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ABSTRACT:
This study integrates literature of job embeddedness (JE) and uses students, who are working, to pilot the development of a new reflective scale for JE. Initially, we carried out 6 focus groups with 36 MBA students designed to gain greater insight into what organisation and non-work forces embed them. Themes were collapsed into categories and prominent phrases were then chosen as item indicators for one of the ten JE themes that emerged and pilot tested using 270 students working in full-time and part-time positions. Preliminary results demonstrate scale validity and reliability. Our findings indicate that the quality and strength of relationships in organisations and with family is an important feature that embeds individuals to where they are.
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Job embeddedness is a construct which was developed to explain why people stay (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001). They defined job embeddedness as the psychological, social and financial forces that act on employees to retain them (Mitchell, et al., 2001). These forces act as a web in the job and work environment by which people become entangled and stuck. The greater the number and strength of the strands of web, the more individuals become interwoven in the web and the greater their reluctance to leave. However, Mitchell and his colleagues never intended that their provisional job embeddedness measure would be a ‘well established, standard scale’ but ‘a preliminary and evolving’ one (Holtom, Tidd, Mitchell, & Lee, 2013; Lee, Mitchell, Sablynski, Burton, & Holtom, 2004, p.720). Literature suggests that further consideration needs to be given to the forces that embed individuals to their jobs and environment because they are unsure that the job embeddedness indicators capture the construct (Lee, Burch, & Mitchell, 2013). In particular, the way job embeddedness is conceptualised and the indicators that capture the nature of the construct need further investigation. It is therefore timely to examine evidence of the forces that embed individuals.

This work contributes to the current literature on JE in two ways, first by providing new indicators that capture a more complex construct improving the work and non-work factors that embed individuals. Second the introduction of a multidimensional scale with reflective indicators that manifest the underlying construct will assist in justifying mediator and moderator models.

Why a New Measure of Job Embeddedness

Literature is concerned about a number of shortcomings of the job embeddedness scale, including its conceptualisation, indicators and non-work factors. First, its conceptualisation stems from Mitchell et al.’s (2001) scale which is a formative measure with 34 causal indicators. Formative or composite measures are ‘formed or induced by their indicators’ (Yao, Lee, Mitchell, Burton, & Sablynski, 2004, p.170) and conceptualised to ‘cause the person to become embedded’ (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 111). This differs from reflective measures where indicators are manifestations of the
underlying construct. The validity of formative models is increasingly difficult to demonstrate when mediators and moderators occur between the independent and the dependent variables. Using a reflector model of job embeddedness becomes easier to justify these models (Lee, Burch, & Mitchell, 2013). Crossley, Bennett, Jex, & Burnfield (2007) have addressed the formative construct problem by proposing a reflective global measure of job embeddedness (i.e., perceptions of job embeddedness). A ‘reflective’ or perceptually based job embeddedness measure is an important research direction (Lee et al., 2013). However, the compactness of Crossley et al.’s (2007) global measure does not highlight the components of the job embeddedness measure like the composite formative measure does (Zhang, Fried, & Griffeth, 2012). Studies have found that there are different relationships across the job embeddedness dimensions and across samples. It is important therefore that a job embeddedness measure is developed that is able to test models and utilise structural equation modelling to test relationships between components of job embeddedness and outcomes.

Second, another issue raised by Lee et al. (2013) is whether the job embeddedness indicators capture the construct. Job embeddedness has been represented by an extensive collection of forces on employee retention (Mitchell et al. 2001). These influences are considered as a web which entangles individuals who become stuck. Yao et al. (2004) emphasise the difficulty employees have of moving away from the existing social, psychological and financial arrangement. Job embeddedness theory considers three dimensions (links, fit and sacrifice) that enmesh individuals in organisations. Links are the ‘the discernable connections people have both on and off-the-job’ (Yao et al., 2004, p. 156). Fit, is ‘employee’s perceived compatibility with an organisation and with his or her environment.’ (p. 156). An employee’s values, are congruent with those of the organisation. Sacrifice, the final aspect of job embeddedness, is characterised by ‘the perceived cost of material or psychological benefits that may be forfeited by leaving one’s job’ (Yao et al., 2004, p. 157).

Although there is extensive research on the fit dimension of job embeddedness, research on the links and sacrifice dimensions is sparse. The definition of links is especially undeveloped as it refers to the number of links and does not consider their quality, importance or frequency (Zhang et al., 2012). In line with prior research (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008) we suggest that the
number of connections may not have sufficient aspects associated with the links dimension. As Holtom and his associates (p. 257) mention ‘we need to develop models that capture the importance of interpersonal ties’. A better understanding of the links component of job embeddedness will enhance our understanding of its influence on staying or leaving.

Last, according to job embeddedness theory (Mitchell et al., 2001), non-work factors (community embeddedness) are key in distinguishing job embeddedness from other organisational attachment constructs (e.g., organisational commitment). Unfortunately, community embeddedness is not consistently associated with turnover and does not demonstrate predictive validity (the value of a formative measure). In particular, the use of the word ‘community’ is a cause for debate as it does not specify the range of a shared geographical location resulting in conflicting results. Improving the non-work factors that embed individuals is therefore another important aspect of the scale which needs to be developed.

Developing a New Job Embeddedness Measure

Using the conceptualisation of JE as a collection of forces that attach and retain employees we aim to gain a greater understanding of the complexity of forces that tap into this attachment. We then sought to collect a pool of questions that reflect the forces in and outside the workplace that compel employee retention. Above all, we aim to develop an initial scale that reflects a greater representation of the dimensions of JE.

First, using focus groups, and later with data from a survey, we sought to investigate the forces that attach employees to where they work as well as the non-work forces that attach them outside of work. Based on our investigations we sought to offer new insights about job embeddedness using MBA students from an Australian university and others without and MBA who are in work settings.

METHOD

Focus Groups

*Sample:* We conducted focus groups with MBA students and other employees outside the MBA program from different cultural backgrounds. The face-to-face discussions were guided by a
moderator so we could learn the common points of view taken by employees on key issues (Groves et al., 2004) and to ensure that as many dimensions of JE as possible were identified (Krueger, 2006). Groups were composed of four to eight people who were selected based on common characteristics relevant to the research (Krueger, 2006). Using open-ended questions the moderator encouraged participants to discuss each question agreeing and disagreeing while interacting with each other (Groves et al., 2004).

The focus groups recruited groups with different cultural backgrounds to generate discussions that would extend our understanding of the JE concept. A demographic range included employees from different sized organisations, different functions, job and employment status, cultural diversity, age groups (ages ranging between 26-60) and family circumstances. There was no attempt to have groups for each of the possible combinations but to ensure that no obvious group was left out (Seale, 2007). The common ground between participants was to have worked and belong to one of the cultural backgrounds of Australian, Chinese, Indian, European, African. Participants were given the opportunity to share relevant characteristics, and the moderator assisted in sharing some ways of talking and ways of working together before commencing the focus groups (Seale, 2007).

The final sample (36 participants) was made up of six focus groups, one of European, African, Indian and Chinese cultural background and two who were Australian. Among them, 55% were male (n=21), 47% were Australian (n=18).

Procedure: Using feedback from an expert in the field, the questions for the focus groups went through three iterations. MBA classes and people at work without an MBA were invited to participate. Focus group sessions were held in tutorial rooms at the university and were audio recorded with participant’s permission. Refreshments before each session encouraged group norms about interaction and similarities in ways of talking (Seale, 2007). Sessions lasted approximately one and a half hours, and questions investigated each of the JE dimensions in the context of the organisation first and subsequently outside the organisation. According to the three dimensions of JE (Mitchell et al., 2001), we initially probed individuals about the ways they were attached and the strength of their attachment to the organisation. Next, we probed the reasons of goodness of fit with their current
employer and what would be needed for a perfect fit. Last, questions focused on the sacrifice individuals would forgo were they to leave their organisation. Similarly, questions about non-work factors that probed the three dimensions of job embeddedness were investigated next.

Analysis: In order to transcribe and be able to include all fleeting and lively discussion into the text, the manuscripts were read while listening to the original recording. Emphases and expressions were noted with the aid of field notes in order to facilitate analysis (Macnaghten & Myers, 2004). The moderator reviewed the audio recordings and changed transcripts to ensure an accurate and readable format (Seale, 2007). We analysed focus group data using inductive content analysis procedures recommended by Hinkin (1998) to analyse the web of forces that entrap and secure individuals. This procedure is similar to using grounded theory technique in order to verify current dimensions as well as identify new dimensions of JE.

RESULTS (Focus groups)

Feedback from all participants across focus groups was used to create major categories. First, phrases that addressed the JE concept (the forces that embedded individuals) in the context of the organisation and outside the organisation from the focus groups were identified and entered into spreadsheets. To begin the analysis we screened the 725 items for meaning clarity and discarded 24 due to unclear meaning. We then sorted the remaining 701 phrases into recurrent themes (Wilkinson, 2006). The researcher classified the phrases into categories, creating new categories as they emerged from the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In total, 65 themes emerged from the data, evident across each of the focus groups, which were collapsed into 25 categories.

Later, two colleagues working independently classified the 701 phrases into categories (Weber, 1985). The raters had some familiarity with job embeddedness but no preconceived idea as to what categories the phrases should be. Their instruction was to assign each phrase to one of the 25 categories which had already been identified or identify a new category until all phrases had been allocated. In total the pool of phrases were classified by two coders and the author with three possible outcomes: (1) full agreement, where the three coders classified the phrase into the same category, (2) two agreements, where two individuals had the same item classification (3) no agreement where each
individual did not agree with the item classification (Dekas, Bauer, Welle, Kurkoski, & Sullivan, 2013). Results illustrate a 65.04% full agreement and 34.09% agreement between two of the coders and 0.01% with no agreement. Any disagreements between coders category classification were not discussed or resolved before the calculation of intercoder reliability to avoid the introduction of bias (Weber, 1990). Overall the coefficients of intercoder reliability (kappas) for the assignment of phrases of the three rater pairs showed substantial agreement (0.64, 0.71 and 0.89).

Finally, we deleted nine of the 25 categories that had very few cases and considered to be a minor aspect of the web of forces confining focus group participants to the organisation and community. The remaining 16 categories were then collapsed into ten broader, more abstract and conceptually similar categories (Wilkinson, 2006) that represent major areas in JE (Mitchell et al., 2001) as well as two categories representing items antecedent to JE. Organisational practices, and influences outside the organisation impacted on the levels of JE rather than forces that embedded individuals (explained further below). Table 1 provides a summary of the 10 JE categories that emerged from the focus groups as well as the frequency (percentage) with which they came up.

Wording for the item indicators for the ten major categories were formulated according to the wording and meaning of phrases that were prominent from focus group participants and had full coder agreement. A list of potential items was generated representing each of the categories while using terminology that was meaningful to potential respondents (Gehlbach & Brinkworth, 2011). Table 1 gives an indication of the items for each of the preliminary dimensions of the JE scale and lists the seven categories of JE that emerged from the focus group discussions and the frequency (%) with which they occurred. Four categories align well with existing dimensions of JE literature (organisation fit and sacrifice and community fit and sacrifice). The three categories that do not align with previously established dimensions of JE deal with social relationships and the quality of these relationships at work and outside work. Last, the organisational practices (e.g., rewards, autonomy, work challenge) and lifestyle categories (e.g., size and environment of city) were features that reinforced JE. Next, we outline the categories that emerged from the focus groups and provide a representative participant quote.
**Organisation fit.** Based on previous literature, organisation fit is a fit between employee’s values, career goals and future plans with their job and larger corporate culture (Mitchell et al., 2001) and included 14.9% of the organisation descriptors generated by the focus groups with comments such as ‘I think I am excellent fit with the stated values’.

**Organisation sacrifice.** The organisational sacrifice dimension that emerged was similar to ‘the perceived cost of material or psychological benefits that may be forfeited’ (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 1105) and included 14.9% of the organisation descriptors generated by the focus group. Participants made comments such as ‘I’ve got long service leave coming up. I’m not leaving before I’m paid up’.

**Community fit.** The community fit dimension was aligned with previous literature which believes that it is similar to organisation fit dimension (Mitchell et al., 2001) and included 6.9% of the community descriptors generated by the focus group. Participants made comments like ‘we all have a shared passion’.

**Community sacrifice (family and friends).** The community sacrifice dimension was similar to Mitchell et al.’s (2001) measure which considers the cost of leaving the attractiveness of the community and the conveniences which will be lost. Additionally, the community descriptors generated by the focus groups (7.8%) also captured the sacrifice of social relationships. Relationships with family and friends were the themes to be sacrificed. Participants made comments such as ‘the greatest sacrifice would be leaving my family and friends’.

**Relationships at work (colleagues, supervisor and teams).** The first new dimension, relationships at work, included 18.8% of the items generated by the focus group and comprised the type and quality of relationships that people have in the organisation with colleagues, supervisors and teams. Mitchell et al. (2001) proposed a ‘links to other people or activities’ (p 1104) dimension. In their conceptualisation they considered the number of links rather than their quality or importance. For example, items in their measure included ‘how many co-workers do you interact with regularly?’ Rather, the type of connections that emerged from the focus groups in this study such as ‘I am happy with the people I work with’ is closer to literature on social relationship (Ferris et al., 2009).
The quality of the relationships included items of trust, support and respect. As Holtom et al. (2013) stated the quality of the relationships is important and likely to influence turnover. Examples, from the focus groups included ‘they support me and my goals … the company that I worked for before, I didn’t get the support that I needed, so I left’.

*Relationships outside work (family and friends).* For the community dimension which was new, relationships outside work provided 20.5% of the items generated by the focus group and included relationships with *family and friends.* The quality of these relationships expanded on the number of links in the community concept suggested by Mitchell et al. (2001). The importance of the relationships with family was the major connection that emerged from the focus groups that embedded people where they were. Comments from this category included ‘I would not leave my grandkids … a very strong attachment to the family.

**RESULTS (Exploratory factor analysis)**

**Designing the Job Embeddedness Scale**

Initial scale development was undertaken using the categories that emerged from the focus groups. A list of the potential scale items was created once definitions for each job embeddedness category had been generated. The 59 items were then submitted to pilot testing. The aim was to test, using a larger sample of participants, scale psychometric properties (reliability and factor structure) of how items function within the scale as well as how the scale functions relative to other measures (Kinicki, Jacobson, Peterson, & Prussia, 2013). The 59 items were submitted to exploratory factor analysis (EFA).

*Sample and procedure:* Data for reliability and factor structure were collected from business students in a Business school in an Australian university working full time or part-time. Participation in the online survey was voluntary and anonymous. Students were encouraged to complete the online survey by the opportunity to be included in a drawing of a Samsung Tablet. In total, 272 students completed the survey, 34.6% were male, 65.5% had worked for the organisation for longer than one year, 50% worked between 20 and 40 hours per week while 16 % worked over 40 hours per week.
Measures and analysis: Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with each of the 59 statements. A Likert type scale measured levels of agreement, 1=strongly disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 5=strongly agree. A principal axis factoring procedure with varimax rotation retained a ten-factor solution according to job embeddedness theory and the focus group results. Eigenvalues greater than 1 (Kaiser criterion) and a scree test supported the 10 factor decision (Hinkin, 1998). In order to develop items that were independent of each other varimax rotation was used. We used factor weight (0.40) and communality to judge factor loadings as meaningful (Ford, MacCallum, & Tait, 1986) and retained the items with higher loadings and communalities (0.6, Hinkin, 1998). High cross loadings and items that were theoretically inconsistent with their a-priori factor were also deleted. The analysis was repeated until a clear structure matrix that explained high percentages of total item variance was achieved (Ford et al., 1986; Hinkin, 1998).

Coefficient alpha was computed to measure the internal consistency for each factor.

Initial Scale Item Development

Results: The factor analysis partially supported the 10 factor relationships derived from the focus groups analyses. The combination of colleague and team relationships resulted in 9 factors. In addition, 13 of the 56 items were deleted because they did not meet the retention criteria described previously. In total 43 items corresponded to 9 factors. Then analysis was repeated until a high percentage of the total item variance was obtained with a clear factor structure matrix (Hinkin, 1998). A further 16 items were deleted corresponding to the 7 factors that were retained. Content validity estimated internal consistency ranging from .82 to .93. Convergent and discriminant validity are evident by the high loadings within factors, and little cross-loadings between factors (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

Although the job embeddness field has acknowledged that the JE scale is a `preliminary and evolving’ one (Holtom et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2004), few scholars have advanced the conceptualisation of the JE construct. In this research we take a step toward the investigation of the
evolution of the JE concept. Findings from this study contribute to the advancement of the study of JE. This preliminary study surfaced new types of JE that exist and apply to organisational employees.

Our findings suggest that the current dimensions of JE (outlined in the literature; Mitchell, Holtom, & Lee, 2001) may be incomplete. Understanding the links component of JE is important as it will enhance our understanding of its influence on staying or leaving (Holtom et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2012). We believe that the new forms of JE identified in this study will capture new dimensions that have also been suggested in literature (Zhang et al., 2012; Holtom et al., 2008). We draw on relational cohesion theory, which focuses on individual-to-group attachment. The theory asserts that frequent social exchanges result in strengthening the person-to-group bond and, while reducing uncertainty, pronounce the relationships between these individuals and their group (Lawler, Thye, & Yoon, 2000). In turn, alliances between groups with a sense of psychological bond increase commitment which causes individuals to remain with the group despite valued alternatives (Allen & Shanock, 2013).

First, we speculate that the **quality of associations with people at work** is part of the reason they want to stay. Quality interactions build friendships which provide support for individuals at work (Brown & Brown, 2006). The delivery of support is based on the strength of the ties (Wellman & Wortley, 1990) and the strength of these connections gives individuals a reason to stay or leave. In addition, we postulate that the **strength of connection with friends**, the second new form of JE detected in this research, addresses the individual’s need for friendships (Wellman & Wortley, 1990). Wellman and Wortley argue that the strength of ties people have with friends, neighbours and family provides them with support and services (half of all the supportive relationships) they need.

Last, we suggest that **family bonds**, the third new form of JE, and **sacrificing family connections**, the last new form of JE, may be what implants individuals where they live. Family bonds are part of the reasons people decide to stay or leave. The importance of family is a factor individuals consider when making a decision about relocating away from their current residence (Akl et al., 2012). Change in family support means changes to their levels of happiness, where strong family relationships help to promote happiness, reduced levels of support diminish levels of happiness.
Typically, moving away changes the individual’s role as a family member and the family as a whole.

It follows that individuals would need to sacrifice family connections when organisations require them to relocate because of work. It raises issues about leaving family behind and losing the close contact it creates. This is in line with findings indicating higher ratings of closeness for genetic relatives than for distant kin or unrelated people (Neyer & Lang, 2003). When these relations are physically accessible they are more likely to provide large and small services which are an ‘important and reliable portion of supportive ties… [and] … secure sources of aid’ (Wellman & Wortley, 1990, p. 582). These social bonds also have an altruistic function which emphasises the giving rather than receiving in relationships (Neyer & Lang, 2003). These include actions such as child nurturing, caring for aged parents and defending family where self-sacrifice is evident. Consequently, altruism is a factor which appears to promote and maintain the family bond by fostering loyalty, interdependence, and commitment (Corbetta & Salvato, 2004). Either way, severing bonds with family becomes a costly exercise for people. Accordingly, family bonds influence the frequency with which employees move, their tenure and the choices they make about leaving because they need to protect their family (Léa, Tissington, & Budhwar, 2010).

We might ask what does this mean for organisations and employee JE? What does it mean for employee propensity to become mobile and to stay or leave? It may be advisable for organisations to be cognisant about their staff’s circumstance in the organisation but it is also just as important to understand and be sensitive to the situations outside the organisation. The non-work forces may be just as compelling if not more than the ones evident within the workplace. Relationships at work are very important and can be strengthened so that individuals have good reasons to stay where they are (Allen & Sanock, 2013). Likewise, relationships outside the workplace involving family and friends bind individuals where they are (Akl et al., 2012). Due consideration needs to be given to these factor as they play an important role when employees make decisions about their living arrangements and their ability to stay or leave.
As far as measuring an individual’s levels of JE, we believe that the present pilot study, conducted with students who are working part time and/or full time, should be extended to a larger sample of workers offering greater insight into the dimensions of the JE scale. As we have followed the steps outlined by (Hinkin, 1998) for scale development carefully it is highly likely that our new provisional JE scale is internally consistent and possesses content validity. However, as goodness of fit has not been quantified with EFA, the quality of the factor structure needs to be further assessed using a computer program such as Mplus for confirmatory factor analysis (CFA; Hinkin, 1998). This will test the items loadings on factors and significance of the overall model. Further, convergent and discriminant validity will be tested using scales which correlate (with similar constructs: organisational commitment, job satisfaction) and with which they do not correlate (with dissimilar measures: job search behaviours, job alternatives). Finally, as noted by (Hinkin, 1998) it is inappropriate to measure psychometric properties of the new measure and carry out scale development with the same sample. Consequently, we need to use an independent sample to enhance the generalizability of the measure. Further, to avoid common method variance, our data collection needs to come from different sources so as to provide construct validity.

CONCLUSION

Scale development is not for the light hearted as it is a long involved process which takes time. Anyone going through the process will understand the difficulties and persistence needed to develop a sound measure. Many researchers have used the process outlined by (Hinkin, 1998; Dekas et al., 2013; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1989; Kinicki et al., 2013). We hope that following this process for our pilot study and continuing with the process to finalise the JE scale development will reward us with a JE scale that is efficient and effective to use.
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### TABLE 1: EMERGENT CATEGORIES AND SCALE ITEMS OF JOB EMBEDDEDNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job embeddedness categories</th>
<th>Examples of focus group participant comments</th>
<th>Examples of job embeddedness items for pilot survey</th>
<th>% of overall generated items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational job embeddedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships at work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Relationships with</td>
<td>I am happy with the people I work with</td>
<td>I am happy with the people I work with</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team relationships</td>
<td>We felt very close to the team</td>
<td>There is a strong sense of friendship in my team</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisor relationships</td>
<td>My supervisor has been very supportive for my</td>
<td>My supervisor supports my development</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Organisational fit

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Value congruence</td>
<td>I think I am excellent fit with the stated values</td>
<td>I am an excellent fit with the values of my organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational Sacrifice

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Cost of leaving</td>
<td>You have to reinvent your whole identity (Aust Alicia)</td>
<td>The changes that I would need to make if I left the organisation would be too great.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Job embeddedness outside the organisation

#### Relationships outside work

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Family</td>
<td>I have great attachments to my Family who are a key integral part of my life</td>
<td>My attachment to my family has a great influence on the decisions I make about employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Friends</td>
<td>I think it’s the friends, the friends you make</td>
<td>My friends outside the workplace are very important to me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Community Fit

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Match place and</td>
<td>I have fitted in very well in my community. I participate in</td>
<td>I am a good fit with my community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Sacrifice</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Family</td>
<td>The biggest sacrifice is getting detached from your loved ones 3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my family</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Friends</td>
<td>I would be sacrificing friendships. People are important 4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The biggest sacrifice is getting detached from your friends</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2: CROSS-LOADINGS BETWEEN FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a real bond with the colleagues at work</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am attached to the people I work with</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am attached to my team at work</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The people at work are like a family to me</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel a real connection with people at work</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The strong sense of friendship in my team binds me to them</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The bond between me and my friends in the community is strong</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have a strong connection with friends in my community</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Friends in my community support me in my time of need</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Friendships in my community are very important to me</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Friendships in my community are very important to me</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My personal values match my community’s values and culture</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My community’s values and culture provide a good fit with the things that I value in life</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my community values & 0.07 & 0.13 & 0.83 & 0.03 & 0.09 & -0.04 & 0.07  \\
15. I am a good fit with my community & 0.09 & 0.09 & 0.81 & 0.04 & 0.10 & -0.01 & -0.00  \\
16. My dedication to my family makes it hard for me to change employers and relocate & 0.01 & -0.02 & 0.04 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.02 & 0.06  \\
17. The bond between my family members and me makes changing employers and relocating for work unworkable & 0.02 & -0.03 & 0.03 & 0.89 & 0.89 & 0.02 & 0.04  \\
18. I would miss the connection I have with my family if I was to change employers and relocate & -0.01 & -0.01 & -0.03 & 0.75 & 0.748 & 0.023 & 0.076  \\
19. It would be very hard for me to change employers and relocate for work because of family interests & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.100 & 0.74 & 0.044 & -0.019 & 0.151  \\
20. My organisation has the same values that I hold & 0.13 & 0.06 & 0.16 & 0.02 & 0.88 & 0.01 & 0.03  \\
21. My organisation’s values and strategic goals are in line with my values and goals & 0.09 & 0.03 & 0.14 & 0.11 & 0.84 & 0.10 & -0.01  \\
22. My organisation meets my expectations & 0.25 & 0.05 & 0.04 & -0.02 & 0.72 & 0.03 & 0.01  \\
23. If I left my organisation I would forgo/sacrifice ongoing job security & 0.06 & -0.02 & 0.06 & 0.02 & 0.06 & 0.87 & 0.03  \\
24. If I left my organisation I would & 0.10 & 0.05 & -0.05 & 0.03 & -0.04 & 0.86 & 0.02  \\
25. If I left my organisation I would forgo/sacrifice benefits that have accrued & 0.12 & 0.06 & 0.02 & 0.08 & 0.09 & 0.60 & -0.07  \\
26. I have a strong attachment to my family & 0.15 & 0.07 & 0.10 & 0.19 & 0.05 & 0.02 & 0.83  \\
27. My commitment to my family binds me to them & 0.14 & 0.04 & 0.08 & 0.27 & 0.05 & -0.06 & 0.80  \\

Note: n=272 students working full-time or part-time. Seven factors highlighted with cross-loadings (not highlighted)