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ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate the moderating effect of embeddedness on the commitment and turnover intentions relationship. Embeddedness was examined as a key variable that links the commitment and turnover literatures together. Job embeddedness was expected to moderate the relationship between job commitment and job turnover intentions, while organizational embeddedness was expected to moderate the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational turnover intentions. Responses from 154 employed individuals were collected for this study. Data was collected using a web-based survey format. Psychometric data was collected with the use of a demographics questionnaire, as well as embeddedness (job and organizational), organizational commitment, and turnover intentions scales. A moderated regression analysis found that both job and organizational embeddedness moderated the commitment-turnover relationship, but in the opposite way as proposed. These relationships can help us better understand why employees remain within their organizations and jobs.
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CHAPTER ONE
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

With the dynamic nature of the workplace, there has been an increasing interest in the area of attachment to work-roles and commitment (Adams, Webster, & Buyarski, 2010). Within these areas, there have been multiple levels of analysis identified including job, career/occupation, and organization attachment. These levels of attachment have been important to consider because these are some of the targets to which individuals commit towards.

When looking at work-role attachment towards organizations and jobs, three important aspects have been identified within the commitment literature (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001). These attachment targets include a strong affective component, unexplained variance in outcomes such as turnover, and both internal and external influential factors. Mitchell et al. (2001) further reveal that occupational commitment is also characterized by similar aspects. Occupational attachment targets have an affective component, there is still a large amount of unexplained variance in outcomes, and there are both internal and external factors as well.

Also within the construct of attachment lies organizational commitment. Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) define organizational commitment as a
relationship based on an individual’s involvement in and identification with an organization. Allen and Meyer (1990) expanded this view of attitudinal organizational commitment to include three types: affective, continuance, and normative. The topic of organizational commitment and attachment has become very prominent in the industrial/organizational psychology literature because of its influences on employee behavior towards an organization, i.e. performance, attendance, and turnover intentions (Riketta, 2002).

In addition to the interest in the area of attachment, there is an increasing emphasis on examining the reasons why people stay with an employer rather than leave (Ng & Feldman, 2011). Instead of looking at turnover, researchers are beginning to focus on employee retention. While turnover has been traditionally viewed as driven by job satisfaction and individual-motivated choices (Campion, 1991), there may be more reasons for employees to consider leaving than previously thought. It is important to note, though, that staying is not simply the opposite of leaving. That is, there are multiple factors which influence the decision to stay that are unique to individuals reasons to leave an organization (Harman, Lee, Mitchell, Felps, & Owens, 2007). In better understanding employee retention, though, the intent and nature of turnover must be better understood as well. March and Simon (1958) theorized that turnover stemmed from a decision to participate, specifically decisions pertaining to the perceived ease and desirability of movement associated in turnover. Throughout subsequent research, perceived ease of movement has come to mean perceived
job alternatives and desirability of movement has come to mean job satisfaction. Lee, Mitchell, Wise, and Fireman (1996) propose that current models of turnover are based on some combination of job dissatisfaction and job alternatives.

In an attempt to find out why employees leave or remain within their employment, the concept of voluntary turnover was examined by Lee and Mitchell (1994). Lee and Mitchell examined the turnover literature revealing that there are contextual and perceptual factors associated in voluntary turnover decisions. Their model is comprised of shock events which can precipitate employees’ decisions, as well as the cognitive and psychological analyses which accompany the decisions to leave. For example, Lee et al. (1996) found support for these active decision paths outlined in the voluntary turnover model, further contributing to the multiple contextual and psychological influences of turnover. Greater contributions and replications to the voluntary turnover model were made by Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel, and Hill (1999). In their study, the authors found that employees considered different paths in response to different shock situations in contemplating turnover intentions. For example, personal shock events, such as following a spouse to find employment or becoming a stay-at-home parent after the birth of a child, elicit scripted behaviors or events which pertain to the individual’s personal life. Organizational shock events, such as separating from employment, may elicit responses to negative events experienced by an employee at his or her organization. Further, job shock
events, such as other job offers or contemplation of better opportunities, may elicit analytical responses from employees about their jobs or organizations.

In the presentation of this emerging model and replication of results, Mitchell et al. (2001) noted that many people who consider turnover are satisfied with their job, do not consider alternatives prior to leaving, and leave based off of a shock event. Donnelly and Quirin (2006) continued to find this trend, that voluntarily leaving employment did not mean that an employee was experiencing dissatisfaction. This relationship was true even with employees who may have considered quitting their jobs but ultimately decided to stay. With their previous findings, and the later confirmation from Donnelly and Quirin (2006), Mitchell et al. (2001) note that negative attitudes were not the sole predictor in turnover, but that there are multiple factors involved in the process. Thus, embeddedness was proposed as a model more descriptive of employee retention.

The topic of embeddedness is still an emerging area and is based off of the commitment and fit literatures (Clinton, Knight, & Guest, 2012) and is separated into organizational, occupational/career, and job embeddedness, respectively. Within the embeddedness literature are the constructs of career mobility and career stability (Feldman, 2007). These constructs are related to embeddedness by looking at how easily an individual can move from one job, career, or organization to another and how likely it is for an individual to remain within his or her job, career, or organization. These assessments are made through the links, fit, and sacrifice of embeddedness. The importance of
embeddedness and how employees become tied to their current jobs, organizations, or occupations is important to consider because of the implications and outcomes associated with turnover and the effects on both employees and organizations alike. If organizations can better understand the events and processes which may invoke employee turnover, then managers may be better prepared to either deter the situation or deal with it in an appropriate manner. Therefore, in the present study we will investigate the effects of job, career/occupational, and organizational embeddedness on the relationship between employee commitment and turnover intentions (Appendix A).

Organizational Commitment

As Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) revealed, organizational commitment is defined through an individual’s relationship with his or her organization. This is traditionally measured through an individual’s involvement in and identification with an organization and its activities. Allen and Meyer (1990) defined and expanded upon three types of organizational commitment through their research. Affective, or attitudinal, commitment refers to an individual’s emotional attachment to, involvement in, and identification with an organization. This commitment is based upon a desire to remain with an organization due to feelings of connectedness (Vandenberghhe, Panaccio, & Ben Ayed, 2011). Continuance commitment refers to an individual’s commitment framed through
perceived costs of leaving an organization. This commitment is based upon a perceived necessity to remain with an organization whether through accumulated benefits or self- or family-sacrifice (Vandenberghe et al., 2011). Normative commitment refers to an individual’s obligation to remain within an organization. The obligation felt in this type of commitment can be that of being able to provide, whether for oneself or others (Vandenberghe et al., 2011). Although there are three types of organizational commitment identified in the literature, the most cited definition of commitment is that of affective, or attitudinal, organizational commitment (Riketta, 2002).

The development and distinction of these three types of organizational commitment is important to consider because it begins to look at the nature of links between employees and organizations (Allen & Meyer, 1991), and ultimately, similar makings of embeddedness. Allen and Meyer further reveal that these types of commitment can be experienced in varying degrees, distinguishing them from one another. This is important to note because, even if all three types of commitment are present, one may be more influential than the others in linking a person to an organization (Meyer, Stanley, Jackson, McInnis, Maltin, & Sheppard, 2002). Through their review, Meyer et al. found that affective commitment was the strongest predictor of organizational commitment leading to a reduction in turnover intentions. The authors note, though, that the strength of all three commitment types may have important implications for other on-the-job behaviors such as performance, attendance, and well-being. Thus, for this study,
affective commitment will be used to examine the moderating effects of embeddedness on turnover intentions.

**Job Commitment**

Of the three forms of commitment outlined in this study, job commitment is the least studied of the constructs (Millward & Hopkins, 1998). Millward and Hopkins define job commitment through three factors, similar to the other forms of commitment. First, an employee must believe in and accept a job’s goals and values. Second, an employee must be willing to exert a considerable effort in order to engage in a job. Third, an employee must have a desire to remain within a job. Farrell and Rusbult (1981) define job commitment as a psychological attachment to a job, independent of affect. In addition, the degree to which an employee wishes to remain within a job represents behavioral intentions of job commitment. Farrell and Rusbult continue to argue that the existence of job commitment is due to an employee’s perception of how connected he or she feels to his or her job. Klein, Molloy, and Brinsfield (2012) further define these bonds of commitment through multiple processes and perceptions experienced by an individual. In experiencing an antecedent to commitment, such as culture or climate, an employee will make a perception about his or her job therefore influencing his or her commitment to that job. In doing so, an employee will either
strengthen or weaken the bond he or she has to a job based on his or her perceptions of commitment.

Mowday et al. (1982) argue that organizational commitment is separate from other types of commitment due to its separate focus from job-specific commitment and involvement. Meyer et al. (1993) continue to argue that other forms of commitment have the same distinction from one another, that they are, in fact, separate constructs. Using this framework, job commitment can be likened to other forms of commitment while remaining a separate construct in the commitment literature (Millward & Hopkins, 1998; Mowday et al., 1982). Rusbult and Farrell (1983) importantly note that job commitment involves employees remaining attached to jobs whether it is satisfying or not. This helps distinguish job commitment from job satisfaction. In addition to its separateness and persistence, job commitment has a direct influence on turnover intentions and turnover; decreased job commitment can lead to increased turnover intentions or turnover (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983). Due to the nature of this attachment to a job, affective job commitment will be used to examine the moderating effects of embeddedness on turnover intentions.

Perceived Organizational Support

As part of an extended commitment model, perceived organizational support (POS) manifests itself as global feelings or beliefs held by employees
about how an organization values employee contributions and employee well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). In this model, employees form inferences about an organization’s commitment to them and in return, this perceived support helps foster employees’ commitment towards an organization (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). The POS relationship is based on a personification formed through employee interactions with an organization (Allen & Shanock, 2013). These interactions with organizational representatives, both human (supervisors) and non-human (policies), allow employees to attribute the organization with human characteristics. This personification leads employees to view POS as a reciprocal social exchange relationship influencing commitment (Settoon, Bennnett, & Liden, 1996).

Being affective in nature, POS has strong influences on employee views and outcomes related to an organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Most notable of these outcomes are commitment and turnover intentions. In their meta-analysis, Rhoades and Eisenberg (2002) found a strong negative correlation between POS and turnover intentions as well as a strong positive correlation between POS and commitment. Further, POS appears to be influential in embeddedness as well (Dawley, Houghton, & Bucklew, 2010). Dawley et al. investigated the effects of fit and sacrifice on POS and found a positive relationship between fit and POS and a negative relationship between sacrifice and POS. Leupold, Ellis, and Valle (2013) found a similar positive
relationship between POS and embeddedness and, in addition, POS helped predict turnover intentions above and beyond commitment itself. These findings suggest that POS can be related to the commitment-turnover relationship and embeddedness as a whole.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

An additional behavior, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), is defined as employee behaviors which contribute to an organization but are not mandatory or directly rewarded by the organization (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Organ and Konovsky note that there are no formal role obligations which elicit these behaviors from employees. Chiang and Hsieh (2012) further elaborate that employees go above-and-beyond their organizational requirements by fulfilling both their expected duties as well as additional voluntary sacrifices. Often, these sacrifices are altruistic in nature, assisting employees with work-related issues (Lev & Koslowsky, 2012). Over time, these behaviors can compound and contribute to overall organizational effectiveness leading to, what appears, an abundance of resources at the organization’s disposal. As a result, though, organizations would need to implement formal procedures in order to endure what were once informal behaviors (Organ & Konovsky, 1989).

Although OCB can be an influential behavior in the workplace, the issue therein lies with the formality of those behaviors (Organ, 1997). Even though
these behaviors are sought after by an organization, there may not be any formal enforcement in place to elicit those behaviors. Even without formal enforcement, Lev and Koslowski (2012) find that OCB is becoming more pivotal to employee performance evaluations. Lev and Koslowski further relate OCB in the workplace to certain behaviors in school which can help predict better student performance. These behaviors are not necessarily required of students but they may help students better succeed in their studies and projects. The interesting thing to note about OCB according to Organ (1997) is that while these expected behaviors may not be enforced, employees tend to exhibit the desired behaviors regardless of the organization’s expectations. Given the nature of OCB, there may be factors which contribute to the commitment-turnover relationship and embeddedness overall.

Turnover and Turnover Intentions

One of the most widely researched organizational topics is employee turnover (Ramesh & Gelfand, 2010). Turnover and turnover intentions are important areas to consider in work-systems because of the impact which these two constructs can have on employees and organizations alike (Wheeler, Harris, & Harvey, 2010). In better understanding the things which may elicit turnover and turnover intentions in employees, organizations can add value to both individual and overall performance. Organizations can become more effective by working to
reduce the amount of turnover and turnover intentions experienced by employees through their retention practices. Organizations which implement one-size-fits-all retention strategies may experience increased turnover and turnover intentions due to employees considering alternatives (Swider, Bosell, & Zimmerman, 2011). It is important for organizations to consider retention strategies which foster more positive employee emotions making it more likely for employees to remain within the organization. Some examples of this strategy would include employee development plans, team-building, flexible schedules, and mentoring systems (Ramesh & Gelfand, 2010). In looking at some of the reasons employees may consider leaving, organizations will be better able to retain talented, high-performing employees (Ramesh & Gelfand, 2010; Swider et al., 2011; Wheeler et al., 2010).

Turnover, as defined by March and Simon's (1958) seminal theory, is an employee’s perceived ease and desirability of movement in seeking a new job. Ease of movement depends upon external factors such as employment opportunities while desirability of movement depends upon internal factors such as job-attitudes and internal opportunities (Tanova & Holtom, 2008). These decisions can be made from a psychological viewpoint or a labor market viewpoint (Morrell, Loan-Clarke, & Wilkinson, 2001). In the psychological view, the focus is on influences to employee’s behavior and intentions to leave. In the labor market viewpoint, the focus is on external factors which would determine employee’s intentions to leave. In addition, these evaluations can be made in
conjunction with employee satisfaction in organizational expectations (Harman, Blum, Stefani, & Taho, 2009). These expectations can influence employee’s views on decisions to leave an organization, especially if they are viewed negatively (Mobley, 1977; Porter & Steers, 1973).

In subsequent turnover models, organizational commitment and job satisfaction have been proposed numerous times to predict explained variance in individual turnover (Harman et al., 2009). It can be argued that psychological factors have a strong influence on individuals in considering turnover because of the voluntary nature of commitment and turnover intentions (Tanova & Holtom, 2008). Through the voluntary nature of these decisions, employees have as much interest in deciding to stay with an organization as they do in deciding to leave an organization. As Hom, Mitchell, Lee, and Griffeth (2012) discuss, it is important to note that since turnover and turnover intentions can be voluntary, no one remains within an organization, career, or job forever. Eventually employees either retire or die, thereby, technically leaving an organization, career, or job. In these cases, employees are involuntarily taken out of these positions. Therefore, when employees remain with their organization, career, or job, they have a just as much an option to leave an organization, career, or job as staying. These considerations of leaving, or turnover intentions, are a very strong predictor to actual employee turnover across multiple scenarios (Harman et al., 2009; Tanova & Holtom, 2008). As a result, embeddedness has been built upon the notion of the voluntary behavior of staying through the relationship individuals
create with organizations (Harman et al., 2009; Mitchell et al., 2001; Tanova & Holtom, 2008).

Job Embeddedness

Job Embeddedness is the extent to which people are linked to other people or activities, people’s jobs are similar to other aspects of their life, and how easily links can be broken (Mitchell et al., 2001). Rather than examine the reasons for why people want to leave their jobs, as is done in most of the job turnover literature, job embeddedness helps describe why people remain in their jobs. Job embeddedness may be influenced by interactions or events both at the organizational-level and at the personal-level (Holtom, Burton, & Crossley, 2012). These interactions or events consist of elements which are found both on-the-job and off-the job, respectively. For example, if an employee is not getting along with coworkers or supervisors, then those events may prompt the questioning of that employee’s values and commitment toward his or her job. Also, in times of personal disruption, putting an employee’s family’s needs first may devalue the benefits of one’s job. Internal job embeddedness refers to factors associated with the job itself while external job embeddedness refers to factors associated outside of the job within an individual’s community (Mitchell et al., 2001). Internal factors include coworker relationships, professional associations, and accumulated benefits, while external factors include education options,
healthcare options, and other community offerings. In addition to these elements, job embeddedness is comprised of links, fit, and sacrifice, and will be elaborated upon in the following sections.

**Links**

Links are connections formed between people and institutions or people and other people through the course of an individual’s working life (Mitchell et al., 2001). Links can be framed both internally and externally to an individual’s job. In this manner of thinking, the more links an employee has, the greater the chance an employee will be bound to his or her job. There are many aspects involved in linking and O’Reilly, Caldwell, and Barnett (1989) use the term Social Integration to describe the process of linking on the job. This process depends on many influences from the group including attraction, satisfaction, and similarity. This integration and linking could stem from normative pressures experienced by coworkers, as well as an individual’s family. Links are one component in job embeddedness which can bind an individual to his or her job.

**Fit**

Fit is an employee’s perceived compatibility within an organization and an environment (Mitchell et al., 2001). Fit can be framed both internally and externally to an individual’s job. Internally, an employee will assess his or her fit by looking at the congruence of his or her values, goals, and plans to that of their job. Externally, an employee may assess his or her fit within contexts outside of his or her job, such as community activities or offerings. It is important to note,
though, that these evaluations of fit may not be dependent on an employee’s actual job or organizational fit. That is, an employee may like his or her job but not where it is located. As with links, there are many aspects which influence an employee’s fit, and these evaluations are carried out on internal and external levels.

**Sacrifice**

Sacrifice is the perceived cost of the loss of benefits in leaving a job (Mitchell et al., 2001). Sacrifice can be framed both internally and externally to an individual’s job. These benefits could be tangible items, such as medical benefits or retirement packages, or they can be psychological connections, such as relationships and community ties. The decision to leave a job can be difficult in itself, but certain perks and incentives offered by an individual’s job may have a greater impact on the decision of whether to stay or leave than links or sacrifice. It is important to note that even in comparable jobs, the cost of relocating, by itself, is an influential factor and may be considered something of great sacrifice. As with the other two components, sacrifice is an influential element in helping explain why people become embedded in their jobs.

**Job Embeddedness and Related Concepts.** In each aspect of job embeddedness, the focus is on the forces which keep people on the job rather than thoughts which make people leave. Using this frame of thought, job embeddedness allows for a broader view of the relationship between employees and employers (Halfer, 2010). Job embeddedness helps expand upon the
concepts of job satisfaction and commitment by spanning across career stages. Rather than focusing on one point in time, job embeddedness can be used to measure satisfaction and commitment levels over a person’s entire career (Ng & Feldman, 2007). In relation to turnover, job embeddedness can be very useful. Since turnover and job embeddedness are negatively related, the more embeddedness experienced within one’s job, the more he or she will think less about leaving his or her job (Jiang, Liu, McKay, & Mitchell, 2012). This will help employees focus on the positive, rather than negative, aspects of their jobs.

Job embeddedness looks at the forces which keep employees within their jobs. There are many influences which occur at both the organizational-level, as well as the personal-level, and these events can occur both on-the-job and off-the-job. Job embeddedness is comprised of: links, the connections made between employees and other people or institutions; fit, an assessment of how well an employee relates to other people or institutions; and sacrifice, what an employee would be willing to give up by leaving his or her job. These components are not always independent of one another; rather, they greatly influence each other by events an employee can experience. Job embeddedness helps expand upon the commitment and satisfaction literature by following employees across career stages, and continuing to focus on why employees stay in their jobs instead of leaving. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

- H1: The effect of job commitment differs for different levels of job embeddedness, such that a strong negative relationship exists between
job commitment and turnover intentions for those who have lower levels of embeddedness versus higher levels of embeddedness (Appendix B).

Organizational Embeddedness

Organizational embeddedness is defined as the forces which bind individuals to their current employer (Ng & Feldman, 2007). As with job embeddedness and occupational embeddedness, organizational embeddedness focuses on the forces which keep people within their organizations (Mitchell et al., 2001). These forces can be framed internally from the organization itself as well as externally to the organization. Organizational embeddedness can also be augmented through job embeddedness because individuals can become enmeshed through this process (Ng & Feldman, 2007). While these two forms of embeddedness can be similar in nature, organizational embeddedness allows individuals the ability to move around and break or create links within organizations. Although Mitchell et al. originally thought of organizational embeddedness as an equally weighted evaluation, the process may be more complex than originally thought. Crossley, Bennett, Jex, and Burnfield (2007) examined the organizational embeddedness process framed through complex perceptions. In their research, the authors were more interested in reactions to organizational embeddedness than how employees become embedded. Crossley et al. found that these perceptions were influential in eliciting both
embedded behaviors as well as job-searching and alternative behaviors. Ng and Feldman (2012) used this approach in their research in order to better assess employees’ perceptions of how they became embedded within their organizations. The authors found that increases in perceptions of embeddedness can be highly influential on employees’ organizational behaviors. Using this approach allows researchers to examine a more comprehensive evaluation of embeddedness based on specific factors rather than one overall factor. As with both job and occupational/career embeddedness, organizational embeddedness is also comprised of links, fit, and sacrifice.

**Links**

Links are the ties an individual has with other people and activities. These are things such as relationships and task interdependence. Links can be made both within an organization and within the larger community. There are multiple factors involved in the linking process, both internally and externally, and individuals may value links differently from each other (Ng & Feldman, 2012). In both instances, a sense of attachment may be established through the people and activities employees may become involved with.

**Fit**

Fit is the extent to which an individual’s abilities match an organization’s requirements and to which an individual’s interests match an organization’s rewards. Fit can be framed both internally and externally to an individual’s organization. In this assessment an individual will assess his or her alignment
with what an organization represents in its transactions. As Crossley et al. (2007) revealed it is important to note that an employee's assessment of fit may be based on factors which are weighed more heavily than others. This assessment also applies to the individual's surrounding community. If an employee considers himself or herself a better fit within the community, then that employee is more likely to become embedded within the organization.

Sacrifice

Sacrifice is the totality of losses by leaving an organization. Sacrifice may be framed both internally and externally to an individual's organization. This involves some degree of risk assessment by the individual. It is important to note, that while high levels of organizational embeddedness may be a sign of an advancing career, it may mean that career opportunities are not being sought and/or passed up by individuals. In addition, sacrifices, in particular, may not be weighed equally with each other (Crossley et al., 2007). For example, if fit is perceived as low and links as few, but if housing, education, or medical care is difficult to establish in relocating, an individual may not leave an organization because the sacrifice would be too high.

Organizational Embeddedness and Commitment Types. Organizational embeddedness is also distinct from affective, normative, and continuance commitment (Crossley et al., 2007; Mitchell et al., 2001). As with occupational/career embeddedness, organizational embeddedness is similar to these work-role attachments through the commitment aspects, but it differs in the
way outcomes are perceived. In each of these instances, organizational embeddedness considers factors outside of the organization which the other commitment types may not fully consider. Organizational embeddedness and affective commitment differ because organizational embeddedness does not have to be affective in nature, it is not limited on identification with an organization or alignment with its goals, and it does not affect an employee’s effort to be a part of the organization. Organizational embeddedness and normative commitment differ because organizational embeddedness is more descriptive in nature and does not relate to the morality of being attached to an organization. Organizational embeddedness and continuance commitment differ because organizational embeddedness includes affective and cognitive evaluations and does not base attachment on sacrifices in an organization.

Whereas the different types of commitment do have things in common with organizational embeddedness, they are distinct constructs with different scopes. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

- H2: The effect of organizational commitment differs for different levels of organizational embeddedness, such that a strong negative relationship exists between organizational commitment and turnover intentions for those who have lower levels of embeddedness versus higher levels of embeddedness (Appendix C).
Summary

The purpose of this exploratory study is to investigate the effects of job and organizational embeddedness on the relationship between employee commitment and turnover intentions. This moderating relationship will be viewed at two levels within the commitment-turnover relationship: job and organizational. It is expected that the relationship between commitment and turnover intentions will be strongly negative in lower-embedded individuals versus highly-embedded individuals. This study will help continue to expand the embeddedness literature as well as further link the commitment and turnover literatures to embeddedness. As individuals and organizations begin to better understand the implications of embeddedness of employee behavior, commitment levels can increase and turnover intentions can decrease leading to an increase in employees remaining within their organizations, occupations, and jobs.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

Participants

Responses from 154 employed individuals who were over the age of 18 and had at least one year of work experience were collected. Specifically, 74 men and 80 women chose to participate in this study. The mean age of participants was 46 years, with a mean age of men being 47 years and a mean age of women being 45 years. The majority of participants were of Caucasian ethnicity (117), followed by African American and Asian (12 in each group), Hispanic (8), mixed race (3), and Native American (2). The majority of participants were married (86), followed by single (38), divorced (18), living together (7), separated (3), and widowed (2). The majority of participants possessed a bachelor’s degree (53), followed by some college (31), advanced degree (27), high school (19), associate’s degree (16), non-college training (7), and non-completion of high school (1). In regard to participants’ work characteristics, the mean hours worked per week were 38.60 hours, participants spent an average of 14.02 years within their occupation, participants spent an average of 10.07 years within their organization, and participants spent an average of 9.19 years in their current job.
Materials

Five psychological scales were adapted from published studies in the commitment, turnover, and embeddedness literatures. There was also a demographic section included in order to capture information from participants. In addition, two psychological scales adapted from published studies in the perceived organizational support and organizational citizenship behavior literatures were included in order to provide data for future research and expansion of the current topic. These self-report measures were administered in one web-based survey using Qualtrics survey software. These measures are provided in Appendix I.

Demographics

Participants were asked to report basic demographic information in order to classify and organize responses by age and job, career/occupational, or organizational tenure. There were 11 questions in this part of our questionnaire. No identifying information (i.e., names, ID numbers) was collected during this assessment. Participants were also asked to report items including their occupations, the length of time they have been in a particular job, career/occupation, or organization, and whether they work part- or full-time (see Appendix B).

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was assessed using a modified version of Meyer and Allen’s (1997) 19-item, 3-dimensional scale measuring affective,
continuance, and normative commitment. Sample items include, “I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own” (affective scale), “This organization deserves my loyalty” (normative scale), and “I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization” (continuance scale). Responses will be collected via a Likert-type scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. Responses to all items will be averaged to form an organizational commitment score. Higher scores will correspond with more commitment. The internal consistency of the scale used in Myer and Allen’s original study was good (Coefficient alpha = .85) (Meyer & Allen, 1997). In the present study, the coefficient alpha was .83 which is similar to the original scale.

Job Commitment

Job commitment was assessed using a modified version of Meyer and Allen’s (1997) 19-item, 3-dimensional scale measuring affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Taking the suggestion of Millward et al. (1998), substituting the word “job” for “organizational” in this scale yielded similar results. Sample items include, “I really feel as if this job’s problems are my own” (affective scale), “This job within my organization deserves my loyalty” (normative scale), and “I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this job” (continuance scale). Responses were collected via a Likert-type scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. Responses to all items were averaged to form a job commitment score. Higher scores corresponded with more commitment. The internal consistency of this scale used in Myer and Allen’s
original study was good (Coefficient alpha = .85) (Meyer & Allen, 1997). In the present study, the coefficient alpha was .86 which is similar to the original scale.

**Turnover Intentions**

Turnover intentions were assessed using a modified version of Jaros’ (1997) measure. This measure contains 3-items. An example question asks, “How likely are you to search for a position with another employer?” to which participants respond using a 5-point, Likert-type scale, where 1 = Not at all likely and 5 = Very likely. Responses to all items were averaged to form a turnover intention score. Higher scores corresponded to higher turnover intentions. The internal consistency of this scale used in Jaros’ original study was good (Coefficient alpha = .82) (Jaros, 1997). In the present study, the coefficient alpha was .83 which is slightly higher than the original scale.

**Job Embeddedness**

Job embeddedness was assessed using an adapted scale developed by Adams et al. (2010) and included items which assessed both internal and external job embeddedness. This scale included 13 items which asked participants to think about their jobs while responding to such statements as, “I have many strong ties to my job,” and, “I would give up a lot if I left my community.” Responses were collected via a Likert-type scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree. Responses to all items were averaged to form an overall job embeddedness score, with higher scores corresponding to greater levels of job embeddedness. The internal consistency of the scale used
in the original Adams et al. study was good (Coefficient alpha = .78) (Adams et al., 2010). In the present study, the coefficient alpha was .90 which is higher than the original scale.

**Organizational Embeddedness**

Organizational embeddedness was assessed using a modified scale developed by Adams et al. (2010) and included items which assessed both internal and external organizational embeddedness. This scale included 13 items which asked participants to picture their organization while responding to such statements as, “I feel like I have a good fit with my organization,” and, “I would give up a lot if I left my community.” Responses will be collected via a Likert-type scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree. Responses to all items were averaged to form an overall organizational embeddedness score, with higher scores corresponding to higher levels of organizational embeddedness.

The internal consistency of this scale used in the original Adams et al. study was good (Coefficient alpha = .78) (Adams et al., 2010). In the present study, the coefficient alpha was .90 which is higher than the original scale.

**Perceived Organizational Support**

Perceived organizational support was assessed using a modified scale developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986). This scale included 8 items which asked participants to evaluate the level of organizational support they experience while responding to such statements as, “The organization values my contribution to its well-being,” and, “The organization
takes pride in my accomplishments at work." Responses were collected via a Likert-type scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. The internal consistency of this scale used in the original Eisenberger et al. study was good (Coefficient alpha = .94) (Eisenberger et al., 1986). In the present study, the coefficient alpha was .66 which is lower than the original scale.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior was assessed using a modified scale developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998). This scale included 7 items which asked participants to evaluate their work behaviors while responding to such statements as, “I volunteer to do things for my coworkers,” and, “I involve myself in work-related activities for the benefit of the organization.” Responses will be collected via a Likert-type scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. The internal consistency of this scale used in Van Dyne and LePine’s original study was good (Coefficient alpha = .85) (Van Dyne and LePine, 1998). In the present study, the coefficient alpha was .91 which is higher than the original scale.

Procedure

Participants were solicited by email, social media, and direct invites to complete an online survey containing the measures previously mentioned (Appendix J). Specifically, participants were emailed the text of Appendix J along
with the survey link, the invite text was posted on social media networks along with the survey link, and, ultimately, participants who were informed of the study by word of mouth were sent an email. Participants were recruited from professional organizations in the Southern California region. If participants met the minimum requirements, they were invited to complete the survey through Qualtrics. Participants were also asked to complete a short demographics section for classification purposes only. No personal identifying information was retained and all responses were kept confidential.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Assumptions

Before data analysis began, SPSS was used in order to assess assumptions on all major variables in the dataset. Upon inspection of the data using SPSS descriptives command, no missing values were found. There were no univariate outliers found in any of the variables (with z-scores above 3.3). Using Mahalanobis distance \((p < .001)\), no multivariate outliers were found. Homoscedasticity, linearity, and skewness were assessed through scatterplots of the major variables. Using Mahalanobis distance and collinearity diagnostics, no evidence of multicollinearity was found. Therefore, there was no need to adjust the raw data in any way. The bivariate inter-correlation matrix is reported in Table 1 (Appendix D).

Hypothesis 1

For hypothesis 1, it was predicted that the effect of job commitment would differ for different levels of job embeddedness, such that a strong negative relationship would exist between job commitment and turnover intentions for those who have lower levels of embeddedness versus higher levels of
Using a moderated regression analysis, job commitment and job embeddedness were entered into step 1 of the model. This step accounted for 6.8% of the variance in turnover intentions ($R^2 = .068, F [2, 151] = 5.475, p < .05$). Job commitment had a positive (but non-significant) relationship to turnover intentions ($\beta = .076, p > .05$) and job embeddedness had a negative relationship to turnover intentions ($\beta = -.303, p < .05$). As a result, lower levels of job embeddedness were associated with higher turnover.

The addition of an interaction term in step 2 between job commitment and job embeddedness accounted for a 6.7% increase in explained variance, with step 2 accounting for 13.5% of the overall variance ($R^2 = .135, \Delta R^2 = .067, F [1, 150] = 11.609, p < .05$). Job commitment had a positive (but non-significant) relationship to turnover intentions ($\beta = .078, p > .05$), job embeddedness had a negative relationship to turnover intentions ($\beta = -.310, p < .05$), and the interaction between job commitment and job embeddedness had a positive relationship to turnover intentions ($\beta = .259, p < .05$). As a result, the relationship between job commitment and turnover intentions was moderated by the level of job embeddedness experienced, but not in the manner expected. This interaction was associated with a significant increase in the proportion of variance explained in turnover intentions. The regression model results are reported in Table 2 (Appendix E).

Examination of the interaction plot showed a negative association between job commitment and turnover intentions for employees with low levels of
job embeddedness. Specifically, as job commitment increased, turnover intentions decreased for employees with low levels of job embeddedness. In contrast, the interaction plot showed a positive association between job commitment and turnover intentions for employees with high levels of job embeddedness. Specifically, as job commitment increased, turnover intentions increased for employees with high levels of job embeddedness. From these results, it appears that the level of job embeddedness moderates the likelihood of turnover intentions based on job commitment, however, the trend observed was not the trend predicted. Overall, these results did not fully support hypothesis 1 (Appendix F).

Hypothesis 2

For hypothesis 2, it was predicted that the effect of organizational commitment differs for different levels of organizational embeddedness, such that a strong negative relationship exists between organizational commitment and turnover intentions for those who have lower levels of embeddedness versus higher levels of embeddedness. Using a moderated regression analysis, organizational commitment and organizational embeddedness were entered into step 1 of the model. This step accounted for 6.3% of the variance in turnover intentions ($R^2 = .063$, $F[2, 151] = 5.105$, $p < .05$). Organizational commitment had a positive (but non-significant) relationship to turnover intentions ($\beta = .068$, $p$
and organizational embeddedness had a negative relationship to turnover intentions ($\beta = -.286, p < .05$). Thus, lower levels of organizational embeddedness could potentially lead to higher turnover.

The addition of an interaction in step 2 between organizational commitment and organizational embeddedness accounted for a 9.9% increase in explained variance, with step 2 accounting for 16.3% of the overall variance ($R^2 = .163, \Delta R^2 = .099, F[1, 150] = 17.807, p < .05$). Organizational commitment was not related to turnover intentions ($\beta = .002, p > .05$), organizational embeddedness had a negative relationship to turnover intentions ($\beta = -.282, p < .05$), and the interaction between organizational commitment and organizational embeddedness had a positive relationship to turnover intentions ($\beta = .322, p < .05$). The relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions was moderated by the level of organizational embeddedness experienced, but, again, not in the manner expected. The interaction lead to a significant increase in the proportion of variance explained in turnover intentions. The regression model results are reported in Table 3 (Appendix G).

Examination of the interaction plot showed a negative association between job commitment and turnover intentions for employees with low levels of organizational embeddedness. Specifically, as organizational commitment increased, turnover intentions decreased for employees with low levels of organizational embeddedness. In contrast, the interaction plot showed a positive association between organizational commitment and turnover intentions for
employees with high levels of organizational embeddedness. Specifically, as organizational commitment increased, turnover intentions increased for employees with high levels of organizational embeddedness. From these results, it appears that the level of organizational embeddedness moderates the likelihood of turnover intentions based on organizational commitment, however, again, the trend predicted was not the trend observed. Overall, these results do not fully support hypothesis 2.

Control Variables

In order to verify the unexpected results of the interactions in both hypotheses, perceived organizational support (POS) and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) were used as control variables. For each hypothesis, POS and OCB were entered into the first step of the models separately, then they were entered simultaneously in an attempt to capture additional variance in turnover intentions. The $R^2$ values for POS on both hypotheses were .050 and the $R^2$ values for OCB on both hypotheses were .004. When both POS and OCB were entered into the first step simultaneously, the $R^2$ values were .078. In comparison to the original models, there was not a significant increase in variance explained in the first steps of the control variable models. The coefficients in the control variable models mirrored the same relationships to turnover intentions as found in the original hypotheses’ models.
The interaction terms in the control variable models still had positive trends toward turnover intentions indicating that the control variables did not account for additional variance unaccounted for by the original models.
The decision to remain within one's job or organization is influenced by a number of factors (Adams et al., 2010; Mitchell et al., 2001). In some instances, physical constraints, such as location or availability, may influence one's employment decision. In other cases, non-physical constraints, such as feelings of belonging or support, may influence one's decision. Commitment is an important factor to consider when observing turnover intentions of employees, although commitment alone may not provide the bigger picture of the commitment-turnover relationship (Adams et al., 2010; Mitchell et al., 2001; Ng & Feldman, 2011). Embeddedness provides a more in-depth look at all of the forces which keep people from leaving their jobs or organizations. Unlike commitment alone, embeddedness considers links, fit, and sacrifice which provide greater insight into the commitment-turnover relationship (Halfer, 2010). The addition of these three components adds greater detail and dimension to the processes involved as one becomes embedded into a job or organization (Ng & Feldman, 2012). Embeddedness further helps explain unaccounted variance in the commitment-turnover relationship by considering both on-the-job and off-the-job factors.
The overall purpose of this study was to explore the potential moderating effect of embeddedness on the commitment-turnover relationship. Although this study is not unique in its presentation of the embeddedness construct, it allows for further investigation into why people remain in certain employment situations and why people may choose to leave certain employment situations. Specifically, this study explored how embeddedness either strengthens or weakens the relationship between job and organizational commitment with turnover intentions.

This study provided two predictions on the moderation of the commitment-turnover relationship. The first prediction stated that the effect of job commitment will differ for different levels of job embeddedness, such that a strong negative relationship will exist between job commitment and turnover intentions for those who have lower levels of embeddedness versus higher levels of embeddedness. As individuals experience embeddedness at lower levels, they will be more likely to turnover from their current jobs compared to individuals who exhibit greater levels of embeddedness (Adams et al., 2010; Mitchell et al., 2001). Those with lower levels of embeddedness will be more likely to turnover even when higher levels of job commitment may be exhibited. This is an example of the influence embeddedness exhibits on those who would be considered committed to their jobs.

The second prediction stated that the effect of organizational commitment will differ for different levels of organizational embeddedness, such that a strong negative relationship will exist between organizational commitment and turnover
intentions for those who have lower levels of embeddedness versus higher levels of embeddedness. As individuals experience embeddedness at lower levels, they will be more likely to turnover from their current organizations compared to individuals who exhibit greater levels of embeddedness. Those with lower levels of embeddedness will be more likely to turnover even when higher levels of organizational commitment may be exhibited (Adams et al., 2010; Mitchell et al., 2001). As with the first prediction, embeddedness strongly influences those who would be considered highly committed to their organizations.

The data collected for this study partially supports both predictions except in how embeddedness moderated these relationships. Upon analyzing the results, it was found that when the embeddedness interaction was added into the statistical model, embeddedness moderated the turnover-commitment relationships differently than what was predicted. For the first prediction, job commitment had a positive trend and job embeddedness had a negative trend in relation to turnover intentions. The positive trend found with job commitment was non-significant in predicting turnover intentions in this study. In contrast, the negative trend found with job embeddedness significantly predicted turnover intentions. Specifically, this negative trend equated to lower job embeddedness levels predicting greater turnover intentions, which is consistent with the literature outlined in the introduction of this study (Mitchell et al., 2001; Adams et al., 2010). Upon analyzing the job embeddedness interaction, job turnover intentions increased as job commitment decreased for those who were less embedded in
their jobs. However, job turnover intentions increased as job commitment increased for those who were more highly embedded in their jobs.

For the second prediction, organizational commitment had a positive trend and organizational embeddedness had a negative trend in relation to turnover intentions. As with the first prediction, the positive trend found with organizational commitment was non-significant in predicting turnover intentions in this study. Again, consistent with the first prediction, the negative trend found with job embeddedness significantly predicted turnover intentions. As with the first prediction, this trend is consistent with the literature. Upon analyzing the organizational embeddedness interaction, organizational turnover intentions increased as organizational commitment decreased for those who were less embedded in their organizations. However, as with the first prediction, organizational turnover intentions increased as organizational commitment increased for those who were more highly embedded in their organizations.

To test a possible suppression effect on the interaction results, organizational commitment and job commitment were separated into three subscales: normative, affective, and continuance commitment. Upon analyzing the bivariate correlation matrix using the new subscales, similar results were found as with the original data. Additional regression analyses on the subscales yielded similar results as with the original combined scales. Further, plotting the interactions between commitment and turnover produced the same reflected slopes as with the original data. After isolating the constructs further and
controlling for combined effects, it appears that there may be a suppression effect which is reflecting the slope of the interaction opposite of what is predicted. Possible reasons for this effect will be addressed as limitations later in this section.

Although the results from both predictions were not as expected, there may still be some significant points to note and possible areas to further explore. One reason for these unexpected results may be due to the nature of the embeddedness construct itself. Embeddedness may overlap with existing work-role attachment relationships (Mitchell et al., 2001). Being that embeddedness is very similar to commitment, there could be some overlap in the on-the-job components which embeddedness measures. Even though embeddedness is providing another dimension by measuring off-the-job components, there may not be enough distinction in this study among the on-the-job components of embeddedness and commitment. Additionally, embeddedness may continue to overlap with person-fit theories (Adams et al., 2010). Even though embeddedness has been distinguished as a construct which looks at additional variance which traditional person-fit theories do not capture, this study may not have truly separated the embeddedness construct. The presentation of the questions to respondents may have triggered responses more geared toward traditional fit theories. Taking these instances into account, the similarities of work-role attachment and embeddedness may help explain why the results were found to be opposite as predicted.
Another reason for the possibility of unexpected results could be due to the differences in how turnover is viewed as a function of career type or level (Mitchell et al., 2001). There is a possibility that certain career types may experience turnover more frequently, therefore, viewing turnover as a routine event. These career types may be lower-level in nature and may be more prone to turnover (i.e., seasonal, temporary, or part-time work). For some careers, relocation may be easier compared to others. In this case, again, turnover may be experienced regularly due to the nature of employment (i.e., criminal justice, retail). This turnover could also depend on the person as well. If someone seeks variety in his or her employment, it may be not be uncommon for him or her to change positions or organizations frequently.

An additional reason for this study’s outcome may lie in the definition of the turnover construct. Turnover intentions do not always provide the same level of detail as turnover behaviors (Clinton et al., 2012). In many cases, turnover intentions can lead to predictions of actual turnover behaviors, but the two measurements are different in nature. In reality, it can be easier for an employee to talk about leaving an organization or a job rather than actually leave. In this study, turnover intentions, rather than behaviors, were utilized and the results may have been affected as a result. Respondents may have felt more comfortable thinking about leaving an organization or job rather than actually leaving. In this study, it would have been more difficult to ask respondents to recall actual turnover since this study was observing present employment.
Theoretical Implications

This study continues to expand the existing job and organizational embeddedness framework in relation to commitment and turnover intentions. Embeddedness reveals additional components in the commitment-turnover relationship (Adams et al., 2010; Halfer, 2010; Mitchell et al., 2001; Ng & Feldman, 2011; Ng & Feldman, 2012). Through links, fit, and sacrifice, embeddedness defines additional areas related to organizational and job commitment which helps explain why people choose to remain within their organizations or jobs. This study resembled the 2007 study which Crossley et al. performed analyzing embeddedness as an overall measure rather than observing internal and external influences separately. Even at this higher-level analysis, embeddedness influenced employees’ views about commitment and turnover. Although the results of this study were not as predicted, embeddedness was able to account for additional variance above and beyond commitment and turnover intentions.

The current study also contributes to the relationship among embeddedness and commitment types (Crossley et al., 2007; Mitchell et al., 2001). Although commitment types and embeddedness are distinct, they can still function in conjunction with one another. While fit, links, and sacrifice may look at the overall relationship one has with his or her job or organization, commitment type may still influence a decision to leave or stay. However, as Crossley et al. (2007) and Mitchell et al. (2001) found, embeddedness and commitment type will
most likely function independently of each other. This is the importance that embeddedness adds to the commitment-turnover relationship – the ability to remain within a particular job or organization even when commitment level is low. Embeddedness is viewed within a wider scope compared to commitment alone.

Practical Implications

Exploring the practical influence embeddedness has on the commitment-turnover relationship is important for individuals and organizations alike to understand. Embeddedness is an important construct to understand because it assists in directing organizations and managers to better retain employees based on a variety of factors other than commitment alone (Mitchell et al., 2001). A better understanding of embeddedness will allow a greater understanding of why employees may choose to leave his or her job or organization when he or she may appear to be strongly committed. Shocks or other specific events may cause an employee to evaluate his or her fit, links, and sacrifice and choose to leave even if they are strongly committed. If organizations and managers are better informed of these situations, they may be better prepared to deal with the consequences of turnover.

A better understanding of embeddedness will allow organizations the opportunity to offer employees additional programs and incentives allowing for greater retention (Adams et al., 2010). A simple example of an incentive would
be a relocation incentive. If organizations are able to offer a relocation incentive, then they may be better able to attract qualified employees. This incentive may help employees consider the sacrifice they may need to make if they have to relocate. Another incentive could include organization-sponsored events. These could include activities such as theme park nights, discounted tickets to sporting events, or any gathering that would encourage employees to feel a valued part of the organization. This could help employees feel as if they fit in well and may promote an increased retention rate. An example of a beneficial program could be employee mentoring. Such a program has the potential for employees to create multiple links to coworkers and professional contacts alike. Based on these examples of programs and incentives, employees may be better able to evaluate their links, fit, and sacrifice within an organization, and ultimately make the decision to remain with the organization for an extended period of time.

Limitations

In examining the results of this study, it is evident that there may be some limitations present. Although there appears to be a suppression effect present in the interaction, there may be other limitations which influenced the observed results. One limitation may lie in the participant requirements (Mitchell et al., 2001). This study did not have any strict requirements in order to participate. Respondents needed only to be 18 years or older, be employed for at least one
year, and work 30 hours per week or more. These lax requirements could have played a part in the results that were obtained. If more specific requirements were proposed, such as specific job requirements or age requirements (later career versus early career), then the findings may have been more in line with the original predictions of this study. For example, those who are in later career stages may feel more embedded within their jobs and organizations versus those who are just starting out their careers.

Another limitation may be due to the way embeddedness was defined. In this study, embeddedness was not separated into internal and external factors; rather, embeddedness was analyzed as a whole. However, a global measure of embeddedness can still yield meaningful results (Crossley et al., 2007). In this exploratory study, it seemed appropriate to analyze embeddedness overall and the relationships between commitment and turnover. Even though an overall measure can be meaningful, separating embeddedness into internal and external factors may have yielded a greater chance at obtaining results that mirrored the original predictions. An employee may feel embedded within his or her job but may not be fully embedded within the community. Without separating embeddedness, there is no way to truly distinguish a person’s feelings when embeddedness is high internally but not externally, or vice versa.

Other limitations may exist in the sample surveyed in this study. Using a traditional power analysis revealed that the sample size for this study was adequate in order to obtain statistically significant results. Even though there was
a sufficient number of participants in this study, the group overall may not have been truly representative to the constructs being explored (Clinton et al., 2012). Upon examining the sample in this study, it appeared that a majority of the sample had significant work experience, but there may have been additional factors influencing the results. There may be differences present in the sample based on career level. In this study, a majority of the sample reflected technical or clerical careers. In comparison, the smaller portion of the sample reported professional-level careers. The individuals with the clerical-/technical-level careers may not be as highly embedded compared to those within the professional-level careers (Mitchell et al., 2001). Those in earlier career stages may be more prone to turnover because they may be looking for opportunities or higher salaries versus those in later careers who may value stability more highly (Ng & Feldman, 2007). Here, the majority responses may have shaped the results opposite of what was predicted.

Future Research

Embeddedness may benefit from future research in a number of areas. One example includes examining potential relationships with other work-role attachment theories. In this study, perceived organizational support (POS) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) questionnaires were administered, and while both POS and OCB were analyzed as control variables in order to explain
the unexpected interaction results, there was no need for further analysis at this level of study. The results of the control variables did not produce additional variance explained above and beyond that of the original analyses performed. Due to the possible suppression effect present, the existing factors may need to be reexamined before adding additional factors into the analysis. Once a suppression effect can be ruled out, then additional analyses may be appropriate. However, POS and OCB may still reveal important relationships with embeddedness and turnover intentions. The affective nature of POS can strongly influence employees in remaining within a job or organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Focusing on the influence POS has on the commitment-turnover relationship could reveal additional support for embedding an individual within a job or organization (Dawley, Houghton, & Bucklew, 2010; Leupold, Ellis, & Valle, 2013). Similarly, OCB can elicit positive influence on the decision to stay because of the voluntary and above-the-ordinary nature of the behaviors themselves (Lev & Koslowski, 2012). The influence of OCB on turnover appears to be strong since these behaviors are elicited intrinsically with little to no enforcement from an organization (Organ, 1997).

Another area which embeddedness as a whole may further benefit from is looking at occupational embeddedness. Occupational embeddedness, like the two forms of embeddedness used in this study, is defined as all of the conditions which fasten someone to his or her occupation (Ng & Feldman, 2007). In this exploratory study, it was determined that job and occupational embeddedness
would be viewed by participants as too similar of constructs, thereby possibly confounding any results. However, Ng and Feldman postulate that it can be possible for an individual to leave his or her current job, but remain within his or her occupation. In addition, they continue hypothesizing that occupational embeddedness may be greatly influenced by organizational embeddedness. Using this logic, it is reasonable that an individual may be influenced to leave a job by how great of a bond he or she feels toward his or her organization, but they may still remain within an occupation. Since occupational embeddedness is so closely related to job and organizational embeddedness, it would be important to include this construct in a more targeted and specific study versus an exploratory study such as the current study.

An additional focus which can advance embeddedness would be to observe any phenomena among career stages. Ng and Feldman (2007) posit that embeddedness may be viewed differently depending on which career stage an individual is in. Links, fit, and sacrifice may be weighted differently if an employee is in a later career stage (retirement or stability) versus an earlier career stage (money or advancement). This added influence of career stages on someone’s decision to stay or leave is important to consider in conjunction with links, fit, and sacrifice. Based on which career stage someone may be in may determine the attitude he or she may have in the commitment-turnover relationship.
Conclusion

This study investigated the moderating effect of embeddedness on the commitment and turnover intentions relationship. Job and organizational embeddedness were examined as key variables that link the commitment and turnover literatures together. Job embeddedness moderated the relationship between job commitment and job turnover intentions, while organizational embeddedness moderated the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational turnover intentions. However, this study found that this moderated relationship was different than originally predicted. Embeddedness is an important factor to consider in the commitment-turnover relationship because it can better help employees and managers alike in realizing why someone may choose to remain within his or her job or organization above and beyond commitment alone. Since this study was exploratory in nature, there are a number of areas which can be further researched in order to fully understand the role which embeddedness plays in keeping employees within their jobs and organizations. Compared to commitment alone, job and organizational embeddedness is a much larger net in which employees become entangled and turnover less frequently.
APPENDIX A

OVERALL EMBEDDEDNESS MODEL
Figure 1. The moderating effects of embeddedness on commitment and turnover intentions.
APPENDIX B

PROPOSED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
JOB COMMITMENT AND TURNOVER
Figure 2. The proposed relationship between job commitment and job turnover intentions based on different levels of job embeddedness.
APPENDIX C
PROPOSED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT
AND TURNOVER
Figure 3. The proposed relationship between organizational commitment and organizational turnover intentions based on different levels of organizational embeddedness.
APPENDIX D

BIVARIATE INTER-CORRELATION MATRIX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age (in years)</td>
<td>46.06</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hours Worked Per Week</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Years in Occupation</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Years in Organization</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Years at Current Job</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job Commitment</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Job Embeddedness</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Organizational Embeddedness</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .001
APPENDIX E

JOB EMBEDDEDNESS REGRESSION TABLE
Table 2
*Multiple Regression Results for Predicting Job Turnover Intentions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Turnover Intentions (reference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Commitment</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Embeddedness</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Interaction Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

JOB EMBEDDEDNESS INTERACTION
Figure 4. The interaction between job commitment and job turnover intentions based on different levels of job embeddedness.
APPENDIX G

ORGANIZATIONAL EMBEDDEDNESS

REGRESSION TABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions (reference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Embeddedness</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Interaction Term</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

ORGANIZATIONAL EMBEDDEDNESS

INTERACTION
Figure 5. The interaction between organizational commitment and organizational turnover intentions based on different levels of organizational embeddedness.
APPENDIX I

SCALES
Demographic Information

The following demographic items are being asked only in order to summarize the group level data. They will NOT be used to identify any individual respondent.

1. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

2. What is your age in years? ______

3. What is your ethnic origin?
   - Native American (including Alaskan Native)
   - Asian (including Oriental, Pacific Islander and Filipino)
   - African American
   - Hispanic
   - Caucasian
   - Other race
   - Mixed race

4. What is your marital status?
   - Married
   - Living together
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Widowed
   - Single, never married
5. How many people live in your household? ________

6. What is your education level?
   - Less than 9th grade
   - Grade 9–11
   - Completed high school
   - Additional non-college training (e.g., technical or trade school)
   - Some college
   - Completed associates (2-year) college degree
   - Completed bachelors (4-year) college degree
   - Completed an advanced degree (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)

7. Typically, how many hours do you work per week? _______________

8. How many years have you worked within your current occupation? - __________

9. How many years have you worked within your current organization? ________

10. How many years have you worked at your current job? __________

11. What is your current job or occupation? ________________________________
Organizational Commitment
(Meyer & Allen, 1997)

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affective Organizational Commitment**

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.
3. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization.
4. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization.
5. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.

**Normative Organizational Commitment**

7. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.
8. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.
9. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
10. This organization deserves my loyalty.
11. I would not leave my organization right now because I have sense of obligation to the people in it.
12. I owe a great deal to this organization.

**Continuance Organizational Commitment**

13. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now even if I wanted to.
14. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now because of my responsibilities with my family.
15. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
16. Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
17. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
18. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
19. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits that I have here.
Job Commitment
(adapted from Meyer & Allen, 1997)

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affective Job Commitment
1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this job.
2. I really feel as if this job’s problems are my own.
3. I do not feel like “part of the family” within my job.
4. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this job.
5. This job has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my job.

Normative Job Commitment
7. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current job.
8. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my job now.
9. I would feel guilty if I left my job now.
10. This job within my organization deserves my loyalty.
11. I would not leave my job right now because I have sense of obligation to the people in it.
12. I owe a great deal to this job.

Continuance Job Commitment
13. It would be very hard for me to leave my job right now even if I wanted to.
14. It would be very hard for me to leave my job right now because of my responsibilities with my family.
15. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my job now.
16. Right now staying with my job is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
17. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this job.
18. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this job would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
19. One of the major reasons I continue to work within this job is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another job may not match the overall benefits that I have here.
Turnover Intentions  
(Jaros, 1997)

Considering your current organization, please use the scales below to rate your opinion about each statement. For each statement, indicate your answer by clicking on the appropriate circle.

1. How often do you think about leaving your organization?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

2. How likely are you to search for a position with another employer in the next year?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Definitely  Probably  Not  Probably  Definitely
   Will Not  Will Not  Sure  Will  Will

3. How likely are you to leave the organization in the next year?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Definitely  Probably  Not  Probably  Definitely
   Will Not  Will Not  Sure  Will  Will
Job Embeddedness
(adapted from Adams, Webster, & Buyarski, 2010)

Considering your current job, please use the scales below to rate your opinion about each statement. For each statement, indicate your answer by clicking on the appropriate circle.

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I have many strong ties to my job.
2. I can reach my professional goals working in my current job.
3. I would give up a lot if I changed jobs.
4. My job allows me to utilize my skills and talents.
5. Leaving this job would require substantial personal sacrifice.
6. I feel like I have a good fit with my job.
7. I have family members who live in my community.
8. I feel like I have a good fit with my community.
9. The people in my community are similar to me.
10. I fit with the culture of my community.
11. My values and those of my neighbors are similar.
12. I would give up a lot if I left my community.
13. I have too many hobbies to leave the community where I reside.
Organizational Embeddedness  
(Adams, Webster, & Buyarski, 2010)

Considering your current organization, please use the scales below to rate your opinion about each statement. For each statement, indicate your answer by clicking on the appropriate circle.

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly No Strongly
Disagree Opinion Agree

1. I have many strong ties to my organization.
2. I can reach my professional goals working in my current organization.
3. I would give up a lot if I changed organizations.
4. My organization allows me to utilize my skills and talents.
5. Leaving this organization would require substantial personal sacrifice.
6. I feel like I have a good fit with my organization.
7. I have family members who live in my community.
8. I feel like I have a good fit with my community.
9. The people in my community are similar to me.
10. I fit with the culture of my community.
11. My values and those of my neighbors are similar.
12. I would give up a lot if I left my community.
13. I have too many hobbies to leave the community where I reside.
Perceived Organizational Support
(Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986)

Considering your current organization, please use the scales below to rate your opinion about each statement. For each statement, indicate your answer by clicking on the appropriate circle.

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The organization values my contribution to its well-being.
2. The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.
3. The organization would ignore any complaint from me.
4. The organization really cares about my well-being.
5. Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice.
6. The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.
7. The organization shows very little concern for me.
8. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.
Organizational Citizenship Behavior
(Van Dyne & LePine, 1998)

Considering your role within your current organization, please use the scales below to rate your opinion about each statement. For each statement, indicate your answer by clicking on the appropriate circle.

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I volunteer to do things for my coworkers.
2. I help orient new employees in my organization.
3. I attend functions that help my coworkers and organization.
4. I assist my coworkers with their work for the benefit of the organization.
5. I involve myself in work-related activities for the benefit of the organization.
6. I help my coworkers learn about the work needing to be completed.
7. I help my coworkers complete their work responsibilities.
APPENDIX J

PARTICIPATION LETTER
Hello,

My name is Michael Sisikin and I am pursuing a Master's Degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino. I am writing to invite you to participate in an online survey designed to understand embeddedness. Specifically, I am investigating how individuals’ attitudes about their jobs may be related to desires to stay or leave their current employment or career.

I would appreciate a few minutes of your time to complete my survey which will help me gather the data required to complete my thesis. The survey will take about 25-30 minutes to complete. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and used only for the purposes of research for this project. No personally identifying information will be asked, thus your responses to this survey will also be anonymous. Please know that there are no right or wrong answers and your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to withdraw your participation at any time during the study, or refuse to answer any specific question.
Simply click on the link below, or cut and paste the entire URL into your browser to access the survey: __________

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or would prefer to receive a summary of the results. I can be reached via email: sisikinm@coyote.csusb.edu.

Also, if you know of anyone else who may be willing to complete my survey please forward this email to them.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely,

Michael Sisikin
APPENDIX K

INFORMED CONSENT
Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in a study designed to investigate how individuals’ attitudes about their jobs may be related to desires to stay or leave their current employment or career. This study is being conducted by Michael Siskin under the supervision of Dr. Kenneth Shultz for a graduate thesis requirement at California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee of California State University, San Bernardino. A copy of the official Psychology IRB Stamp of approval appears at the bottom of this page. The University requires that you give your consent BEFORE participating in this study.

This study is for participants who are 18 years of age or older and who are currently employed for at least one year. If you consent to participate, you will be administered an online survey that measures embeddedness framed within your organization and job, commitment framed within your organization and job, turnover intentions, organizational citizenship behaviors, and perceived organizational support. You also will be asked to provide some demographic information (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, etc.). The survey should take approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

This study involves no risks beyond those routinely encountered in daily life, nor any direct benefits to you as a participant. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to withdraw your participation at any time during the study, or refuse to answer any specific question without penalty. As no identifying information will be collected, your name cannot be connected with your responses. Hence, your data will remain completely anonymous. Your responses will NOT be shared with your organization of employment. All responses will be protected by the researcher on password protected computers. When you have completed the survey, you will receive a debriefing statement describing the study in more detail. To ensure the validity of the study we ask that you not discuss this study with other participants. Summary results of this study will be available from Michael Siskin (siskinm@coyote.csusb.edu) or Dr. Kenneth Shultz (kshultz@csusb.edu) after December 30, 2014.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact the Department of Psychology IRB sub-committee (at PSYC.IRB@csusb.edu). You may also contact the Human Subjects office at California State University, San Bernardino at (909) 537-7588.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and understand the true nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age. Please click next below to indicate your desire to participate.

The California State University
Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles • Maritime Academy
Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sanoma • Stanislaus
APPENDIX L

INFORMATION STATEMENT
Thank you for your participating in our study designed to investigate how individuals’ attitudes about their jobs may be related to desires to stay or leave their current employment or career. This study is being conducted by Michael Sisikin, graduate student of the Master of Science program in Industrial-Organizational Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino, under the supervision of Dr. Kenneth Shultz. This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee of California State University, San Bernardino.

This study involved no risks beyond those of everyday life, nor any direct benefits to you as an individual beyond the participation in psychological research. In order to ensure the validity of the study, we ask that you do not discuss this study with other participants or other individuals who may also serve as participants.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact Michael Sisikin at sisikinm@coyote.csusb.edu or Dr. Kenneth Shultz at kshultz@csusb.edu. Summary results of this study will be available after December 30, 2014.
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