JOB EMBEDDEDNESS AS A MEDIATOR OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK AND FAMILY CONFLICT AND LEAVING INTENTION

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the relationships between work-family conflict, employee job embeddedness and intention to leave, in an attempt to (i) understand how family and work conflict impact on employee embeddedness, and (ii) to assess the extent of job embeddedness as a mediator of the relationship between work and family conflict and intention to leave. Based on a sample of 124 white collar manufacturing employees, WFC and FWC predicts employee intention to leave, and can contribute to employee job embeddedness. Components of job embeddedness mediate Family-Work Conflict but not Work-Family Conflict in the relationship between work and family conflict and intention to leave.
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Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski and Erez (2001)’s Job Embeddedness Theory (JET) has quickly developed a substantial literature (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee & Eberly 2008). Developed originally to explain a problem in Lee and Mitchell (1994)’s Unfolding Theory of Turnover – why a ‘shock’ may prompt one employee to leave an employer, while another employee decides to continue – the JET has developed to provide an alternative account of employee retention (Bergiel, Nguyen, Clenney & Taylor 2009; Burton, Holtom, Sablynski, Mitchell & Lee 2010; Hom, Tsui, Lee, Ping, Wu, Zhang & Lan 2009). Job embeddedness has been repeatedly found to be a reliable predictor of intention to leave, and when used in conjunction with the Unfolding Theory of Turnover, to account for actual turnover (Holtom, Mitchell & Lee 2006; Holtom et al. 2008; Lee, Mitchell, Sablynski, Burton & Holtom 2004; Mitchell, Holtom, & Lee 2001; Mitchell & Lee 2001).

This research, however, has a surprising absence: almost nothing is known about how job embeddedness is established, how it changes over time, and the mediating role played by job embeddedness in explaining intention to leave. This paper explores the effect of a set of antecedent
factors – the conflict between an employee’s work and family lives – on job embeddedness and the employee’s intention to leave.

**JOB EMBEDDEDNESS, WORK AND FAMILY CONFLICT AND INTENTION TO LEAVE**

*The Job Embeddedness Theory*

JET is particularly appropriate to understanding the relationship between an employee’s work and family lives, and leaving intentions for two reasons. First, the job embeddedness framework recognises that employees are bound to their organisation by an organisationally and personally idiosyncratic set of perceptual and structural connections. These connections go beyond the psychological connections implicit in theories of employee engagement (Halbesleben & Wheeler 2008; Seppälä, Mauno, Feldt, Hakanen, Kinnunen, Tolvanen, et al. 2009) or organisational commitment (Mowday, Steers & Porter 1979; Meyer & Allen 1991) and acknowledge the structural, non-affective factors shaping an employee’s labour mobility. The JET acknowledges the impact of an employee’s broader life, the role of social, family and labour market constraints and opportunities on the ongoing employment decision. Of relevance to this paper, the JET acknowledges that an employee’s roles as employee and family member can transcend cognitive choices and perceptions.

Secondly, the job embeddedness theory explicitly recognises that an employee exists in two domains – the work-world; and the non-work world where family is likely to play a major role. From a job embeddedness perspective, work-life conflict would impact not only on an employee’s perceptions and feelings about their workplace, but also on the nature of their relationships and attachment within the workplace. The off-the-job domain is understood to have an influence on the employee’s capacity to engage with their workplace (Mitchell et al. 2001). However the theoretical and empirical importance of off-the-job embeddedness remains largely unexplored within the literature beyond the early introductory writings such as Mitchell et al. (2001) and recent extensions to the theory by writers such as Mallol, Holtom and Lee (2007), and Ramesh and Gelfand (2010).

These worlds (the work/ life out of work; perceptual and structural dimensions) are inter-related, but not in an obvious or predictable way. The pull of family obligations can oblige one person to further commit themselves to their organisation in order to improve family living standards or
security. For another, family obligations may put pressure on an employee to make less of an effort in an attempt to reconcile their work-life balance (Mitchell et al. 2001; Mitchell & Lee 2001).

JET theorists propose that each of the two worlds of employees has three dimensions. The first dimension of embeddedness is the degree of fit of the employee to the job and the organisation.\(^1\) This dimension is a broadly version of person-job and person-organisation fit: does the employee possess congruent skills, attitude, approach, values with the organisation, the job and other employees? The greater the fit, the greater is the embeddedness.

The second dimension relates to the *links* between of the employee to the workplace and the people of the workplace. This linkage can be formal, such as the level of responsibility the individual has for decisions and activities within the organisation, or the number of people to whom one reports or is responsible for. The linkage could be informal or social, relating to one’s immediate work responsibilities and the social connection resulting from one’s work, the number of people they work with, whether they socialise outside of work, or their feeling of belonging. The greater the linkage, the greater is the embeddedness of the individual into the organisation.

Whereas the first two dimensions emphasise congruence and connectedness, the third dimension – *sacrifice* – is concerned with the real or imagined loss the employee would experience if they left the organisation. Managements can create organisational practices that can increase the employee cost of leaving the organisation. These practices may be financial (salary sacrificing provisions, entitlements that are linked to length of service; career development opportunities that come through internal promotion); social (the development of social networks through organisationally-supported out-of-work activities such as sport or recreational activities); or through quality of life issues (on-site or subsidised childcare, superior work-life balance arrangements; healthcare and gym membership sponsorship).

*The conflict between an employee’s family and work lives*

Several decades of research has clarified that an adverse relationship between an employee’s home and work lives has negative implications for an employee’s health (Perrewe, Hochwarter &

---

\(^1\) To simplify the exposition of this paper, the following discussion of organisational fit, links and sacrifice should be read to also apply to off-the-job fit, links and sacrifice
Kiewitz 1999), life satisfaction (Ford, Heinen & Langkamer 2007; Kossek & Ozeki 1998), success as a parent (Major, Klein & Ehrhart 2002; Westman, Etzion & Gortler 2004), burnout (Rupert, Stevanovic & Hunley 2009) as well as employee outcomes such as overall performance (Witt & Carlson 2006), affective commitment (Wang, Lawler, Walumbwa & Shi 2004) and intention to leave (Bhave, Kramer & Glomb 2010; Casper, Martin, Buffardi & Erdwins 2002; Cullen & Hammer 2007; Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Collins 2001, Rode, Rehg, Near & Underhill 2007).

Understood as a form of tension between an employee’s roles as employee and as family member, this conflict is understood to take two distinct but inter-related dimensions (Frone, Russell & Cooper 1992; Greenhaus & Beutell 1985, Rode et al 2007). The first results from the conflict experienced by employees that comes from the requirements of work that conflict with the employee carrying out their normal role in their home life. Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian (1996) call this Work-Family Conflict (WFC). An example of this would be being required to work late, or on the weekend, and as a consequence being less able to carry out routine parenting duties. The second, Family-Work Conflict (FWC), occurs when home-life responsibilities impacts on an employee’s perceived capacity to carry out their responsibilities as an employee. An example of this is when a parent is unable to travel interstate because of the need to provide childcare, the need to leave work early to pickup children from childcare, or the inability to attend early morning meetings.

It could be argued that an employee has a relatively finite number of hours to allocate between their home and work lives, and that an increase in time expenditure in one domain is likely to come from a loss of time from the other domain. The difficulty in reconciling one’s obligations in response to this zero-sum situation gives rise to work and family conflict. Both forms of conflict can be expected to increase employee dissatisfaction, leading to increased intention to leave. Accordingly,

*Hypothesis 1: Increased WFC is likely to result in increased intention to leave*

*Hypothesis 2: Increased FWC is likely to result in increased intention to leave*

This conflict is likely to impact on an employee’s level of embeddedness for several additional reasons. Increased work and family conflicts may lead to decreased organisational fit embeddedness, as a result of growing employee speculation that the job and the employer is not an ideal fit with the employee. Growing disenchantment with the role may lead to a decrease in
employee engagement with other people within the organisation, and the activities of the organisation – resulting in reduced organisational linkage embeddedness. As an employee’s disengagement grows, the perception of the cost of leaving an organisation may decline, as well. Thus it may be speculated that increased employee work and family conflict, in both Work-Family and Family-Work varieties may lead to a decrease in employee organisational embeddedness. Accordingly, the following hypotheses will be tested:

**Hypothesis 3:** Work-Family Conflict is negatively related to the components of job embeddedness (Organisational-Fit, Organisational-Linkage, Organisational-Sacrifice)

**Hypothesis 4:** Family-Work Conflict is negatively related to the components of job embeddedness

It is to be expected that increased off-the-job embeddedness is likely to create more likelihood of role conflict between an employee’s work and non-work lives – a person with a family or involvement in the community is more likely to find more challenges to reconciling the competing interests than a person without a family or community involvement. People with families are more likely to get involved in community activities that are involved with the development and recreational activities of their children, such as participation in the life of the school or in assisting with the management of sporting clubs. People without families but an involvement in the local community may find themselves with new and additional involvement in community activities that may present challenges to an employee’s worklife (Burgham & Downward 2005). Accordingly, the following hypothesis will be tested:

**Hypothesis 5:** Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict predict off-the-job embeddedness

If work and family conflicts predict employee job embeddedness and intention to leave, then it is likely that job embeddedness (and its components) will also act as a mediator. This will occur because some or all of the effect of the work and family conflict will manifest itself as a decreased level of attachment to the organisation and job, and this decrease in embeddedness will predict increased intention to leave. Accordingly,

**Hypothesis 6:** The components of job embeddedness mediate the relationship between Work-Family Conflict and Intention to Leave
Hypothesis 7: The components of job embeddedness mediate the relationship between Family-Work Conflict and Intention to Leave

Figure 1 outlines these hypotheses.

------------ Figure 1 about here ------------

METHODS

Participants

The business is a large South Australian based manufacturing enterprise, providing electrical products for the Australian and international market, employing almost 500 blue collar employees and 600 white collar employees at its main metropolitan site. The business was established over fifty years ago and has remained a family owned business until the sale of the business to an international concern several years prior to this study. In the year prior to the study, the entire workforce was relocated to a new purpose built manufacturing plant.

The organisation was selected for several reasons. First, the organisation was undergoing far-reaching organisation restructuring following its acquisition by a multinational organisation. At the time of data collection, the business was undergoing a simultaneous organisation of its product line, management structure and internal processes, including worksite relocation, changes in employee roles, reclassifications of employee roles and redundancies. This is likely to add to the demands of work on an employee, and likely to add to work and family conflict, compared to before the sale and relocation. As a result, work impacts on employees are likely to be greater during this period of transition. Second, at the time of surveying the organisation had almost six hundred white collar employees engaged in a wide variety of occupational types (from professional, such as engineer and accountants; paraprofessionals, such as technicians, salespeople; and administrative staff). Third, these potential respondents could be reached through email and online surveys.

Survey

Following Dillman (2007) and Anseel, Lievens, Schollaert & Choragwicka (2010)’s findings that prior notice of a survey can increase survey response rates, an email introducing the project and the imminent survey was sent to all employees several days prior to the survey being distributed. The
advance notice survey was drafted and signed by the research team, had a university logo, and was distributed by a member of the organisation’s HR unit. No incentives were offered for survey participation. An invitation to participate was later emailed to all white collar employees with computer accounts (591 white-collar employees) with a click-on URL to the online survey. Potential respondents were assured of the anonymity and confidentiality of responses, and that the research project had been approved by a University ethics committee. In keeping with the literature two follow-up reminders were distributed after each survey to remind employees to participate (Kaplowitz, Hadlock & Levine 2004).

The online survey was completed by 124 employees, representing a response rate of 21.1%. This response rate is lower than that typically found in these studies (Cycyota & Harrison 2006; Baruch & Holtom 2008). This can be attributed to the hesitancy of the organisation’s workforce to comment on developments within workplace. Five years prior to the surveys, the previously-family owned, South Australian-based business had been sold to a French based corporation employing approximately 150,000 employees. The integration of the business into the global structure – with new systems, policies and decision-making practices – had accelerated in the two years prior to the study, with redundancies, restructuring, outsourcing, and the relocation of the majority of the workforce to a new site. Following the Blair & Zinkhan (2006) approach to testing for non-response bias, the characteristics of the sample were compared against the characteristics of the workforce. The average age of the sample was 35-39, equal to the workforce average. Although around one quarter of the sample were female (25.6%) compared with women representing 32% of the white collar workforce, ANOVA testing did not find significant different scores between the male and female respondents on the key variables used in this study. Accordingly, there was no apparent non-response bias.

**Measures**

All items, except the fill-in-the blank questions, were measured using 7-point Likert scales, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.
Family-Work (FWC) and Work-Family Conflict (WFC) FWC and WFC were measured using the two five item scales developed by Netemeyer et al. (1996). The unweighted mean of the five items in each scale represents the score.

Intention to leave Intention to leave was measured using Abrams, Ando and Hinkle (1998)’s three item scale. The unweighted mean of the three items represents the final intention to leave score.

Job satisfaction Overall satisfaction was measured using Cammann, Fichmann, Jenkins and Klesh (1983)’s 3-item scale. The unweighted mean of the three items represent the final job satisfaction score.

Job Embeddedness Job embeddedness was measured using the Felps, Mitchell, Hekman, Lee, Holtom and Harman (2009) 21 item job embeddedness scale. The items of this scale can be broken up into the 9 item organisational embeddedness scale, and the 12 item off-the-job embeddedness scale. The organisational embeddedness scale is made up of three three-item sub-scales. As this scale was composed of both Likert scales and dichotomous questions, this measure was calculated using the average of the standardised (z-scores) of the items following the procedure outlined by Lee et al. (2004).

Organisational Embeddedness–Fit was measured as the unweighted mean of the three relevant items from Felps et al. (2009)’s job embeddedness scale: ‘My job utilises by skills and talents well’; ‘I feel like I am a good match for this organisation’, and ‘If I stay with this organisation, I will be able to achieve most of my goals.’

Organisational Embeddedness–Links was measured as the unweighted mean of the three relevant items from Felps et al. (2009)’s job embeddedness scale: ‘I am a member of an effective work team’; ‘I work closely with my co-workers’, and ‘On the job, I interact frequently with my work colleagues.’

Organisational Embeddedness–Sacrifice was measured as the unweighted mean of the three relevant items from Felps et al. (2009)’s job embeddedness scale: ‘I have a lot of freedom in this job to decide how to pursue my goals’, I believe the prospects of continuing employment with this organisation are excellent’, and ‘I would sacrifice a lot if I left this job.’
**Organisational Embeddedness** Organisational Embeddedness was calculated as the unweighted average of the nine items making up Organisational Embeddedness-Fit, Linkage and Sacrifice using Felps et al (2009)’s job embeddedness scale.

**Off-the-job embeddedness** This measure was made up of the unweighted mean of the standardised (z) scores of the remaining 12 items non-Organisational Embeddedness items specified in the job embeddedness scale in Felps et al. (2009). Standardising of the scale was necessary as three of the twelve items in this scale were dichotomous or open text, while the remaining items were seven point likert scales.

**RESULTS**

Table 1 reports on the descriptive statistics.

---Table 1 about here---

**Hypotheses 1 and 2: The relationship between work and family conflicts and intention to leave**

As can be seen in Table 1, FWC \( r(124) = .18, p < .05 \) and WFC \( r(124) = .49, p < .01 \) are positively correlated with Intention to Leave. Hypotheses 1 and 2 are supported.

**Hypotheses 3-5. The relationship between WFC and FWC with the components of job embeddedness**

These hypotheses ask the threshold question for a study of the antecedent factors in an embeddedness theory of turnover: does the conflict that can arise from role conflict between an employee’s work and out-of-work life impact on their embeddedness as an employee? Table 1 and the testing of Hypothesis 1 and 2 demonstrates that several of the components of job embeddedness are correlated to FWC and WFC.

In the case of Work-Family Conflict, only one component – Organisational Embeddedness – Sacrifice is correlated with WFC \( r(124) = -.23, p < .05 \). As Organisational Embeddedness is the arithmetic sum of the Fit, Linkage and Sacrifice components, Organisational Embeddedness is also correlated with WFC \( r(124) = -.19, p < .05 \). Hypotheses 3 is partially supported.

Family-Work Conflict had a different effect: it was correlated with only one job embeddedness component – Organisational Embeddedness-Linkage \( r(124) = -.28, p < .01 \).
Organisational Embeddedness was not found to be correlated with FWC. Hypotheses 4 is partially supported. The data of Table 1 suggests that Off-the-Job embeddedness is not correlated with FWC or WFC. Hypothesis 5 is not supported.

Hypotheses 6 and 7: The mediating role of job embeddedness in the work and family conflict and intention to leave relationship

Following Baron and Kenny (1986) and Frazier, Tix and Barron (2004) – given the proximity of work and family conflict to employee dissatisfaction, and dissatisfaction’s association with intention to leave - the first stage of testing for mediation is to establish whether a direct effect exists between the measures of work and family conflict, and Intention to Leave. As can be seen in Table 1, a direct relationship exists in both cases, although of very different magnitudes ($r_{FWC}(124)=.18$, $p<.05$; $r_{WFC}(124)=.49$, $p<.01$).

The second of the Baron and Kenny (1986) steps requires a testing of the relationship between the work and family conflict constructs and the job embeddedness components. Following the finding for Hypotheses 3 and 4, Family-Work Conflict is only statistically related to Organisational Embeddedness–Links, and Work-Family Conflict is only correlated with Organisational Embeddedness–Sacrifice, and as a by-product, Organisational Embeddedness (Table 1). The third Baron and Kenny step is satisfied for the three job embeddedness components that met the second stage test.

The final Baron and Kenny step tests the extent to which the mediator carries the direct effect described in the first step. Table 2 reports on the regression for the three sets of relationships. In the case of Work-Family Conflict, Organisational Embeddedness –Sacrifice and Organisational Embeddedness do not act as mediators. Hypothesis 6 is not supported.

After testing for the role of Organisational Embeddedness–Links on the FWC and ITL relationship, it was found that the Links component completely mediated the relationship. A Sobel test confirmed the mediation (Sobel statistic = 2.13, $p<.05$) (MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, & Sheets 2002). Hypothesis 7 is supported.

DISCUSSION

Implications of these findings.
The findings of this paper are interesting in several ways. The first point of interest is that this paper demonstrates that both forms of family and work conflict appear to have a direct impact on the employee Intention to Leave. The more the employee experiences conflict between their work and home lives, greater the likelihood the employee has an inclination to leave.

The second interesting finding is that the type of family and work conflict is important. Employees who experience high levels of work-family conflict are much more likely to consider leaving their job \( (r(124)=.49, p<.01) \) than those experiencing high levels of family-work conflict \( (r(124)=.18, p<.05) \). This suggests that the adverse effects of work on home life is almost two and a half times more likely to prompt an employee to rethink their ongoing employment, than conflict at home that prompts conflict at work leads to thoughts of leaving. This can be seen in the insignificant mediating effect of job embeddedness on the relationship between work-family conflict and intention to leave.

Third, these findings demonstrate a connection between the work and family conflict and an employee’s job embeddedness. The more conflict arising from the conflict between work and home lives, the less embedded an employee. However, the effect of this tension is not experienced in terms of reduced fit-based organisational embeddedness as expected, but through reduced linkages and sacrifice. This finding will need to be tested in a larger sample, through longitudinal study and through employee interviews.

One explanation for these unexpected findings is that – perhaps – this analysis is skewed by the small sample size and insufficient power. This issue is discussed later. Another possible reason for the unusual results is the possibility that men and women experience family and work conflict differently. Although Gutek, Searle and Klepa (1991) have provided evidence that work and family conflict can be explained as a function of the time spent by an employee in their two roles, the majority of the literature supports a gender role based view of the origins of work-family conflict (Livingston & Judge 2008; McElwain, Korabik & Rosin 2005). In these accounts, women are argued to value their time in home-related activities more highly than men, and men are more likely to be relatively unaware of the family-time cost associated with their work. As a result, women are more likely to be affected by work-related impositions on their time in general, and home-life in particular,
as increased time allocated to work is time lost to family related activities; to evaluate work-related impositions as more conflicting than men as a consequence, and to be less likely to willingly accept the imposition of work on their family lives. This can be seen in Table 3, that lists the key correlations between work and family conflict, and the various embeddedness components, by gender.

---Table 3 about here---

Table 3 reports on the correlations between WFC and FWC and job embeddedness components, for male and female employees. For men job embeddedness was completely unrelated to the level of WFC experienced. There was a large correlation ($r(32)=-.53, p<.01$) between WFC and women’s Organisational Embeddedness-Sacrifice, and as a result, Organisational Embeddedness ($r(32)=-.4, p<.05$).

Both men and women reported that Organisational Embeddedness-Linkage was negatively associated with FWC, with men reporting a correlation of -.28 ($p<.01$) and women reporting a correlation of -.36 ($p<.05$). These correlations, however, were not statistically different. Accordingly, in this data set, men and women have statistically similar experiences of Work-Family Conflict.

These findings have serious implications for employers in addition to adding to our knowledge about the impact of work and life imbalance on employee retention intentions, the antecedents of job embeddedness, and the role of gender. A failure to properly engage with the lived experience of conflict between employee work and family lives can lead to employee turnover. Management practices aimed at minimising these conflicts, as well as providing necessary workplace flexibility and support could be of substantial benefits to employers struggling to cope with employee turnover in a labour market made up of increasingly mobile actors.

**Limitations and further research**

This research has several limitations. The first limitation is that, like much research in the social sciences, it relies on cross-sectional data to make inferences about the dynamics of employee behaviour. In this case, an employee’s work and family conflict at a point in time is compared with their job embeddedness and intention to leave at that same point in time, in order to make inferences about how work and family conflict impacts on employee decision-making over time. Ployhart and Vandenburg (2010), Pitariu and Ployhart (2010) and Ployhart, and Ward (in press) have argued that
research based on cross-sectional data is unable to make confident findings about processes that are essentially dynamic. In this case, the impact of work and family conflict can only really be measured by comparing how a change in work and life conflict results in a change in job embeddedness and intention to leave. Employees may have different levels of work and family conflict, but have no discernable differences in embeddedness or intention to leave due to habituation or necessity. Static analysis would be unable to reliably analyse the relationship, where longitudinal analysis would be able to distinguish between changes in levels of family and work conflict, the consequential changes in embeddedness (if any) and intention to leave.

The second limitation relates to the self-reported nature of the data. The same person assesses their level of family and work conflict, their level of embeddedness and their intention to leave. It is quite possible for some form of systematic bias – common method variance – to arise within the dataset, undermining its explanatory power. This problem again could be resolved by longitudinal study, by collecting predictor and predicted variables at different points, or through the use of additional data such as independent assessments of the employee’s work and family conflict, or components of their embeddedness, or by the use of turnover data.

This analysis is also limited by the small number of respondents (n=124). As can be seen in Table 1, the apparent correlations between the various job embeddedness components and family and work conflict sometimes lies between .02 and .2. A sample of 148 would be needed to detect an effect size of .2 with a power of .8. A sample of 2469 would be needed to detect an effect size of .05 with the same power (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner & Lang 2009). Further studies with larger samples will be needed.

These limitations would be overcome by additional research using larger samples – to overcome the effect-size issues – collected longitudinally, to identify the dynamic nature of this behaviour, and by the use of non-self-reported data.


Figure 1. Relationship between Work, Family conflict, Job Embeddedness and Intention to leave
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Table 1. Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intention to leave</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>[.7]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family-Work Conflict</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>[.91]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work-Family Conflict</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>[.95]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job embeddedness (z)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>[.84]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Off the Job Embeddedness (z)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>[.74]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organisational Embeddedness</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>[.86]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OE - Fit</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>[.78]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. OE-Links</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>[.81]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. OE-Sacrifice</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-.61**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * p<.05; ** p<.01; Cronbach alpha scores reported on the diagonal
Table 2. Job embeddedness components as mediators in the Work and family conflict and Intention to Leave relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FWC &amp; OE-Links</th>
<th></th>
<th>FWC &amp; OE</th>
<th></th>
<th>WFC &amp; OE-Sacrifice</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$SE\ b$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$SE\ b$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE-Links</td>
<td>-0.445</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE-Sacrifice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .03$ for Step 1*, $\Delta R^2 = .06$ for Step 2**

$R^2 = .03$ for Step 1*, $\Delta R^2 = .38$ for Step 2**

$R^2 = .24$ for Step 1***, $\Delta R^2 = .5$ for Step 2***

Dependent variable: Intention to leave
*p<.05, **p<.01
Table 3. Correlations: Job embeddedness by Work and Family Conflict and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FWC</th>
<th>WFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. OE-Fit</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OE-Linkages</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OE-Sacrifice</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Off-the Job-Embeddedness (z)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organisational Embeddedness</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Embeddedness (z)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p<.05; ** p<.01