relationship between the level of education and Job –Embeddedness construct.

Table 10: Results of one-way ANOVA for education level and job-embeddedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>University Graduate</th>
<th>Professional Diploma Holder</th>
<th>MBA Holder</th>
<th>DBA Holder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Graduate</td>
<td>3.656 (0.047)</td>
<td>3.737 (0.104)</td>
<td>3.692 (0.308)</td>
<td>3.904 (0.229)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-ratio = 0.768, df = (3,596), Sig = 0.517, p>0.05 (Not Significant)

- From the previous Table 9, it is shown that there is no significant differences between the various education levels and job embeddedness construct.
Results of Education Levels and Job Embeddedness-Fit Sub-dimension

Table 11: Results of T-test (education levels and job embeddedness-fit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Sub Dimension</th>
<th>Education Levels</th>
<th>University Graduate</th>
<th>Professional Diploma</th>
<th>MBA Holder</th>
<th>DBA Holder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F - ratio</td>
<td>Sig. F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit - Organization</strong></td>
<td>University Graduate</td>
<td>3.639</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Diploma</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>(0.102)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBA Holder</td>
<td>3.771</td>
<td>(0.329)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBA Holder</td>
<td>3.880</td>
<td>(0.227)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit - Community</strong></td>
<td>University Graduate</td>
<td>3.704</td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Diploma</td>
<td>3.728</td>
<td>(0.107)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBA Holder</td>
<td>3.771</td>
<td>(0.251)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBA Holder</td>
<td>3.913</td>
<td>(0.355)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit</strong></td>
<td>University Graduate</td>
<td>3.672</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Diploma</td>
<td>3.774</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBA Holder</td>
<td>3.771</td>
<td>(0.298)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBA Holder</td>
<td>3.907</td>
<td>(0.226)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Results of Table 11 show no significant difference between the various education levels and job-embeddedness-fit.

Results of Education Levels and Job Embeddedness-Links Sub-dimension

Table 12: Results of T-test (education levels and job embeddedness-links)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Education Levels</th>
<th>University Graduate</th>
<th>Professional Diploma</th>
<th>MBA Holder</th>
<th>DBA Holder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F - ratio</td>
<td>Sig. F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links - Organization</strong></td>
<td>University Graduate</td>
<td>3.650</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Diploma</td>
<td>3.765</td>
<td>(0.104)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBA Holder</td>
<td>3.672</td>
<td>(0.328)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBA Holder</td>
<td>3.940</td>
<td>(0.310)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links - Community</strong></td>
<td>University Graduate</td>
<td>3.501</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Diploma</td>
<td>3.635</td>
<td>(0.098)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBA Holder</td>
<td>3.578</td>
<td>(0.304)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBA Holder</td>
<td>3.910</td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links</strong></td>
<td>University Graduate</td>
<td>3.566</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Diploma</td>
<td>3.699</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBA Holder</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>(0.316)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBA Holder</td>
<td>3.925</td>
<td>(0.209)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Results of Table 12 show no significant difference between the various education levels and job-embeddedness-links.

Table 13: Results of T-test (education levels and job embeddedness- sacrifice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacrifice Sub-Dimension</th>
<th>Education Levels</th>
<th>F - ratio (df)</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Graduate</td>
<td>Professional Diploma</td>
<td>MBA Holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacrifice - Organization</strong></td>
<td>3.752 (0.047)</td>
<td>3.742 (0.106)</td>
<td>3.734 (0.295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacrifice - Community</strong></td>
<td>3.603 (0.054)</td>
<td>3.735 (0.112)</td>
<td>3.625 (0.332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacrifice</strong></td>
<td>3.670 (0.048)</td>
<td>3.739 (0.108)</td>
<td>3.680 (0.312)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Results of Table 13 show no significant difference between the various education levels and job-embeddedness-Sacrifice.

The statistical results and as presented in Tables (10, 11, 12 & 13) reveal no significant difference across all the educational levels and job embeddedness including all its sub-dimensions. Accordingly, the third hypothesis can be rejected.

**Hypothesis Number Four: It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between role ambiguity and job embeddedness.**

Simple regression analysis was used to test the effect of role ambiguity on job embeddedness. The following scatter diagram (Figure 1) shows the shape of the effect whereby the x-axis represents Job embeddedness and the y-axis represents Role Ambiguity.
The results shown in the previous Figure 1 indicate that there is a negative linear relationship with \((R^2 = 95.5)\). This is further elaborated in Table 14:

Table 14: Simple regression analysis – role ambiguity and job embeddedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Test (T-test)</th>
<th>(Y = 6.028 - 0.995X_{1t})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>((266.281))** ((113.3791))**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model Test**

| F-ratio = 12854.695***, df = 1, 598 |
| \(Sig = 0.000, p < 0.01, R^2 = 95.5\%, S.E. = 0.219\) |

**: significance at 0.01
Results of Role Ambiguity and Job Embeddedness-Fit Sub-dimension

The following Table 15 shows the results of simple regression analysis with respect to Job Embeddedness-Fit (sub-dimension). There is a negative relation with $R^2=92.2\%$.

Table 15: Simple regression analysis – role ambiguity and job embeddedness – fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit - Organization</th>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th>$Y = 6.060 - 1.002 X_{fit}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td>(115.462)** vs (-49.249)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td>$F_{ratio}=7425.313^{**}$, $d.f.=1,598$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sig} = 0.000, p&lt;0.01, R^2 = 92.2%$, S.E. = 0.508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fit - Community |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Estimated Parameters | $Y = 6.045 - 0.979 X_{fit}$ |
| Parameter Test (T-test) | (118.396)** vs (-49.432)** |
| Model Test | $F_{ratio}=7443.570^{**}$, $d.f.=1,598$ |
| $\text{Sig} = 0.000, p<0.01, R^2 = 93.3\%$, S.E. = 0.495 |

**: significance at 0.01

Results of Role Ambiguity and Job Embeddedness-Links Sub-dimension

The following Table 16 shows the results of simple regression analysis with respect to Job Embeddedness-Links (sub-dimension). It is seen that there is a negative relation with $R^2=92\%$.

Table 16: Simple regression analysis – role ambiguity and job embeddedness – links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links - Organization</th>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th>$Y = 6.057 - 1.007 X_{links}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td>(137.658)** vs (58.978)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td>$F_{ratio}=3478.360^{**}$, $d.f.=1,598$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sig} = 0.000, p&lt;0.01, R^2 = 95.3%$, S.E. = 0.427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Links - Community |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Estimated Parameters | $Y = 5.834 - 0.965 X_{links}$ |
| Parameter Test (T-test) | (155.251)** vs (-66.295)** |
| Model Test | $F_{ratio}=4383.060^{**}$, $d.f.=1,598$ |
| $\text{Sig} = 0.000, p<0.01, R^2 = 98.0\%$, S.E. = 0.364 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sig} = 0.000, p&lt;0.01, R^2 = 92.0%$, S.E. = 0.297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**: significance at 0.01
**Results of Role Ambiguity and Job Embeddedness-Sacrifice Sub-dimension**

The following Table 17 shows the results of simple regression analysis with respect to Job Embeddedness-Sacrifice (sub-dimension). It is concluded that there is a negative relation with $R^2 = 92.2\%$.

Table 17: Simple regression analysis – role ambiguity and job embeddedness – sacrifice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacrifice - Organization</th>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th>$\gamma = 6.025 - 0.954X_{1t}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(167.350)** (69.037)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>$F$-ratio = 4764.57**, d.f = (1,598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig = 0.000, $p &lt; 0.01$, $R^2 = 93.3%$, S.E. = 0.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacrifice - Community</th>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th>$\gamma = 6.146 - 1.056X_{1t}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(130.636)** (-57.861)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>$F$-ratio = 3348.093**, d.f = (1,598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig = 0.000, $p &lt; 0.01$, $R^2 = 84.8%$, S.E. = 0.456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacrifice</th>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th>$\gamma = 6.085 - 1.010X_{1t}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(156.737)** (-84.174)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>$F$-ratio = 7085.328**, d.f = (1,598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig = 0.000, $p &lt; 0.01$, $R^2 = 92.7%$, S.E. = 0.300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****: significance at 0.01

Based on all the results presented in Tables (14, 15, 16, and 17) hypothesis number four can be accepted.

Hypothesis Number Five: It is expected that there will be a positive relationship between training and job embeddedness.

Simple regression analysis was used to test the effect of training on job embeddedness. The following scatter diagram (Figure 2) shows the shape of the effect whereby the x-axis represents Job embeddedness and the y-axis represents training.

Figure 2: Scatter diagram – the effect of training on job embeddedness
The results shown in the previous Figure 2 indicate that there is a positive linear relationship with \( R^2 = 93.4\% \). This is further elaborated in Table 18:

### Table 18: Simple regression analysis – training and job embeddedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> = 6.028 - 0.995X1t</td>
<td>(266.781)** (-113.379)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td>F-ratio =</td>
<td>12854.695**, d.f. = (1,598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td>Sig =</td>
<td>0.000, p &lt; 0.01, R² = 93.5%, S.E. = 0.219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**:** significance at 0.01

**Results of Training and Job Embeddedness–Fit Sub-dimension**

The following Table 19 shows the results of simple regression analysis with respect to Job Embeddedness-Fit (sub-dimension). There is a positive relation with \( R^2 = 86.5\% \).

### Table 19: Simple regression analysis – training and job embeddedness – fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit</th>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> = 0.432 + 0.888X2t</td>
<td>(4.684)** (36.765)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td>F-ratio =</td>
<td>1351.491**, d.f. = (1,598)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td>Sig =</td>
<td>0.000, p &lt; 0.01, R² = 69.3%, S.E. = 0.634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit - Organization</th>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> = 0.280 + 0.941X2t</td>
<td>(4.050)** (31.697)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td>F-ratio =</td>
<td>2672.526**, d.f. = (1,598)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td>Sig =</td>
<td>0.000, p &lt; 0.01, R² = 81.7%, S.E. = 0.477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit - Community</th>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> = 0.356 + 0.914X2t</td>
<td>(6.317)** (61.896)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td>F-ratio =</td>
<td>3831.061**, d.f. = (1,598)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td>Sig =</td>
<td>0.000, p &lt; 0.01, R² = 86.5%, S.E. = 0.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**:** significance at 0.01
Results of Training and Job Embeddedness-Links Sub-dimension

The following Table 20 shows the results of simple regression analysis with respect to Job Embeddedness-Links (sub-dimension). It is seen that there is a positive relation with $R^2=92.4\%$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links - Organization</th>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th>$Y = 0.090+0.97\times X_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td>$(1.658)** (58.411)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td>$F_{\text{ratio}} = 4680.095**$, $d.f. = (1.598)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sig.} = 0.000, p &lt; 0.01, R^2 = 92.4%, \text{ S.E.} = 0.375$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Simple regression analysis – training and job embeddedness – links

**: significance at 0.01

Results of Role Ambiguity and Job Embeddedness-Sacrifice Sub-dimension

The following Table 21 shows the results of simple regression analysis with respect to Job Embeddedness-Sacrifice (sub-dimension). It is seen that there is a positive relation with $R^2=91.2\%$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Links - Community</th>
<th>Estimated Parameters</th>
<th>$Y = 0.232+0.905X_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter Test (T-test)</td>
<td>$(3.960)** (58.859)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Test</td>
<td>$F_{\text{ratio}} = 3464.974**$, $d.f. = (1.598)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Sig.} = 0.000, p &lt; 0.01, R^2 = 93.3%, \text{ S.E.} = 0.403$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Simple regression analysis – training and job embeddedness – sacrifice

**: significance at 0.01

Based on all the results presented in Tables (18, 18, 20, and 21) hypothesis number five can be accepted.
5 DISCUSSION

This research aimed at analyzing selected job embeddedness antecedents namely; role ambiguity, training, and demographic characteristics (age, gender and education). Previous literature studies were analyzed and accordingly research hypotheses were posed. Self-administered questionnaires were developed using sound, and valid scales among employees working in the private banking sector in Egypt. Results revealed a negative relationship between role ambiguity and job embeddedness, a positive relationship between training and job embeddedness, elder employees held higher level of embeddedness compared to young employees, females possessed higher level of embeddedness compared to males, and no significant differences among the various education levels and job embeddedness. This study makes an important contribution to the job embeddedness literature through exploring several antecedents in relation to the sub-dimensions of job embeddedness especially within the Egyptian domain. The findings lend a weight to the concept that employees do consider the sub-dimensions of job embeddedness separately.

Results revealed that older employees held a higher level of job embeddedness when compared to young employees. This was obvious among the three job embeddedness sub-dimensions (fit, link and sacrifice). This result agrees with the findings of (Griffeth et al., 2010). The researcher views the results to be coherent with previous research suggestions. Older people don't attempt to accommodate changes in their jobs or communities easily. Change gets to be difficult to approach especially if they feel fitting and linked with their organizations and communities. The willingness and the ability to sacrifice current jobs decreases and hence embeddedness acts as a tie that locks them to their organizations. On the other hand, young employees tend to accept new trails and career opportunities. They can cope easier with life changing pace and the notion of 'change is the only constant'. As such fitting and linking themselves to the organization is not strong enough compared to older employees and their readiness to sacrifice is higher.

As for the gender, results showed that females enjoy a higher level of job embeddedness for the three sub-dimensions compared to males. This result is tied to the oriental Egyptian culture that tends to impose more obligations on women with regard to work-family balance. Family commitments are the first priorities for many women and financial obligations also tie them up to their jobs. As such stability in the job is a psychological tie specifically if the job is a private sector whereby security on the job is not guaranteed. The sense of link to the job is well-established once they feel fitting particularly if the community and family endorses this. Males on the other hand, enjoy a higher level of freedom to move across organizations especially if they can find jobs with higher organizational positions and better payment. The community supports males to move freely even if their move is overseas as their obligations are more financial than operational towards their families and communities. This elevates their readiness to move across jobs regardless of fit, link or sacrifice dimensions.

It was found that no significant differences among the various educational levels and job embeddedness sub-dimensions. This result disagrees with previous findings of Royalty (1998). The researcher perceives these results to be attributed to the fact that private banks in Egypt tend to offer minimum promotional opportunities and payment differences among the various educational degrees. Growth and promotion are based on performance rather than on educational degree progress. This is also apparent as most of the employees are university graduates compared to professional diploma holders, MBA holders and DBA holders. The ties to the organization and the community will not vary as employees don't feel tangible or morale differences among the various educational degrees.

Results indicated training to be positively related to job embeddedness and its sub-dimensions. The highest effect was on (link-organization), followed by (sacrifice-organization) and then (fit-community) sub-dimension. This supports the idea of valuing the workforce and investing in employees will improve loyalty, increase their tie-up forces to the organization and foster employees’ attitudes towards staying with the organization for long. Training had the highest impact on (link –organization) is a coherent objective of training exercise as employees feel connected and linked to their organizations especially when the organization is concerned with improving their skills. This was followed by the willingness to sacrifice after acquiring new skills and with the organizational expenditure on their intellectual skills. Last is to feel a sense of (fit-community) whereby employees feel proud to share with the community their organizational investment in them.

Role ambiguity was reported to be negatively related to job embeddedness and its sub-dimensions. The differences among the three sub-dimensions were not significant. Fit and sacrifice sub-dimensions reported equal relationship (R²=92.2%), while link sub-dimension showed (R²=92%). These findings support the idea that lack of well-communicated objectives and transparency practices evoke the sense of detachment inside the workplace. Embracing clarity loops across employees will maintain an improved sense of embeddedness. Spending time in a workplace full of doubts will promote the idea of dusting off jobs and is likely to break the embeddedness ties towards the workplace.
6 MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Organizations should foster the generation of job embeddedness across its all sub-dimensions (fit, link and sacrifice).

The following are some proposed recommendations to management and decision-makers inside organizations:

1. Recognize performance among young and elder employees equally as this will help young employees to feel a sense of appreciation and attachment towards the organization.
2. Offer equal development and growth opportunities among all employees.
3. Applaud the results of females and males equally. A sense of equality specifically among females is perceived to be of a real tangible return.
4. Disseminate transparency practices among all the organizational goals and objectives communicated to employees. This provides a real boost towards magnifying job embeddedness.
5. It is hard to stay positive without being fueled! Training is the fuel of positive attitudes towards the organization. It promotes organizational willingness to enhance employees’ intellectual skills.
6. Envision education across all the board as it is the key driver of self-development and the compelling path towards building valuable job embeddedness and appreciation.

7 RESEARCH LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE STUDIES

Due to cost constraints the study was adopted on Cairo, Giza and Alexandria governorates, Egypt only. It is recommended that the research could be extended to other governorates within Egypt to gain a better insight for the generalization of the results. Future research could extend to include several other antecedents to enrich the existing academic literature specifically in the Middle East region.

8 CONCLUSION

This research study aimed at analyzing selected antecedents of job embeddedness in the private banking sector in Cairo, Egypt. Questionnaires were distributed relying on previously published scales. Statistical analysis were conducted and results revealed a negative relationship between role ambiguity and job embeddedness, a positive relationship between training and job embeddedness, elder employees held higher level of embeddedness compared to young employees, females possessed higher level of embeddedness compared to males, and no significant differences among the various education levels. Discussion and managerial implications were developed based on the research findings.
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