



JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES DEVELOPMENT

www.jssd.org.pk



ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING AND JOB EMBEDDEDNESS: THE MEDIATION OF ROLE AMBIGUITY ACROSS INDIVIDUAL, GROUP, ORGANIZATIONAL, AND INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL LEVELS

Kamran Naeem¹, Amjad Khan², Nidal Fawwaz Al Qudah³ & Imran Naeem⁴

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Mir Chakar Khan Rind University, Sibi, Pakistan, Email: kamran.naeem@mckru.edu.pk

²Department of Economics, University College Zhob, BUIITEMS, Pakistan, Email: amjadkhan90@yahoo.com

³Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Ajloun National University, Ajloun, Jordan, Email: nidal.alqudah@anu.edu.jo

⁴Examination Department, University of Balochistan, Quetta, Pakistan, Email: imrannaeem06@yahoo.com

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Organizational learning; job embeddedness; role ambiguity; employee retention	Organizational learning has allied with employee and organizational performance, but limited attention has given to the processes through which organizational learning processes contribute to employees' job embeddedness. This study examines the relationship between organizational learning and job embeddedness and explains the mediating role of role ambiguity. Organizational learning studied on four levels: individual-level learning, group-level learning, organizational-level learning, and inter-organizational-level learning. A quantitative, cross-sectional research design used for study, and data collected through a structured questionnaire from 245 employees working in service-sector organizations in Pakistan. Regression analysis and bootstrapping was used to test the proposed relationships and mediation effects. The findings reveals that organizational learning and sub levels are positively related with job embeddedness and negatively with role ambiguity. Whereas role ambiguity is negatively related with job embeddedness. The study explores that role ambiguity significantly mediates the relationships between organizational learning (and each of its four levels) with job embeddedness. The findings suggest that organizational learning helps employees' job embeddedness by creating opportunities for knowledge acquisition, social connection, reducing uncertainty regarding roles, responsibilities, authority, and performance expectations.
ARTICLE HISTORY	 2026 Journal of Social Sciences Development
Date of Submission: 11-08-2026	
Date of Acceptance: 25-09-2026	
Date of Publication: 03-10-2026	
Corresponding Author	
Email:	kamran.naeem@mckru.edu.pk
DOI	https://doi.org/10.59075/jssd.v5i8.335
Volume/Issue	5(8), 2026, 32-45

Introduction

Employee retention continues to be a major concern for organizations as losing experience of employee may affect organizational performance, profitability, knowledge retention, social relationships, and service quality. Mitchell and lee (2001) studied reasons for employees quitting and found that employee has at times reasons for staying in their organizations, which was termed job embeddedness (JE) that considers employee retention as a multidimensional phenomenon, emerging from the extent to which an employee is connected to and constrained by his or her job and surrounding environments (Mitchell et al., 2001).

Job embeddedness is different from the traditional approaches to turnover. Job embeddedness focuses the combination of forces that link employees to their job and organization. Recent studies suggest that job embeddedness is giving more importance to employee retention and organizational outcomes (Majumdarr & Shilpee A. Dasgupta, 2024; Malalage & Perera, 2025). The concept of job embeddedness has developed on three dimensions: links, fit, and sacrifice. Links are formal and informal connections that employees develop in and out of the organization, fit is the perceived compatibility of employee with the organization, environment and job tasks, and sacrifice is the material and psychological benefits and attachments employees believe they would give up if they left (Mitchell et al., 2001). Recent studies continues to frame job embeddedness as an important construct for understanding employee retention beyond conventional turnover and its antecedents. (Li jing et al., 2025; Majumdarr & Shilpee A. Dasgupta, 2024).

Organizational learning refers to processes through which organizations acquire, interpret, share, retain and apply knowledge which helps to develop framework of organizational action and adaptation (Argote, 2011; Fiol & Lyles, 1985). Organizational learning is more than formal training activities; it includes system, structure, where development and sharing of knowledge occurs at individuals, groups, organizational, and inter-organizational levels. Studies continue to emphasize that organizational learning is an integral system framework for organizational adaptation, innovation, knowledge renewal, and effectiveness for long-term outcomes (Balarezo et al., 2024). Organizational learning is therefore a process through which employees gain information, develop competencies and exchange knowledge. Organizational learning is multilevel in nature, and this is especially important to understand employee attitudes and behaviors for better organizational learning. Knowledge is often acquired by organizations through experiences of employees, communication, partnerships, professional networks, alliances, suppliers, customers, regulators, and other external stakeholders.

Role ambiguity is a stressor at organization that affects employee attitudes and behaviors. Studies indicates that role ambiguity can contribute to mitigate unfavorable employee attitudes (Junça Silva & Rodrigues, 2024). Job-related information more readily available and accessible by organizational learning may reduce employees' role ambiguity. Individual learning helps employees with their skills, information related to job, tasks and performance feedback that can make workplace demands clearer. At group level learning, information sharing, collective interpretation, and communication can help employees build an understanding of roles,

responsibilities, authorities, and work processes. The information developed at group level learning is used by the organizational level learning, which are transformed into standard operating procedures (SOPs), policies, job descriptions, training programs, and organizational routines which helps in institutionalize learning. Inter-organizational learning guides employees understand expectations in roles which develop their professional standards, outside knowledge and practices (Balarezo et al., 2024; Crossan et al., 1999).

Employees with role ambiguity may find it difficult to see compatibility with the job and environment, because uncertainty can disturb coordination and interpersonal interactions. Role ambiguity may also erode social, professional, and work-related ties which eventually disturb their performance outcomes. Eventually these employees are negatively perceived and considered low performing, decrease their involvement due to incompatibility and may be barred from other organizational benefits, which are harmful repercussions of role ambiguity (Junça Silva & Rodrigues, 2024). The circumstances with less role ambiguity comprehending employee embeddedness has also been reaffirmed by research on role clarity and job embeddedness. Fang et al. (2025) investigated the relationship between job embeddedness and role clarity and found psychological mechanisms linking employees' embeddedness to clarity-related work experiences (Fang et al., 2025).

Based on the literature, theoretical understanding is used to understand the relationship between job embeddedness and organizational learning. Therefore, organizational learning can enhance employees' understanding of their responsibilities, make them more compatible with organizational procedures, foster social relationships at organization and outside organization, which increases the perceived worth of belonging to the organization. Role ambiguity represents an important construct within this process because information and knowledge acquired through organizational learning at various levels may reduce uncertainty about responsibilities and expectations, thereby facilitating stronger job embeddedness. Studies related to job embeddedness has explored antecedents, including social support, job resources, organizational practices, psychological states, and work-related experiences ((Majumdar & Shilpee A. Dasgupta, 2024; Malalage & Perera, 2025), the impact of role ambiguity between organizational learning as a multilevel antecedent of job embeddedness remains unexplored.

This study addresses this gap by exploring the relationship between organizational learning as a multilevel antecedent of job embeddedness and by investigates the mediating role of role ambiguity.

The study contributes to the literature by extending job embeddedness research and identifies organizational learning as an important organizational antecedent of employees' embeddedness. It also contributes to organizational learning research by examining whether learning at various levels impact job embeddedness only focusing organizational performance. The study also identifies role ambiguity as an explanatory construct through which organizational learning may impact job embeddedness.

Theoretical Framework

Job embeddedness is a factor which makes employees stay and have a broad array of influences on employee retention structured across three dimensions: Fit (perceived compatibility), Links (formal/informal connections), and Sacrifice (cost of leaving). Organizational learning is an important mechanism that strengthens these dimensions across all four levels: individual level learning, group level learning, organizational level learning, and inter-organizational level learning.

The individual level learning primarily occurs through personal intuition and cognitive interpretation (Crossan et al., 1999). As employees acquire knowledge including the tacit knowledge, their domain competence increases their subjective sense of person-job fit (Abdelwahed & Doghan, 2023). High individual competence increases psychological capital, raising the perceived cost of leaving the organization termed as sacrifice, as employees build localized professional and social equity with the current roles (AlQudah et al., 2023; Dapeng et al., 2019). Group-level learning employee communicates and develops shared sense-making, interactive dialogue, and team-level knowledge integration (Edmondson, 1999). This brings psychological safety, developing interpersonal networks among peers with mutual reliance, called links (Pervez et al., 2022; Zafar et al., 2026). At organizational-level learning the knowledge gets institutionalized in policies, culture and repositories (Levitt & March, 1988). When these employees express strong learning perceived high organizational support, eventually reinforcing organizational fit (Naeem et al., 2026). Formal developmental practices increase structural sacrifice, as leaving would mean forfeiting institutional growth opportunities (Naeem et al., 2019) (Naeem et al., 2019). When these employees participate in inter-organizational communication through strategic alliances, joint ventures, industry networks, and supply chain knowledge-sharing they develop external social capital and industry wide knowledge which expands the links and increases the personal fit (Abdelwahed & Doghan, 2023; Powell & Koput, 1996). Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:

H1: Organizational learning has positive impact on job embeddedness.

H1a: Individual level learning has positive impact on job embeddedness.

H1b: Group level learning has positive impact on job embeddedness.

H1c: Organizational level learning has positive impact on job embeddedness.

H1d: Inter-organizational level learning has positive impact on job embeddedness.

Employee with unclear role, lack of actionable information, unclear authority and responsibility guidelines and unclear performance outcomes are termed role ambiguity (Kahn, 1964). It acts as an important job demand that depletes employee energy whereas organizational learning functions as a resource generator that helps to reduce uncertainty (Bakker, n.d.; Shinde, 2025). The relationship between OL and RA is reciprocal: OL reduces systemic ambiguity, while unmanaged ambiguity disrupts the learning process (Bakker, n.d.; March & Olsen, 1975). On individual level learning employee gets clarified domain boundaries and performance

expectations but it triggers cognitive overload (Jo & Shin, 2025; Khumalo & Olaleye, 2025; Shinde, 2025). At group level learning it helps to establish shared norms and alignment of team responsibilities but causes communication misalignment learning (Khumalo & Olaleye, 2025). Group level learning allows members to continuously negotiate and realign overlapping responsibilities and authorities, clarifying expectations and reduce ambiguity (Edmondson, 1999). At organizational level they codify the processes into SOPs, job descriptions, schedule of powers/authority, which systematically dismantle ambiguity across organization (Jo & Shin, 2025; Shinde, 2025). At interorganizational level learning it helps to define and develop relational governance and boundary spanning role. Ambiguity regarding partner intentions or property rights inhibits knowledge transfer and leads to opportunistic friction in inter-firm collaborations (Kale et al., 2000). Therefore, we can propose following hypothesis:

H2: Organizational learning has negative impact on Role Ambiguity.

H2a: Individual level learning has negative impact on Role Ambiguity.

H2b: Group level learning has negative impact on Role Ambiguity.

H2c: Organizational level learning has negative impact on Role Ambiguity.

H2d: Inter-organizational level learning has negative impact on Role Ambiguity.

Role ambiguity is source of role stress, anxiety, and psychological burnout (Rizzo et al., 1970). When employee face uncertainty about their performance, as performance outcomes are not clear, the fit with the job and organization deteriorates. Which leads to interpersonal conflicts (Pervez et al., 2022). Vague job boundaries generate task overlaps, misplaced accountability, and interpersonal friction, weakening professional relationships and social links (Shinde, 2025). When employee experience role ambiguity the perceived opportunity cost of leaving the firm (sacrifice) declines significantly (Khumalo & Olaleye, 2025). Leaving an organization with ambiguous roles which eventually causes stress and conflicts viewed as a net positive gain rather than a sacrifice (Dapeng et al., 2019). keeping in view of the literature we propose the following hypothesis.

H3: Role Ambiguity has negative impact on job embeddedness.

Organization learning and job embeddedness cannot analyze directly as there are several factors which influences and impacts their connection. The study focuses on role ambiguity as one of the mediating factors in between organizational learning and job embeddedness. As individual employees, they engage in continuous learning and skill acquisition, which is merely self-direct. The role ambiguity can influence the relationship, and organizational learning can also help to reduce role ambiguity and enhances the task clarity, self-efficacy, and clear understanding of performance standards (Abdelwahed & Doghan, 2023; Shinde, 2025). Reduced role ambiguity minimizes emotional exhaustion and cognitive strain. Enhancing their perceived person-job fit and increasing the perceived relational sacrifice of leaving (Khumalo & Olaleye, 2025). In group level learning interactive dialogue, team-based knowledge integration of collaborative learning environments and psychological safety establish clear group norms and peer dependencies, systematically reduces role ambiguity across team members (Zafar et al., 2026).

At low ambiguity interpersonal task overlapping and operation friction declines and develop trusting relationships (Mitchell et al., 2001; Shinde, 2025) . Organizational-level learning involves institutionalizing knowledge into systems by developing SOPs, job descriptions, policies and culture (Levitt & March, 1988) , Employees experience higher person-organization fit feels that leaving the organization mean forfeiting a transparent, well-structured work environment (sacrifice) (Naeem et al., 2026) . Role ambiguity serves as a main structural mediator: institutionalized learning removes organizational uncertainty, creating a supportive climate that binds employees to the organization. Inter-organizational learning mechanisms define explicit boundary-spanning roles, preventing role ambiguity for employees operating at the firm's boundaries (Abdelwahed & Doghan, 2023; Kale et al., 2000) . Whereas role ambiguity allows employees to navigate complex external environments without experiencing role conflict or identity drift, which eventually strengthens their fit and link with the organization. Keeping in view the above relationships we can propose following hypothesis.

H4: Role ambiguity mediates the relationship between organizational learning and job embeddedness.

H4a: Role ambiguity mediates the relationship between individual level learning and job embeddedness.

H4b: Role ambiguity mediates the relationship between group level learning and job embeddedness.

H4c: Role ambiguity mediates the relationship between organizational level learning and job embeddedness.

H4d: Role ambiguity mediates the relationship between inter-organizational learning and job embeddedness.

Research Design and Methodology

A cross-sectional quantitative design used in the study. Convenience sampling used to distribute closed-end questionnaires to respondents at various organizational levels, including non-governmental organizations, public and private sector service organizations, aviation, banking, telecommunications, hospitality, media, education, and financial institutions. Likert scale parameters used in the development of the questionnaire. A cover letter with sufficiently detailed information about the purpose, background, and intended use of the data provided with each questionnaire. The research title and the estimated time required to complete the survey clearly stated in the cover letter. A final sample of 245 valid questionnaires kept for study after the replies screened.

The 18-item scale provided by (Lloria & Moreno-Luzon, 2014) has applied for organizational learning. Individual-level learning, group-level learning, organizational-level learning, and inter-organizational-level learning are the four aspects of organizational learning that the instrument was modified to evaluate. Because of this, the dimensional framework employed in this study differs from the original empirical factor structure outlined by (Lloria & Moreno-Luzon,

2014) , but it maintains the same item content and organizes the items according to their organizational learning levels. The modified scale consisted of three items for learning at the individual level, six for learning at the group level, seven for learning at the organizational level, and two for learning at the inter-organizational level.

The C. David Shepherd & Leslie M. Fine (1994) six-item scale has been used for role ambiguity (David Shepherd & Fine, 1994) . The data is reverse coded to determine role ambiguity since the scale measure's role clarity in an organizational area. Role ambiguity is employed as a single concept based on prior methodology and contextual theoretical framework. Following are individual items of role ambiguity scale and the coding used in statistical program presented as well.

For job embeddedness seven items scale has used which adopted from Cragg Crossley and Rebecca J.Bennett (2007) (Crossley et al., 2007). Sample items of the scales are "I feel attached to this organization.", "It would be difficult for me to leave this organization.", "I'm too caught up in this organization to leave.". Complete set of items given in Appendix-A.

Analysis and Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics, internal consistency reliabilities, and bivariate Pearson correlation coefficients for the Role Ambiguity (RA), Job Embeddedness (JE), and four levels of Organizational Learning (Individual Level Learning [OLIN], Group Level Learning [OLG], Organizational Level Learning [OLO], and Inter-Organizational Level Learning [OLIO]). All the organizational learning and its sub variables are negatively correlated with the role ambiguity while positively correlated with job embeddedness. Whereas Cronbach Alpha values for the variables are statistically significant.

Table 1 Correlations, descriptive statistics and reliability

	7 (RA)	9 (JE)	10 (OLIN)	11 (OLG)	12 (OLO)	13 (OLIO)
Role Ambiguity (RA)	.934					
Job Embeddedness (JE)	-.560"	.925				
Individual Level Learning (OLIN)	-.661"	.600"	.828			
Group Level Learning (OLG)	-.722"	.601"	.823"	.925		
Organizational Level Learning (OLO)	-.701"	.602"	.790"	.884"	.921	
Inter-Organizational Level Learning (OLIO)	-.657"	.520"	.696"	.775"	.851"	.876
Means	2.479	3.308	3.205	2.964	2.985	2.698
Standard Deviations	.985	0.976	0.985	1.019	1.015	1.260

Note. " p < .01;

Organizational Learning Relationship with Job Embeddedness

Table 2 shows regression analysis of organizational learning and Interpersonal conflict with (β =

0.631, $t = 12.629$, $R^2 = 0.369$) having significant relation; thus, supporting Hypothesis 1 “*Organizational learning would be positively related to the level of job embeddedness*”.

Hypothesis 1a prospect that “*Individual level learning would be positively related to the level of job embeddedness*”; regression analysis ($\beta = 0.595$, $t = 11.699$, $R^2 = 0.360$) having significant relation supports hypothesis 1a. Hypothesis 1b proposed, “*Group level learning would be positively related to the level of job embeddedness*”; hypothesis was tested using regression analysis ($\beta = 0.576$, $t = 11.709$, $R^2 = 0.361$) having significant relation supports hypothesis 1b. Regression analysis ($\beta = 0.580$, $t = 11.765$, $R^2 = 0.363$) having significant relation; thus supporting Hypothesis 1c “*Organizational level learning would be positively related to the level of job embeddedness*”. Hypothesis 1d prospect that “*Inter-organizational level learning would be positively related to the level of job embeddedness*”; regression analysis of inter organizational level learning and job embeddedness ($\beta = 0.403$, $t = 9.483$, $R^2 = 0.270$) having significant relationship which supports hypothesis 1d.

Table 2 Results from the regression analysis for organizational learning and job embeddedness

Hypothesis	β	<i>t-statistics</i>	Significance Level (β)	R^2	F	Significance Level (F)
2	.631 ^{***}	12.629	.000	.396	159.489	.000
2a	.595 ^{***}	11.699	.000	.360	136.870	.000
2b	.576 ^{***}	11.709	.000	.361	137.110	.000
2c	.580 ^{***}	11.765	.000	.363	138.407	.000
2d	.403 ^{***}	9.483	.000	.270	89.931	.000

Note. ^{***} $p < .01$

Table 3 shows regression analysis of organizational learning and Role ambiguity with ($\beta = -0.751$, $t = -17.240$, $R^2 = 0.550$) having significant relation; thus, supporting Hypothesis 2 “*Organizational learning would be negatively related to the level of role ambiguity*”. Hypothesis 2a prospect that “*Individual level learning would be negative related to the level of role ambiguity*”; regression analysis of Individual level learning and role ambiguity ($\beta = -0.661$, $t = -13.731$, $R^2 = 0.437$) having significant relation supports hypothesis 2a.

Hypothesis 2b proposed, “*Group level learning would be negative related to the level of role ambiguity*”; hypothesis was tested using regression analysis depicts ($\beta = -0.698$, $t = -16.248$, $R^2 = 0.521$) having significant relation supports hypothesis 2b. Regression analysis of Organizational Level and Role ambiguity with ($\beta = -0.681$, $t = -15.341$, $R^2 = 0.492$) having significant relation; thus supporting Hypothesis 2c “*Organizational level learning would be negative related to the level of role ambiguity*”.

Hypothesis 2d prospect that “*Inter-organizational level learning would be negative related to the level of role ambiguity*”; regression analysis of inter organizational level learning and role ambiguity ($\beta = -0.513$, $t = -13.572$, $R^2 = 0.431$) having significant relation supports hypothesis 2d.

Table 3 Results from the regression analysis for organizational learning and role ambiguity

Hypothesis	B	<i>t-statistics</i>	Significance Level (β)	R ²	F	Significance Level (F)
2	-.751 ^{**}	-17.240	.000	.550	297.229	.000
2a	-.661 ^{**}	-13.731	.000	.437	188.553	.000
2b	-.698 ^{**}	-16.248	.000	.521	264.004	.000
2c	-.681 ^{**}	-15.341	.000	.492	235.345	.000
2d	-.513 ^{**}	-13.572	.000	.431	184.193	.000

Note. ^{**} $p < .01$

Role ambiguity and job embeddedness

In Table 4 regression analysis test Hypothesis 3 “*Role ambiguity will be negatively related to the level of job embeddedness*” where variables role ambiguity and job embeddedness are having significant correlation and statistics shows that ($\beta = -.554$, $t = -10.524$, $R^2 = 0.313$) supports our hypothesis.

Table 4 Results from the regression analysis for role ambiguity interpersonal conflict and job embeddedness

Hypothesis	B	<i>t-statistics</i>	Significance Level (β)	R ²	F	Significance Level (F)
3	-.554 ^{**}	-10.524	.000	.313	110.756	.000

Note. ^{**} $p < .01$

The Mediating Role of Role Ambiguity on the Relationship between Organizational Learning and Job Embeddedness

Having established the mediation model of organizational learning relationship with job embeddedness which mediated by role ambiguity following results obtained which displayed in Table 5 below. The analysis used bootstrapping (5000 samples) to estimate the standardized indirect effects with Standard Error (SE) and 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals.

The standardized indirect effect of organizational learning on job embeddedness mediated by role ambiguity was $\beta = 0.1291$ (SE = 0.0349), with a 95% bias-corrected confidence interval of (0.0663, 0.2025). as the interval excludes zero, the mediating effect is significant and supports the hypothesis 4. For individual level learning indirect effect on job embeddedness $\beta = 0.1361$ (SE = 0.0360), 95% CI (0.0709, 0.2115) shows that there is significant mediation which supports hypothesis 4a. For group level learning indirect effect was $\beta = 0.1307$ (SE = 0.0329), 95% CI (0.0707, 0.1994) supports the mediation and hypothesis 4b. for organizational learning The indirect effect was $\beta = 0.1295$ (SE = 0.0325), 95% CI (0.0730, 0.1999). Mediation supported. For inter-organizational learning and job embeddedness indirect effect, results shows $\beta = 0.1146$ (SE =

0.0277), 95% CI (0.0646, 0.1722) which is statistically significant mediation and supports hypothesis H4d.

Table 5 Indirect effect organizational learning and job embeddedness: mediated by role ambiguity.

Variable		Standardized effects (β)	Indirect <i>SE</i>	95% biased corrected confidence interval	
				Lower Bounds	Upper Bounds
H4	OL-RA- JE	.1291*	.0349	.0663	.2025
H4a	OLIN-RA- JE	.1361*	.0360	.0709	.2115
H4b	OLG-RA- JE	.1307*	.0329	.0707	.1994
H4c	OLO-RA- JE	.1295*	.0325	.0730	.1999
H4d	OLIO-RA- JE	.1146*	.0277	.0646	.1722
Note:		Organizational Learning (OL)		(Independent Variable)	
		OLIN=Individual level Learning		(Independent Variable)	
		OLG= Group Level Learning		(Independent Variable)	
		OLO= Organizational Level Learning		(Independent Variable)	
		OLIO=Inter-Organizational Level Learning		(Independent Variable)	
		Role Ambiguity (RA)		(Mediator)	
		Job Embeddedness (JE)		(Dependent Variable)	
		Bootstrap Standard Error (SE)			
		Number of booth strap samples are 5000			
		Where * $p < .05$			

Discussion

The current study investigated the relationships between organizational learning (and its four multilevel dimensions), role ambiguity, and job embeddedness, with a focus on the mediating role of role ambiguity. Drawing on the job-demands-resources viewpoint and the multilevel organizational-learning framework, the findings give consistent empirical support for the presented hypotheses and offer various theoretical and practical insights.

Higher levels of fit, connections, and sacrifice reported by workers who have access to learning opportunities at the individual, group, organizational, and inter-organizational levels. These findings support the theoretical claim that ongoing institutionalization and knowledge acquisition increase the perceived costs of leaving, broaden formal and informal social networks, and improve person-job and person-organization compatibility (Crossan et al., 1999; Mitchell et al., 2001).

Learning processes define role expectations, formalize procedures, and build accepted norms, so minimizing uncertainty regarding performance standards, authority boundaries, and responsibility. Learning at the group and organizational levels demonstrated large negative correlations, highlighting the significance of formal institutionalization and group sense-making

in lowering ambiguity.

Role ambiguity has a significant negative effect on job embeddedness (H3). Because employees lack clear information about their responsibilities and performance criteria, their sense of fit deteriorates, interpersonal links weaken through conflicts related to tasks, and the perceived sacrifice of leaving declines because departure viewed as an escape from stressors rather than a loss of valued resources. This pattern is consistent with prior evidence linking role stress to reduced organizational attachment (Khumalo & Olaleye, 2025; Rizzo et al., 1970).

Role ambiguity strongly influenced the associations between overall organizational learning and each of its four levels and job embeddedness (H4 and H4a–H4d). The indirect effects demonstrating that learning promotes embeddedness partly by first lowering ambiguity. The mediation was comparatively constant over the four learning levels, indicating that learning's clarifying function functions at various organizational levels.

Practical implications

The biggest increases in employee embeddedness to come from human-resource interventions that combine learning opportunities with clear role-clarification processes. At the individual level actions include training and developmental feedback; at the group level, team-based knowledge-sharing routines and psychological safety practices; at the organizational level, standard operating procedures, job descriptions, and developmental policies are formalized; and at the inter-organizational level, carefully crafted roles that span boundaries in alliances and networks. All together they develop an environment which eventually reduces ambiguities related to job and role which are the key factors to be considered at managerial levels.

Limitations and future research directions

The data was gathered using convenience sampling using self-report questionnaires which focus on perceived measures. Future research might use multi-source data (such as supervisor ratings of role clarity and role ambiguity or archival records). Role ambiguity is considered a unidimensional mediator in the study; alternative mediators, such as psychological capital or perceived organizational support, and multidimensional conceptualizations of role stress, such as role conflict and role overload, can be investigated to better understand the relationship of organizational learning and job embeddedness.

Future studies should also examine border circumstances that may affect the organizational learning, role ambiguity, and job embeddedness, such as leadership style, corporate culture, or employment status. In experimental or quasi-experimental research specific learning levels can be studied separately which causes changes in role ambiguity and job embeddedness, which will definitely provide stronger evidence of practical impact.

References

- Abdelwahed, N. A. A., & Doghan, M. A. A. (2023). Developing Employee Productivity and Performance through Work Engagement and Organizational Factors in an Educational Society. *Societies*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc13030065>
- AlQudah, N. F., Adeel Anjum, M., Naeem, K., Alqudah Ajloun, M. M., Ahmed, A., & Shtnaoui, H. (2023). Examining the antecedents of employee retention among Jordanian private Universities: The moderating role of knowledge sharing. *Cogent Business and Management*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2208429>
- Argote, L. (2011). Organizational learning research: Past, present and future. *Management Learning*, 42(4), 439–446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507611408217>
- Bakker, A. B. (n.d.). *Multiple Levels in Job Demands-Resources Theory: Implications for Employee Well-being and Performance*.
- Balarezo, J. D., Foss, N. J., & Nielsen, B. B. (2024). Organizational learning: Understanding cognitive barriers and what organizations can do about them. *Management Learning*, 55(5), 741–768. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505076231210635>
- Kahn, R. L. (1964). Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. In *American sociological review*: jhon wiley.
- Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An Organizational Learning Framework: From Intuition to Institution. In *Source: The Academy of Management Review* (Vol. 24, Number 3).
- Crossley, C., Bennett, R. J., Jex, S. M., & Burnfield, J. L. (2007). Development of a global measure of job embeddedness and integration into a traditional model of voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1031–1042. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1031>
- Dapeng, L., Naeem, K., Durrani, D. K., & Anjum, M. A. (2019). High-performance work practices versus work-role ambiguity. *Human Systems Management*, 38(2), 141–148. <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-180381>
- David Shepherd, C., & Fine, L. M. (1994). Role conflict and role ambiguity reconsidered. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 14(2), 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.1994.10753985>
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. In *Source: Administrative Science Quarterly* (Vol. 44, Number 2).
- Fang, C., Ran, Y., Huan, Z., & Xiaoyan, Z. (2025). The mediating role of decent work perception in role clarity and job embeddedness among Chinese nurses: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Nursing*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-025-02861-z>
- Fiol, C. M., & Lyles, M. A. (1985). Organizational Learning. In *The Academy of Management Review* (Vol. 10, Number 4).
- Jo, H., & Shin, D. (2025). The impact of recognition, fairness, and leadership on employee outcomes: A large-scale multi-group analysis. *PLoS ONE*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0312951>
- Junça Silva, A., & Rodrigues, R. (2024). Affective mechanisms linking role ambiguity to

- employee turnover. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 32(1), 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-08-2023-3891>
- Kale, P., Singh, H., & Perlmutter, H. (2000). Learning and protection of proprietary assets in strategic alliances: building relational capital. *Strategic Management Journal Strat. Mgmt. J*, 21, 217–237.
- Khumalo, N., & Olaleye, B. R. (2025). Emotional Demands and Role Ambiguity Influence on Intentions to Quit: Does Trust in Management Matter? *Administrative Sciences*, 15(11).
<https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15110424>
- Levitt, B., & March, J. G. (1988). Organizational learning. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14, 319–359. <http://about.jstor.org/terms>
- Li jing, Lijun, W., Yucheng Zhang, Meng, Z., & Peter, R. (2025). Decoding job embeddedness: a meta-analysis on consequences and unveiling moderating forces. *Personnel Review*, 54(9), 2375–2405.
- Lloria, M. B., & Moreno-Luzon, M. D. (2014). Organizational learning: Proposal of an integrative scale and research instrument. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(5), 692–697.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.11.029>
- Majumdar, S., & Shilpee A. Dasgupta. (2024). Understanding why do we stay in our jobs? A bibliometric and content analysis of job embeddedness in the past two decades (2001–2021). *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 46(2), 309–339.
- Malalage, G. S., & Perera, G. A. T. R. (2025). Exploring job embeddedness among local and international employees: a systematic review. In *Cogent Business and Management* (Vol. 12, Number 1). Cogent OA. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2486580>
- March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1975). The uncertainty of the past: organizational learning under role ambiguity. *European Journal of Political Research*, 3, 147–171.
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinsky, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. In *Academy of Management Journal* (Vol. 44).
- Naeem, K., Karim, J., & Khan, A. (2019). Competition shadow relation with organizational learning. *Pakistan Study*, 10(2).
- Naeem, K., Shah, J. A., Durrani, D. K., Khan, A., & Naeem, I. (2026). Organizational Learning and Job Embeddedness: An Analysis in the Service Industry. *International Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 7(4), 315–325.
- Pervez, A., Naeem, K., Naeem, I., Lodhi, S., & Khan, M. C. (2022). Role Ambiguity versus job embeddedness; mediation of interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 27(5), 2635–2644. <https://cibg.org.au/>
- Powell, W. W., & Koput, K. W. (1996). Interorganizational Collaboration and the Locus of Innovation: Networks of Learning in. In *Administrative Science Quarterly* (Vol. 41, Number 1). <http://www.jstor.orgURL:http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393988>
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organizations. In *Source: Administrative Science Quarterly* (Vol. 15, Number 2).
- Shinde, Shilpa. (2025). Role ambiguity and employee well-being: The critical need for clear job descriptions. *Kaav International Journal of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences*, 12(2).

Zafar, M. Z., Irshad, H., Al Rassas, A. H., Hussain, R. Y., & Hussain, H. (2026). Leveraging job embeddedness theory to MITIGATE school employee turnover. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2026.2700061>