International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 13 Issue 9, Sep 2023,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Examining Job Embeddedness across Demographics among Academicians in India

[1]**Neha Gupta**
Research Scholar,
Haryana School of Business,
GJUS&T, Hisar, Haryana,
Email ID-nehagupta2100@gmail.com

[2]**Vandana Singh**
Assistant Professor,
Haryana School of Business,
GJUS&T, Hisar, Haryana,
Email ID- vandana10march@gmail.com

Abstract

The current examines demographic differences in relation to job embeddedness among academicians in India. The sample collection was done from various public and private sector higher education institutions in India from 646 academicians. The demographics under study were age, gender, income level and marital status. The difference between public and private sector was also examined. Firstly factor structure was determined then t-test and other tests were applied. The overall job embeddedness was examined across various demographic dimensions. It was found that all the demographics revealed significant differences among themselves with respect to job embeddedness. The implications and conclusion are discussed in detail.

Keywords: Job Embeddedness, Public sector, Private sector, Demographic factors.

Introduction

Analysts and consultants have talked about turnover costs and developed strategies to reduce it, while academics and specialists theorised about why employees leave their job (Diemer, 1917; Eberle, 1919). Moreover, the education sector in India is not untouched with this calamity. Although teachers in India have always been held in the highest regards, from the rural schoolmaster to the faculty in university, their devotion and commitment towards their work is unmatched. Still higher education institutions in India are facing difficulty to find and keep excellent teachers due to shifting social, economic, demographic and psychological conditions (Dechawatanapaisal, 2018).

In the sociological literature, the concept of "embeddedness" has been employed to define the process by which social relations affect and confine economic conduct (Granovetter, 1985; Uzzi, 1996). Embeddedness is the concept that people can get so deeply ingrained in their environment and surroundings that they find it difficult to break free of it (Ng and Feldman, 2009). JE is a "web" of stifling influences that makes someone feel "stuck" in many facets of their life, including their family or their job. As a result, the concept of JE was created with the goal of illuminating the various elements that influence people's decisions to remain in their current positions (Mitchell et al., 2001).

Review of Literature

The engagement and embeddedness had distinct relationships with performance and desire to leave regarding which future research areas are explored (Halbesleben and Wheeler, 2008). "The combined factors that prevent a person from quitting his or her employment," defines job embeddedness (Yao et al., 2004). While work embeddedness has two aspects, organizational and community embeddedness (Mitchell et al., 2001), studies have shown that the organizational component outperforms the community dimension in predicting employee job success also, when relocating job is not an issue, the organizational factors outperforms the community dimension in predicting employee retention (Allen, 2006 & Lee et al., 2004). As a result, when it comes to job embeddedness, we confine our investigation to the organizational dimension in our research. Mitchell et al. (2001) defined JE as one's connectwith differentconstituents of the job, opinions of person-job fit, and the costs of resigning the job.

The linkages part of embeddedness implies that workers have official and unofficial relationships with other entities on the job, and that as the number of such links rises, so does embeddedness (Holtomet al., 2006).

Fit means alignment of an employee's aims and values with the company; more fit means greater embeddedness (Holtom et al., 2006).

Sacrifice refers to the observed financial and social consequences of quitting the company. The higher the perceived expenses, the more embeddedness there is (Holtom et al., 2006). Gonzalez et al., 2006 addresses employment embeddedness encapsulates aspects of one's connection to one's job, comparable to the hypothesized function of arrangement in attachment.Despite the fact that both work involvement and JE arose from the positive psychology movement (Maslach et al., 2001), researchers have not thoroughly investigated

the parallels and contrasts between the two conceptions.Workers who have children show a greater degree of organisational and societal sacrifice than those who do not; employees who own a house demonstrate a high level of organisational and societal sacrifice than those who do not.

Furthermore, relationship between community-related JE and performance were found positive, and a negative relationship between organization-related JE and burnout (Candan, 2016). Affective commitment was favourably connected to organisational embeddedness and all of its characteristics. Satisfactionwith the job and engagement in job moderated the effects of organisational embeddedness, fit, and sacrifice on emotional commitment to some extent (Ampofo, 2020).

According to Felps et al. (2009), people who leave their jobs because of their colleagues' job embeddedness and job-hunting habits are more likely to do so, as well. Mitchell, et al. (2001) found that JEis able to predict primary outcomes i.e. 'voluntary' turnover and 'intend to depart' and is able to explain considerable additional variation over and beyond satisfaction in job and commitment with the organisation.

According to the findings of Hussain&Deery (2018), there is a strong connection between transformational leadership and JE. Work characteristics play an important role in explaining the link between transformational type of leadership and JE. Workers would be inspired to work in team productively in tough work environments if they had leaders who were transformational. A connection was found between Kapil and Rastogi's (2020) primary research factors. The association between organisational characteristics, including leader-member interchange, work engagement, and organisational citizenship behavior, was partly mediated by organisational job embedding (OJE). For the sake of explaining the link between transformational leadership and work embeddedness, Khalid et al. (2021) found that job characteristics operate as a moderator and supported the finding that leadership style has a major influence. In tough work environments, transformational leaders would encourage their staff to work together in constructive ways.

According to recent research by Nguyen et al. (2017) many factors may influence job embeddedness. A further finding identified a link between work embeddedness and these organisational factors: a positive perception of support from one's employer. As demonstrated by Afsar et al. (2018), embeddedness in the workplace impacts the effects of

high-performance work practises and trust of supervisor on turnover intentions, and turnover intentions positively influence intended departure.

As Smith and colleagues (2022) discovered, since performance is linked to WSSW, the negative impacts of abusive supervision on job satisfaction are amplified. Thus, research shows that, when work performance (and self-worth) improves, "abusive supervision" diminishes job embedding and promotes turnover via two measures of pleasure. For both theory and practise, we explain how these insights might be used. On-the-job embeddedness predicts emotional commitment, according to Philip and Craven. (2022). In any of the studies, there was no correlation between community involvement and organizational commitment. Park et al. (2021) found that emotional commitment impacts the relationship of work embeddedness on in-role and extra-role service behaviors, whereas a supervisor's behavioral fluctuations moderates the effect of commitment on in-role and extra-role service behavior. According to Huang et al. (2021), socialization strategies directly influence work embeddedness, which in turn influences emotional commitment. Embeddedness and socializing strategies have a substantial moderating influence on workplace spirituality.

Also, occupational embeddedness and emotional commitment are influenced by workplace spirituality. It was highlighted in a research that as the income from the present job increases the propensity to leave the job decreases Griffeth et al (2000). JE plays an important role in predicting turnover in different job types, variety of job characteristics in different demographic arenas Holdom&Inderrieden (2006).Mallol et al., (2007), found that JE was significantly able to predict voluntary turnoveracross all races however Allen and Shannock (2012) contradicted in their findings.

Objectives of the Study

- To determine the factors of job embeddedness among academicians.
- To compare public sector and private sector with respect to job embeddedness among academicians in India.
- To study job embeddedness across demographics such as gender, marital status, income level and age among academicians in India.

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 13 Issue 9, Sep 2023,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Methodology

The data was collected from 646 academicians working in higher education institutions in India through convenience sampling method. The instrument used to collect the data was through questionnaire method which was adapted from composite scale of JE given by Mitchell et al. (2001) consisting of 38 statements on 5 point Likert scale. Demographic outline of the sample is shown in table 1

Table 1 Demography of the Sample

Demographic Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age	25-35	185	28.64
	35-45	257	39.78
	above 45	204	31.58
	Total	**646**	**100.0**
Gender	Male	339	52.48
	Female	307	47.52
	Total	**646**	**100.0**
Marital Status	Married	444	68.74
	Unmarried	202	31.26
	Total	**646**	**100**
Your university/institute	Public	271	41.95
	Private	375	58.05
	Total	**646**	**100.0**
Annual income	3-7 lakhs	271	41.95
	7-11 lakhs	191	29.56
	11-15 lakhs	105	16.25
	Above 15 lakhs	79	12.24
	Total	**646**	**100.0**

Source: - Primary Survey

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 13 Issue 9, Sep 2023,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Data Analysis

Determining the factors of Job Embeddedness among academicians

Table 2 shows the adequacy of sample size of 646 responses for factor analysis. Sample adequacy was confirmed with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure which turned out to .936 which is considered adequate (Kaiser, 1974; Sofroniou, & Hutcheson, 1999) showing adequacy. Bartlett's test of sphericity in case of present study turned out to be 24024.305 with 703 degrees of freedom at a significance level of .000 which further reinforces that the corelation matrix is not an identity matrix which is required for formulation of factors. For stating the factors clearly, only those statements are considered which have loadings exceeding value 0.60 and communalities > 0.5 (Field, 2013). After analysis it was found that statements SO11, SO12, SO13, FO9 and FO10 were not fitting in the parameters hence they were deleted. Finally there were 33 statements left.

Table 2

Factor Determination

Item	**Factors Loading**								
Codes	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**Communalities**	**Alpha value**
LCI	.828	-	-	-	-	-	-	.943	**0.648**
LC2	.843	-	-	-	-	-	-	.934	
LC3	.826	-	-	-	-	-	-	.951	
FC1	-	.868	-	-	-	-	-	.861	
FC2	-	.847	-	-	-	-	-	.832	
FC3	--	.845	-	-	-	-	-	.852	
FC4	-	.828	-	-	-	-	-	.825	
FC5	-	.757	-	-	-	-	-	.688	
SC1	-	-	.810	-	-	-	-	.843	
SC2	-	-	.774	-	-	-	-	.845	

SC3	-	-	.797	-	-	-	-	.881	
LO1	-	-	-	.788	-	-	-	.837	
LO2	-	-	-	.798	-	-	-	.824	
LO3	-	-	-	.772	-	-	-	.823	
LO4	-	-	-	.761	-	-	-	.816	
FO1	-	-	-	-	.714	-	-	.636	
FO2	-	-	-	-	.846	-	-	.779	
FO3	-	-	-	-	.842	-	-	.767	
FO4	-	-	-	-	.710	-	-	.550	
FO5	-	--	-	-	.806	-	-	.748	
FO6	-	-	-	-	.825	-	-	.800	
FO7	-	-	-	-	.786	-	-	.720	
FO8	-	-	-	-	.825	-	-	.771	
SO1	-	-	-	-	-	.846	-	.760	
SO2	-	-	-	-	-	.861	-	.784	
SO3	-	-	-	-	-	.784	-	.649	
SO4	-	-	-	-	-	.793	-	.689	
SO5	-	-	-	-	-	.839	-	.741	
SO6	-	-	-	-	-	.853	-	.747	
SO7	-	-	-	-	-	.869	-	.771	
SO8	-	-	-	-	-	.852	-	.754	
SO9	-	-				.829		.709	
SO10	-	-				.827		.710	
SO11	**-**	**-**				**.503**		**.355**	

SO12	**-**	**-**				**.449**		**.400**	
SO13	**-**	**-**				**.432**		**.321**	
FO9	**-**	**-**					**.463**	**.460**	
FO10	**-**	**-**					**.362**	**.249**	

Examining job embeddedness across public sector and private sector educational institutions

For this purpose, the two dimensions of job embeddedness namely community job embeddedness and organizational job embeddedness are analysed along with the demographic variable namely academicians of public (government) sector and academicians of private sector are compared with the help of t- value.

The following hypotheses were formulated.

H_{01}: There is no significant difference in JE among academicians of public sector and private sector.

Table 3 shows the results of independent sample t-test on the basis of public sector academicians and private sector academicians. The independent samples t-test ($p \leq 0.01$) is used to find out the difference in the community job embeddedness, organization job embeddedness and overall job embeddedness among public (government) sector academicians and private sector academicians.

Table 3: Difference in job embeddedness and factors across sectors

Variable	**Mean**		**Std. Deviation**		**T-test for equality of mean**		**Mean difference**	**Hypothesis**
	Public (271)	**Private (375)**	**Public**	**Private**	**T-test**	**Sig. (two tailed)**		
Job Embeddedness	10.776	10.335	1.531	1.674	5.028	.000*	0.224	**Rejected (H_{01})**

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 13 Issue 9, Sep 2023,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Source: Primary Data, Note: *Significance at <1%

(a) Job embeddedness: Public (government)/ private sector

The mean values of job embeddedness for public (government) sector academicians and private sector academicians are 10.776 and 10.335 with standard deviation 1.531 and 1.674 respectively. The mean difference for job embeddedness is 0.224. On the basis of mean value, it is concluded that public (government) sector academicians are having high job embeddedness than the private sector academicians. The t-value is 5.028 and is found statistically significant (p=0.000) at 1% of significance which indicates that there is a significant difference in the job embeddedness between public (government) sector academicians and private sector academicians. Thus, on the basis of significance values the null hypothesis, (H_{01}) is rejected.

Job embeddedness across gender

Hypothesis formulation

H_{02}: There is no significant difference in JE among academicians based on gender.

Table 4 the independent samples t-test is applied to find out the difference in job embeddednessbased on gender. The t-value and significance value are calculated to examine the difference between male and female academicians.

Table 4 Comparison of job embeddedness among academicians based on gender

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	SD	Mean difference	t-value	p-value	Hypothesis
Job Embeddedness	Male	339	3.650	.718	0.186	3.172	.002*	**Rejected (H_{02})**
	Female	307	3.467	.771				

Source: Primary Data, Note: *Significance at <1%

The mean values of job embeddedness for male and female respondents are 3.650 and 3.4647 with mean difference of 0.186. The t-value is 3.172 which is statistically significant (p=.002*) at 1% of significance level which indicate that there is a significant difference in

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 13 Issue 9, Sep 2023,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

the job embeddednessamong male and female**.** Based on mean value, it is concluded that the male respondents have higher job embeddedness than female respondents. Thus, the null hypothesis, (H_{02}), there is no significant difference in job embeddedness based on gender is rejected.

Job embeddedness across marital status

H_{03}: There is no significant difference in JE among academicians based on marital status.

Table 5 the independent samples t-test is applied to find out the difference in job embeddednessbased on marital status. The t-value and significance value are calculated to examine the difference between married and unmarried academicians. The mean values of job embeddedness for married respondents are 3.664 and for unmarried respondent is 3.337. The mean difference for job embeddedness is 0.327. The t-value is 5.249 which is statistically significant (p=.000) at 1% level of significance which indicate that there is a significant difference in job embeddedness among married and unmarried academicians**.** Based on the mean value, it is concluded that the married respondents are having higher level of job embeddedness than unmarried respondents. Thus, the hypothesis, (H_{03}), there is no significant difference in job embeddedness based on material status is rejected.

Table 5Comparison of job embeddedness among academicians based on Marital Status

Variable	Marital Status	N	Mean	SD	Mean difference	t-value	p-value	Hypothesis
Job Embeddedness	Married	444	3.664	.680	0.327	5.249	.000*	**Reject (H_{03})**
	Unmarried	202	3.337	.841				

Source: Primary Data, Note: *Significance at <1%

Job embeddedness across income level

Table 6 to test the difference in job embeddedness among academicians across income, one way ANOVA is applied. Table 6 shows results along with descriptive statistics. As depicted from the results Levene's test comes out to be -3.357 with .001 level of significance, hence the assumption of homogeneity is violated. To accept or reject the hypothesis (H_{04}), Welch test is considered. The value of Welch test is 5.847 with .001 level

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 13 Issue 9, Sep 2023,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

of significant so the null hypothesis (H_{04}) is rejected depicting that the income groups have significant differences among them. Now, in order to find out the difference between different groups Games-Howell is applied.

For calculating the results on income following hypothesis is formulated.

H_{04}: There is no significant difference in JE among academicians based on income level.

Table 6 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) based on income.

Variable	Income group	N	Mean	SD	Levene's (sig.)	F Value (sig.)	Welch (Sig.)	Hypothesis
Job embeddedness	3-7 lakhs	791	3.40	.615	-3.357 (.001*)	5.574 (.001*)	5.847 (.001*)	**Rejected (H_{04})**
	7-11 lakhs	191	3.58	.509				
	11-15 lakhs	105	3.36	.594				
	Above 15 lakhs	79	3.52	.429				

Source: Primary Data, Note: *Significance at <1%

Post hoc table 7 clearly explains where the difference among groups exists. Game Howell method is used to reveal which income groups differ significantly among themselves. Post hoc is applied on four income groups which are group 1 (3-7 lakhs), group 2 (7 -11 lakhs), group 3 (11-15 lakhs) and the last one is (above 15 lakhs). The multiple comparisons using Games-Howell test, result revealed that mean difference for (Group 1) significantly differs with income group of (7-11 lakhs) and (above 15) at $p<0.01$. There is no significant difference found, among different income groups in context of (Group 2). While the mean difference for (Group 3) of income groups for (3-7 lakhs), (7-11 Lakhs) and (above 15 lakhs) is found significant ($p<0.01$). Also, the mean difference for (Group 4) of income group (7-11 lakhs) is found significant ($p<0.01$).

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 13 Issue 9, Sep 2023,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Table 7 Post hoc analysis for academicians across income

Multiple Comparisons				
Variable	**Income Group (in Lakhs)**		**Games-Howell**	
			Mean Difference	**Sig.**
Job Embeddedness	3-7 lakhs (Group 1)	7-11 lakhs	-.182	.002*
		11-15 lakhs	.045	.914
		above 15 lakhs	-.121	.195
	7-11 lakhs (Group 2)	3-7 lakhs	.193	.003*
		11-15 lakhs	.227	.005*
		above 15 lakhs	.060	.753
	11-15 lakhs (Group 3)	3-7 lakhs	-.045	.914
		7-11 lakhs	-.247	.005*
		above 15 lakhs	-.166	.125
	above 15 lakhs (Group 4)	3-7 lakhs	.121	.195
		7-11 lakhs	-.060	.753
		11-15 lakhs	.166	.125

Source: Primary Data, Note: *Significance at <1%

Negative mean difference disclosed that in context of group 1 (3-7 lakhs) academicians in income of (7-11 lakhs) are significantly better than those in income of (above15 lakhs). Similarly in context of group 3 (11-15 lakhs) academicians in income of (7-11 lakhs) are significantly better than those in income of (3-7 lakhs) and (above15 lakhs). Further, in context of group 4 (above 15 lakhs) academicians in income of (7-11 lakhs) is significant. Hence, groups that have significant difference show higher job embeddedness among academicians.

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 13 Issue 9, Sep 2023,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Job embeddedness across age groups

H_{05}: There is no significant difference in JE among academicians based on age.

To test the difference in job embeddedness among academicians across age, one way ANOVA is applied. Table 8 shows results along with descriptive statistics. As depicted from the results Levene's test comes out to be -4.061 with .001 level of significance, hence the assumption of homogeneity is violated. To accept or reject the hypothesis (H_{05}), Welch test is considered. The value of Welch test is 9.456 with .001 level of significance so that the null hypothesis (H_{05}) is rejected which means that a significant difference exists between age groups. Now in order to find out the difference between different groups Games Howell is applied.

Table 8 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) based on age.

Variable	Age group	N	Mean	SD	Levene's (sig)	F Value (sig)	Welch (Sig.)	Hypothesis
Job embeddedness	25-35	185	3.30	.637	-4.061 (.001)	11.166 (.000*)	9.456 (.000*)	**Rejected (H_{05})**
	35-45	257	3.52	.522				
	above 45	204	3.53	.526				

Source: Primary Data, Note: *Significance at <1%

Post hoc analysis shown in table 9 clearly explains where the difference among groups exactly exists. Game Howell method is used for this purpose, the three age groups are group 1 (25-35), group 2 (35-45) and group 3 (above 45). Multiple comparisons using Games-Howell test reveal that mean difference for (Group 1) of age groups for (35-45) and (above 45) is significant at p>0.001. While the mean difference for (Group 2) of age groups for (above 45) was found significant (p<0.01). There is no considerable difference among the different age groups in the context of (Group 3). Negative mean difference disclosed that in context of group 1 academicians in the age of 35-45 and above 45 are significantly better than the age group of 25-35. Similarly for group 2 those academicians in the age of above 45 is better than the age group of 25-35. Hence, groups that have significant difference show higher job embeddedness among academicians.

International Journal of Research in Social Sciences
Vol. 13 Issue 9, Sep 2023,
ISSN: 2249-2496 Impact Factor: 7.081
Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com
Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gate as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

Table 9 Post hoc analysis for academicians across age

Variable	Age		Games-Howell	
			Mean Difference	Sig.
Job Embeddedness	25-35 (Group 1)	35-45	-.124	.000*
		Above 45	-.236	.003*
	35-45 (Group 2)	25-35	.224	.000*
		Above 45	-.012	.855
	Above 45 (Group 3)	25-35	.236	.000*
		35-45	.214	.969

Source: Primary Data, Note: *Significance at <1%

Conclusion

The paper firstly finds out the statements that form the basis of job embeddedness among academicians by applying factor analysis thus eliminating a few statements which were not meeting the threshold criteria. Then the various hypotheses relating to age, gender, income level, marital status and type of organization were tested by applying t-test and ANOVA. All the hypotheses were rejected thus showing that academicians show different levels of job embeddedness based on their age, gender, marital status, income level and type of organization. In overall job embeddedness it was seen that the public sector academicians are more embedded than the private sector academicians in their job. The difference among respondents with various age groups it is concluded that on the basis of age the academicians who are in the age group of 35-45 and above 45 are more embedded to their jobs than to those who are in the age group of 25-35. Further in terms of income it is observed that those academicians who are in income group of 7-11 lakhs are most embedded in their job than those who are earning between 3-7 lakhs,11-15 lakhs and above 15 lakhs. In comparison to female academicians, male academicians were found to be more embedded to their job. Also the married academicians are more embedded then the unmarried academicians.

References

1. Afsar, B., Shahjehan, A. and Shah, S.I. (2018), "Frontline employees' high-performance work practices, trust in supervisor, job-embeddedness and turnover intentions in hospitality industry", International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 1436-1452.
2. Allen, D. G. (2006). Do organizational socialization tactics influence newcomer embeddedness and turnover?. *Journal of management*, *32*(2), 237-256.
3. Allen, D. G., &Shanock, L. R. (2013). Perceived organizational support and embeddedness as key mechanisms connecting socialization tactics to commitment and turnover among new employees. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34(3), 350-369.
4. Ampofo, E. T. (2020). Mediation effects of job satisfaction and work engagement on the relationship between organisational embeddedness and affective commitment among frontline employees of star–rated hotels in Accra. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *44*, 253-262.
5. Candan, H. (2016). A research on the relationship between job embeddedness with performance and burnout of academicians in Turkey. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, *18*(3), 68-80.
6. Diemer, H. (1917). Causes of" Turnover" Among College Faculties. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 71(1), 216-224.
7. Dechawatanapaisal, D. (2018). Employee retention: the effects of internal branding and brand attitudes in sales organizations. Personnel Review, 47(3), 675-693.
8. Eberle, G. J. (1919). Labor turnover. The American Economic Review, 9(1), 79-82.
9. Felps, W., Mitchell, T. R., Hekman, D. R., Lee, T. W., Holtom, B. C., & Harman, W. S. (2009). Turnover contagion: How coworkers' job embeddedness and job search behaviors influence quitting. Academy of management journal, 52(3), 545-561.
10. Field, A. (2013). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics. Sage.
11. Griffeth, R.W.;Hom, P.W.&Gaertner, S. (2000), A Metaanalysis of Antecedents and Correlates of Employee Turnover, Update, Moderator Tests, and Research Implications for the Next Millennium, Journal of Management, 26(3), 463-488.

12. Granovetter, M. (1985). The problem of embeddedness. American journal of sociology, 91(3), 481-510.

13. Halbesleben, J. R., & Wheeler, A. R. (2008). The relative roles of engagement and embeddedness in predicting job performance and intention to leave. Work & Stress, 22(3), 242-256.

14. Holdom, B.C. &Inderrieden, E.J. (2006) Integrating the Unfolding Model and Job Embeddedness Model to Better Understand Voluntary Turnover. Journalof Managerial Issues,18(4), 435-452.

15. Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., & Lee, T. W. (2006). Increasing human and social capital by applying job embeddedness theory. Organizational Dynamics, 35, 316–331.

16. Huang, H. L., Cheng, L. K., Sun, P. C., Jiang, Y. S., & Lin, H. H. (2021). Relationship among social tactics, job embeddedness, and affective commitment in newcomers: the moderating effect of workplace spirituality. Journal of Management & Organization, 1-21

17. Hussain, T., &Deery, S. (2018). Why do self-initiated expatriates quit their jobs: The role of job embeddedness and shocks in explaining turnover intentions. International Business Review, 27(1), 281-288.

18. Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. psychometrika, 39(1), 31-36.

19. Kapil, K. and Rastogi, R. (2020), "The relationship between leader-member exchange, work engagement and organizational citizenship behaviour", Journal of Indian Business Research, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 191-214.

20. Khalid, U., Mushtaq, R., Khan, A.Z. and Mahmood, F. (2021), "Probing the impact of transformational leadership on job embeddedness: the moderating role of job characteristics", Management Research Review, Vol. 44 No. 8, pp. 1139-1156.

21. Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Sablynski, C. J., Burton, J. P., &Holtom, B. C. (2004). The effects of job embeddedness on organizational citizenship, job performance, volitional absences, and voluntary turnover. *Academy of management journal*, *47*(5), 711-722.

22. Mallol, C. M., Holtom, B. C., & Lee, T. W. (2007). Job embeddedness in a culturally diverse environment. Journal of Business and Psychology, 22, 35-44.

23. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual review of psychology*, *52*(1), 397-422.

24. Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablynski, C. J., &Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of management journal*, *44*(6), 1102-1121.

25. Nguyen, V.Q., Taylor, G.S. and Bergiel, E. (2017), "Organizational antecedents of job embeddedness", Management Research Review, Vol. 40 No. 11, pp. 1216-1235.

26. Park, I. J., Zhu, D., Doan, T., & Kim, P. B. (2021). Stay away from fickle supervisor! Supervisors' behavioral fluctuation diminishing the effect of job embeddedness on employees' service behavior. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 95, 102893.

27. Philip, J. and Medina-Craven, M.N. (2022), "An examination of job embeddedness and organizational commitment in the context of HRD practices", Management Research Review. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-03-2021-0224.

28. Smith, T. A., Boulamatsi, A., Dimotakis, N., Tepper, B. J., Runnalls, B. A., Reina, C. S., &Lucianetti, L. (2022). "How dare you?!": A self-verification perspective on how performance influences the effects of abusive supervision on job embeddedness and subsequent turnover. Personnel Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12494.

29. Sofroniou, N., & Hutcheson, G. D. (1999). The multivariate social scientist: Introductory statistics using generalized linear models. The Multivariate Social Scientist, 1-288.

30. Uzzi, B. (1996). The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. American sociological review, 674-698.

31. Yao, X., Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Burton, J. P., &Sablynski, C. S. (2004). Job embeddedness: Current research and future directions. Understanding employee retention and turnover, 153-187.