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The moderating role of job embeddedness on the relationship between career plateau and counterproductive work behaviors of the Mansoura university staff

Dr. Ghada Salah El-deen Abo El-Ata

1. Abstract

Purpose: Based on the social exchange theory (SET) and social identity theory (SIT), the current study aims to examine the moderating role of job embeddedness (JE) in the relationship between career plateau (CP) and counterproductive work behavior (CWB) of the Mansoura university staff.

Design/methodology/approach: The data were collected by using the online survey method from (240) staff members in Mansoura university. Data were analyzed by using SPSS V.26.

Findings: Results showed there is a significant positive effect of the CP on the CWB. In addition, there is a significant negative impact of the JE on the CWB. Furthermore, JE buffers the positive impact of the CP on CWB through moderating this relationship.

Research implications: This study adds value to the existing literature by employing both the SET & SIT theories in the organizational context. It enriches the CP literature by highlighting that CP may lead to CWB when employees lose their hope in the hierarchal progression and start to act in aggressive manner. Furthermore, this study examined the moderating role of the JE in the relationship between CP and CWB and how it can buffer the side effect of the CP on CWB among Mansoura university staff.

Originality/value: Drawing on the SET and SIT, the current study clarifies the causes of the employees' aggressive behaviors. It examined the impact of CP, JE on CWB in a governmental organization like Mansoura university. This study is one of the first studies that examined the state of career plateau and the moderating role of JE among the university staff.
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2. Introduction

The latest digital developments decrease the chance of creating new jobs. Besides, the single development channel, limited room for expansion, and limited mobility in pyramid-shaped organizations especially after the crises that the world has been exposed to, including wars, epidemics, and others decrease the job opportunities. The employees in these organizations started to feel worried about their career progression, and at some point they realized that there may be no more hieratical advancement (Ng & Yang, 2023; Peltokorpi & Allen., 2024). In this case, they act in a harmful manner, such as high absenteeism, poor quality communication with managers, and finally, do counterproductive work behaviors (Hu et al., 2023; Tremblay, 2021).

The counterproductive work behavior (Henceforth in any elsewhere CWB) is one of the aggressive behaviors that have been observed in organizations lately. CWB is the behavior that violates the legitimate interests of an organization, it can harm its members or the organization (Fatfouta & Shwarzinger, 2024). In addition to be as an illegal behavior, CWB in many literatures can be seen as a type of skepticism (Obrein et al., 2024), or protest (Kellowy et al., 2010). These CWB appears in the direct behaviors such as violation interest, theft, sabotage, and rumor about worker. It also implies indirect behaviors like the loss of productivity, the damage of organization reputation, and the loss customers (Bowling, 2010).

Many studies focus on the reasons of the CWB. One of the causes was the career plateau (Henceforth in any elsewhere CP) (Zhong et al., 2023). CP is the low possibility of hieratical promotion (Agu et al., 2023; Nachbagaur & Riedle et al., 2002). Employees who believe they are at a rest in their careers and have little chance of moving up the ladder are said to be exposed to CP. In the uncertain environment, career plateau can lead to silence, low morale, physical, and emotional distress between employees (Chang et al., 2024; Hu et al., 2022; Jing et al., 2024). This eventually led to the emergence of the CWB because the employee's progression is not a priority to their organization (Moore et al., 2012). Especially, when they compare their career progression with the other employees at the same hieratical level in other organizations (Jian & Chhabra, 2023).
However, the span of the employee's tenure within the organization determines how well the employee's identity and the organization's identity match and reflects the level of the embeddedness in the organization (MeiRun et al., 2018). The job embeddedness (Hence forth in any elsewhere, JE) is the extent to which the employees choose to stay in the organization despite the benefits he may get in another organization (Lee et al., 2004). It plays a significant role in the reduction of the turnover, improving the social capital, and reflects the level of an employee's ingrainedness (Majumdarr & Dasguptal, 2024; Obeng et al., 2024).

In this essence, drawing upon the social exchange and social identity theory. The current study examined the impact of JE in the relationship between CP and CWB. It enriched the literature as we introduced how the CP plays a significant role in the existence of CWB. It also presented a model that enhanced the understanding of CP-CWB through the buffering effect of the JE. Our data was collected from Mansoura university staff where the CP appears obviously.

3. Literature review and hypothesis development:

1.3 The relationship between the CP and CWB:

Ference et al. (1977) defined CP as "the lower probability of getting further promotions in one's career". As we can note that this definition concentrated only on the hierarchical plateau. On the other hand, some of the subsequent definitions concentrated on the low possibility of hierarchical promotion (e.g. Agu et al., 2023; Ongori & Agolla, 2009; Nachbagauer & Riedle, 2002; Tremblay & Roger, 2004). Moreover, Galhena, (2009); Wen & Liu, (2015) enrich the definition by adding perception and subjective side to it. However, the definitions didn't give the sufficient attention to the case when employee have skills and abilities in the organization where there is a chance to have hierarchical promotion, but the employees don't have the ambition to promote. So, this study defined the employee plateau as "the state when employees intentionally or unintentionally do not receive the appropriate promotion".

CP divided into two dimensions hierarchical (structural) plateau and job content plateau. The hierarchical plateau is the little chance of further vertical movement in the organization, and the content plateau is the perceived stagnation between the challenges and responsibilities of the job. It is reflected on the lack of learning and challenge in the job (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Hu et al., 2023; kwon, 2023; Jian & Chhabra, 2024). However, besides hierarchical and content plateau, Agu et al. (2023) & Tremblay (2021) added personal career plateau as a third
dimension to career plateau. The personal career plateau is the individual feeling of being sucked or tapped in their roles. This occurs when they lose their desire to promote because they have the technical and professional skills, and they don't have the ambition to promote. In fact, the personal plateau is the most serious dimension because the employees suffer from the lack of motivation, enthusiasm and passion to perform their tasks.

CP also has many significant negative effects on the stability of organizations especially in the periods of downsizing and cutting costs. For instance, CP has a significant positive effect on the employee turnover intentions (Obianuju, 2021; Christian; Foster et al., 2004; Win & liu, 2015). In addition, CP has a significant negative effect on the level of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and positive effect on the level of stress (Hu et al., 2022; Human-Ramirez et al., 2018; Sijabat et al., 2023).

Sackett and DeVore (2002) defined CWB as: "the behaviors that runs counter to the organization's legitimate interests". Spector and Fox (2005) defined it as "behaviors that intentionally harm or intend to harm others or organizations". It also implies a kind of protest as a reaction to injustice, loss of identity, the low quality of being instrumental in the organization all these aspects express the staff displeasure (Kellowy et al, 2010). Service sabotage, significant absenteeism, completing job incorrectly, and destroying property are examples of organizations directed behaviors, but harassment, workplace bullying, attacks on coworkers, retaliation, and aggressiveness are all examples of behaviors that can harm the coworkers within the organizations (kim, 2016; Dunlop & Lee., 2004; Spector, 2011; O'boyle et al., 2011; Zomeran et al., 2008; Ramadani et al., 2023).

CWB antecedents are related to both the personality traits and the surrounded environment. On one hand, the personality traits specifically the neuroticism shows the tendency to some negative feelings such as anger, anxiety, and depression (Duradoni et al., 2023; Grijalva & Newman, 2015; Oh et al., 2014). These high negative emotions can interpret the workplace events in a bad manner and make employees act in aggressive way (Holtom et al., 2012). On the other hand, the factors that related to the surrounded environment are concerned with goals and intensions of employees that arises from the interaction with their environment. This interaction led to the emergence of the CWB in case the employees feels that there is organizational injustice, imbalance power, and loss of autonomy (Case, 2000). In this line, the existence of ethical leadership support the feeling of implementing justice procedure in fair manner between all employees. This can reduce the CWB (Al Halbusi et al., 2021; Bian, 2021; Jeewandara, & Kumari, 2021).
According to social exchange theory, individuals give when they know they will get. Therefore, employees are more likely to work hard and provide services in exchange for rewards such as promotion, money, and support. All these benefits encourage employees to do their best to achieve career objectives (Chernyak & Rabenu, 2018). Furthermore, when existing positions provide employees with the skills and abilities they need to succeed in their careers, they show commitment to the organization and devote their efforts to achieve organizational goals (Aktas, 2015). However, any breach in the exchange relationship between employee and employer makes the employee believe that his organization fails to appreciate him (Ahmad et al., 2023). The competent workers in this situation are unhappy with their progress, especially while there are no positions elsewhere. However, there is a different group of employees who believe that reaching their career plateau made them feeling relax and satisfied. They don't need to improve their talents and abilities because they do the same thing every day (Lin et al., 2018).

In this context, CWB emerged when employees see that they can't get the career progress that they want. They feel that they have worth and eligible capabilities for making career progression (Hershcovis et al., 2007; Cohen et al., 2019). Hu et al., (2022) found a direct positive relationship between the subjective CP and CWB. Furthermore, Ng & Yang, (2023) employed the stressor emotion model and found that the negative emotions strength the positive relationship between the CP and CWB of employees in China. On the contrary, Jian & Chhabra, (2024) revealed that there is not significant relationship between the CP and CWB among Indian bankers.

Thus, this study assumed that when the employees found that the organization don't give them the sufficient level of promotion, and the upward movement in doubt, they first start to make additional efforts and create more challenging work. However, this will not long lasting and in many cases lead to negative effects on job outcomes. Thus, the hierarchal plateau is the primary stage when the employee saw that there is a lack of promotion in the organization. After that the job content plateau appears when employees found that their jobs don't give them the sufficient challenge or the responsibilities they deserve.

Based on the above analysis and with the support of social exchange theory, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**H1: The CP has a positive impact on CWB.**
This main hypothesis is divided into sub hypotheses as follows:

H1a: The content CP has a positive impact on CWB.
H1b: The structural CP has a positive impact on CWB.
H1c: The personal CP has a positive impact on CWB.

2.3. The relationship between the JE and CWB

Allen et al. (2016) defined JE as: "the occupational network of psychological, social, and financial components". It also implied the meaning of stickness i.e., being a part of a network that makes it difficult to separate from the organization. JE is considered one of the theories that concentrates on how the organization can motivate the employees to remain in the organization. It fosters the employee's desire to stay in the organization, regardless of the rewards the person may get if he leaves it (Lee et al., 2004; Mitchell et al., 2001).

JE involves three main dimensions as follows: link, fit, and sacrifice on both the level of on -the- job and off -the- job. On one hand, on -the- job embeddedness is the extent to which an individual is involved in the organization. On -the- job link is the formal and informal connection between managers and employees in the organization. On -the- job fit is the compatibility, comfort, and fit with the organization. Lastly, On -the- job sacrifice is the perceived cost the employee may lose if he chooses to stay in the organizations. On the other hand, off -the- job embeddedness is reflected on how individuals are involved in the non-workspace. For more explanation, the link in off -the- job embeddedness is the formal and informal interaction with others in non-wok. Off -the- job embeddedness fit refers to how the employee feels comfortable or compatible in the non-workspace. Furthermore, sacrifice refers to the perceived cost of material and psychological gains that may be lost by leaving the non-work area (Darrat et al., 2017; Harris et al., 2011; Holtom et al., 2006).

JE improves the ties between workers and organizations, which reduces the intentions of turnover (Chen et al., 2019). This ultimately hinders employees from getting involved in CWB (Holtom et al., 2012). In this context, off -the- job embeddedness has a significant effect on the voluntary turnover and absence, while the on -the- job embeddedness is a predictor for organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance (Lee et al., 2004; Tang et al., 2021). JE also has a significant negative effect on the CWB between employees and mediates the relationship between the organizational justice and CWB (Avey et al., 2015). Besides, JE can buffer the negative effect of the psychological contract violation on turnover intentions (He et al., 2023).
Based on the above argument according to social identity theory (SIT), individuals generally differ from others in terms of how effectively they think and act due to their social identities. Employee identity in human resources may result from their career progression. Subordinate's attitude and belief in oneself are shaped by the organization and hierarchical identity (Abas & Otto, 2016). This identity shapes the employees' cognition and promotes adaptation with a changing environment. Thus, considering the current environmental circumstances, protecting an employee's identity from negative factors like career plateau and counterproductive behaviors is one of the fundamental cornerstones of the survival of organizations nowadays. (Shaw & Liao, 2021; Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Islam, 2014).

Abas and Otto (2016) revealed that social identity is also considered as a precondition for the formation of clearly distinct social groups composed of supervisors and subordinates, where the supervisors themselves may choose to hold onto their current positions for longer and obstruct the advancement of their subordinates. This affects the subordinates' social image, particularly if they feel they deserve to advance in their careers, which might have negative effects (MeiRun et al., 2018; Furnham and Siegel, 2011).

The social ties between employees and organization make them not only able to do extra role behavior but also decrease his desire to search for another organization (Eliason et al., 2023). In this context, the job embeddedness theory is one of the theories that can interpret to what extent the employee attached to his organization. It also can play a key role in exploring how to alleviate the effects of the negative workplace events. In many cases the JE enriches the social ties between organizations and employees. The emotional and psychological stability outside the organization and the pensions plans, health care service, and engaging in interesting projects are considered a type of social exchange between the employees and the organizations. So, when the employees are satisfied both inside and outside the organization, they will not be needed to do any CWB (Chan et al, 2019).

In addition, these social bonds led to minor satisfaction between employees. This satisfaction makes them unwell to act in misbehavior way which is expected to decrease the CWB (Harries et al., 2011). So, JE has a direct effect on the negative discretionary behaviors such as counterproductive work behavior (Holtom et al., 2012). Darrat et al., (2017) & Mehmood et al., (2023) found a
negative relationship between the JE and CWB. Mehmood added that the psychological ownership moderates the relationship between JE and CWB. Employees with high level of embeddedness tend to avoid bad behaviors at the workplace to keep their position in the organization.

Moreover, JE can limit the employees to change their position. Thus, it can reduce the cost of turnover, the recruitment of new employees and training them (Holtman, 2008; Marasi et al., 2016). To sum up, the embedded employee can absorb some of the negativity in the workplace and convert it into a good reaction or at least avoid a bad reaction that would harm the organization and coworkers. However, In the long run, the employee may become attached to the firm, and his desire not to quit creates constraints that prohibit him from investing his talents and obtaining higher financial advantages in another organization. As a result, positive behaviors such as organizational citizenship behaviors are reduced, while emotional stress and job frustration increase. All of this contributes to the emergence of CWB at work (Allen et al., 2016; Mehmood et al., 2023). Based on the above argument with the frame of the social identity theory, the study assumes the follows:

**H2: There is a negative impact of JE on CWB.**

This hypothesis is divided into two sub hypotheses as follows:

H2a: The ON -the- JE has a negative impact on the CWB.

H2b: The OFF -the- JE has a negative impact on the CWB.

3.3 The moderating role of job embeddedness on the relationship between career plateau and counterwork behavior:

Due the latest trends of downsizing and layoff, managers need to deal with the employees' career plateau. The efficient dealing with this phenomenon can restrict its negative effects (Abd-Elrahman et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2015). Empirically, CP has many negative effects such as bad performance, loss of motivation and low organizational commitment (Carnazz et al., 1981; Stout et al, 1988; Slocum et al, 1985).

However, some employees may enact in some behaviors to alleviate the negative effects of career plateau (Bardwick, 1986). For instance, the JE may foster the job challenge and create a chance for the promotion. When JE is high, CP may not result in CWB. This is a result of embedded employees' desire to remain longer because of their ties inside the company, fit with the position, and the sacrifices they must make should they decide to leave.
Hobfoll (1989) asserts that workers who are under stress or in a bad work environment endeavor to acquire, preserve, or create resources that they need to thrive in the company. Embedded employees work hard to maintain their social standing within the company and are unlikely to turn to CWB. This is because these workers hope to remain with the company longer, and using CWB will probably endanger their employment and give the wrong impression of them. In addition, JE moderates the relationship between the organizational trust and deviant behavior (Marasi et al., 2016) and the relationship between abusive leadership and job frustrating (Avey et al., 2015).

To summarize, although, many previous studies relied on JE as a mediator (Herschi, 1969; Hom et al., 2009; Hotom & Inderrieden, 2006), this study will examine it as a moderator between the CP and CWB. As it is known that the moderator can affects the strength and direction of the relationships. It is anticipated that the JE can alleviate the anticipated negative effect of the CP on the CWB. These overall relationships are illustrated in our study model in Figure (1) and the following hypothesis is proposed.

**H3: The job embeddedness plays a moderating role in the influential process of the career plateau on counterproductive work behaviors.**

![Conceptual Framework](image)

**Figure (1):** Conceptual Framework includes career plateau as independent variable; counterproductive work behavior as dependent variable; and Job embeddedness as moderating variable.

4. **Methodology:**

1.4 **Participant and procedures**

Our population consists of the staff of six faculties at Mansoura universities. The faculties are Commerce, Lows, Arts, Sciences, Agriculture, and Pharmacy. This study depended on these facilities because they included the largest number of staff members. Thus, Our population is (987) staff members (professors, assistant professors, and lecturers) from both theoretical and practical
faculties. As the population is heterogeneous, we depended on stratified random sampling. This sample can create a sample population that most closely resembles the total population under study. We used the sample calculator, and the sample consisted of (270) respondents. Then, we use the online Google form for about (300) respondents. There were about (240) accurate respondents. The respondent rate was about (80%). This rate is sufficient to represent the population. The following table summarizes the total number of staff in every faculty and the number of respondents in each faculty.

Table (1): The distribution of the population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>The faculty</th>
<th>The number of the staff</th>
<th>The number of the respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lows</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>987</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: based on the records of faculty members’ affairs.

2.4 Research instrument

The general demographic characteristics data were collected using a questionnaire specifically designed by the researchers. The data included gender, age, tenure years of teaching work. Then, all variables are evaluated on a five-point scale ranging from (1) disagree to (5) strongly agree. First, we employ (Agu et al, 2023) career plateau measurement. The questionnaire has three dimensions: content, structure, and personal, each divided by three items. Second, CWB was measured using (Vatankhah et al., 2017). It consists of sixteen items. Finally, the JE was determined using (Chen & Ayoun, 2019). It comprises two dimensions: organizational and community. Every dimension contains nine items.

3.4 Data Analysis and Results

This study adopted multiple regression analysis for analysing the moderating role of Job embeddedness on the relationship between the Career plateau and Counterproductive work behaviour. In this regard, A moderator analysis is used to determine whether the relationship between two variables depends on (is moderated by) the value of a third variable. Consequently, SPSS V.26 used for analysing this relationship.
3.4.1 Measurement Model

The first stage aims to evaluate the instruments' quality in terms of item factor loadings, internal consistency and discriminant validity. All constructs are reflectively measured only as first order factors. As shown in Table 1, the factor loading for the items were far greater than the suggested threshold of 0.60 (Henseler et al., 2009). Furthermore, Cronbach's alpha (a) and the composite reliability (CR) for each of the constructs were greater than the suggested threshold of 0.60, showing that the measures were reliable (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2010). Furthermore, to estimate convergent validity, Fornell and Larcker (1981) proposed that average variance extracted (AVE) be equal to or greater than 0.50. Table 2 shows that AVE is greater than 0.50 for all constructs, indicating adequate convergent validity.

Finally, Skewness and kurtosis data are also mentioned in Table 2 and their values confined between ±3 and ±10 respectively, and the means for all questions in the questionnaire is greater than 3 which mean tendency to agreement.
Table (2): Confirmatory factor analysis (PLS approach), Loading, Cronbach's Alpha (a), Composite reliability (CR), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs, dimensions, and indicators</th>
<th>Mean Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
<th>Loading Statistic</th>
<th>Alpha Statistic</th>
<th>CR Statistic</th>
<th>AVE Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Job embeddedness (OJE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJE 1</td>
<td>3.240</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>-0.301</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.236</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJE 2</td>
<td>3.257</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>-0.245</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.330</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJE 3</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>-0.288</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.295</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJE 4</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>-0.232</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.330</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJE 5</td>
<td>3.260</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>-0.290</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.255</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJE 6</td>
<td>3.230</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.342</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJE 7</td>
<td>3.297</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>-0.277</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.290</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJE 8</td>
<td>3.317</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>-0.337</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.201</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJE 9</td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>-0.284</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.333</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Community Job embeddedness (CJE)       |                |                          |                   |                   |                  |                |             |              |
| CJE 1                                  | 3.297          | 1.396                    | -0.289            | 0.141             | -1.262           | 0.281          | 0.668       |              |
| CJE 2                                  | 3.350          | 1.393                    | -0.360            | 0.141             | -1.190           | 0.281          | 0.795       |              |
| CJE 3                                  | 3.437          | 1.397                    | -0.413            | 0.141             | -1.166           | 0.281          | 0.701       |              |
| CJE 4                                  | 3.150          | 1.429                    | -0.169            | 0.141             | -1.321           | 0.281          | 0.736       |              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs, dimensions, and indicators</th>
<th>Mean Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJE 5</td>
<td>3.283</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.286</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJE 6</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>-0.232</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.339</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJE 7</td>
<td>3.487</td>
<td>1.343</td>
<td>-0.464</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.106</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJE 8</td>
<td>3.510</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>-0.477</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.100</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJE 9</td>
<td>3.483</td>
<td>1.384</td>
<td>-0.464</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-1.166</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Career plateau (CCP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP 1</td>
<td>3.342</td>
<td>1.376</td>
<td>-0.255</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-1.273</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP 2</td>
<td>3.365</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>-0.354</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-1.249</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP 3</td>
<td>3.402</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>-0.310</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-1.309</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Career plateau (SCP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP 1</td>
<td>3.319</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-1.247</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP 2</td>
<td>3.342</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>-0.368</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-1.200</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP 3</td>
<td>3.362</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>-0.356</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-1.192</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Career plateau (PCP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP 1</td>
<td>3.339</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>-0.297</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-1.334</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP 2</td>
<td>3.425</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>-0.396</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-1.122</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP 3</td>
<td>3.266</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-1.283</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructs, dimensions, and indicators</td>
<td>Mean Statistic</td>
<td>Std. Deviation Statistic</td>
<td>Skewness Statistic</td>
<td>Kurtosis Statistic</td>
<td>Loading</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 1</td>
<td>3.367</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>-0.400</td>
<td>-1.219</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 2</td>
<td>3.347</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>-0.344</td>
<td>-1.230</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 3</td>
<td>3.320</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>-1.242</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 4</td>
<td>3.387</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>-0.393</td>
<td>-1.162</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 5</td>
<td>3.377</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>-0.305</td>
<td>-1.296</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 6</td>
<td>3.323</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>-1.384</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 7</td>
<td>3.343</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>-0.270</td>
<td>-1.272</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 8</td>
<td>3.327</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>-0.394</td>
<td>-1.164</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 9</td>
<td>3.413</td>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>-0.367</td>
<td>-1.238</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 10</td>
<td>3.317</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>-0.337</td>
<td>-1.299</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 11</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>-1.265</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 12</td>
<td>3.433</td>
<td>1.460</td>
<td>-0.438</td>
<td>-1.242</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 13</td>
<td>3.413</td>
<td>1.352</td>
<td>-0.416</td>
<td>-1.102</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 14</td>
<td>3.337</td>
<td>1.384</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>-1.238</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 15</td>
<td>3.330</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>-0.279</td>
<td>-1.253</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB 16</td>
<td>3.297</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td>-0.272</td>
<td>-1.328</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.2 Hypotheses Testing

This study hypothesised the existence of a positive impact of (CP) on the (CWB) by (H1). Then (H2) predict the impact of (JE) on the (CWB). Finally, (H3) analyse the moderating role of (JE) on the relationship between the (CP) on the (CWB). Based on the mentioned hypotheses relationships, this study uses the SPSS V.26 for testing these hypotheses with 5,000 bootstrap samples at a confidence interval of 95%.

Table (3): The direct effect of CP on the CWB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>LL95%CI</th>
<th>UL95%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-1.590</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.862</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career plateau (CP)</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>7.980**</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165.502**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 300; Bootstrap sample size = 5000; B = Unstandardized regression coefficients; SE = standard error; LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

Source: based on the results of the SPSS.

According to (Table 3), it is obvious that there is a significant positive impact of CP on CWB where (B = 0.667; T = 7.980; P < 0.01). For more analysis, career plateau consists of three sub dimensions: Content, Structural and Personal Career plateau so we test its impact on the (CWB) as follow:

Table (4): The direct impact of (CP) dimensions on (CWB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>LL95%CI</th>
<th>UL95%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-1.729</td>
<td>-0.190</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Career plateau (CCP)</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>4.122**</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Career plateau (SCP)</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>6.904**</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Career plateau (PCP)</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>10.971**</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158.800**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 300; Bootstrap sample size = 5000; B = Unstandardized regression coefficients; SE = standard error; LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

Source: based on the results of the SPSS.
According to the impact of the three dimensions of Career plateau (Content, Structural and personal) on CWB, there is a positive direct impact of the three dimensions where (B = 0.161, 0.267, 0.441; T = 4.122, 6.904, 10.971; P < 0.01) respectively for the Content, Structural and personal Career plateau on the CWB. Consequently, this study accepts H1 and the three sub- hypotheses (H1a, H1b, H1c).

**Table (5):** The direct impact of the (JE) on the (CWB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>LL95%CI</th>
<th>UL95%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>-0.228</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.704</td>
<td>-0.190</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-0.781</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job embeddedness (JE)</td>
<td>-0.582</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-9.725**</td>
<td>-0.690</td>
<td>-0.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.738**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 300; Bootstrap sample size = 5000; B = Unstandardized regression coefficients; SE = standard error; LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

Source: based on the results of the SPSS.

Based on the above results, the (JE) has a direct negative impact on the (CWB), where (B = -0.582; T = -9.725, P < 0.01). Moreover, (JE) consists of two sub dimensions related with Organizational and Community so it is important to test its impact on the (CWB) as follow:

**Table (6):** The direct impact of Job embeddedness dimensions (JE) on the CWB:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>LL95%CI</th>
<th>UL95%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>-0.241</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.711</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-0.784</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Job embeddedness (OJE)</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>-2.019*</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Job embeddedness (CJE)</td>
<td>-0.330</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-3.315**</td>
<td>-0.511</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.769**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 300; Bootstrap sample size = 5000; B = Unstandardized regression coefficients; SE = standard error; LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

Source: based on the results of the SPSS.
According to the impact of the two dimensions of JE (Organizational and Community) on CWB, it is clear the existence of a negative direct impact of the two dimensions where (B = -0.243, -0.330; T = -2.019, -3.315; P < 0.05, 0.01) respectively for the Organizational and Community JE. Consequently, this study supports H2, and we also can accept H2a, H2b.

**Table (7):** The moderating impact of (JE) on the relationship between (CP) and (CWB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>LL95%CI</th>
<th>UL95%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-1.144</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.206</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.742</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career plateau (CP)</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>4.915**</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job embeddedness (JE)</td>
<td>-0.328</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>-2.584**</td>
<td>-0.606</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP × JE</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>2.035*</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>52.031**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** N = 300; Bootstrap sample size = 5000; B = Unstandardized regression coefficients; SE = standard error; LL = lower limit; CI = confidence interval; UL = upper limit; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

Source: based on the results of the SPSS.

Based on the mentioned results on table (3), the direct relationship between CP and CWB revealed the existence of a positive significant impact of CP on the CWB where (B = 0.667; T = 7.980; P < 0.01). Then after the interaction between CP and JE in table (7) we can note a significant and positive impact on CWB where (B = 0.067, T = 2.035, P < 0.05), but its slope is less than the slope of CP on the CWB. Consequently, results found that JE can moderate the positive impact between the CP and CWB. Where Figure (2) shows that increasing JE led to decreasing the positive significant effect of CP on CWB, consequently these results support H3.
5. Conclusion, discussion, implications, and future directions:

5.1 Discussion and conclusion:

The recent technological changes lead to the scarcity of positions. This scarcity occasionally involves accepting a job that may not suit the employee's talents and abilities. The barriers like career plateau that impede individuals from continuing their professional paths will eventually lead to negative behaviors in the workplace (Kurji et al., 2023; Muthuswamy, 2023). So, this study employed both the social exchange and social identity theory to test the moderating effect of JE on the relationship between CP and CWB.

According to the first hypothesis, the impact of CP on the CWB was significant and positive. In line with social exchange theory, when the employees understand that there is a limited chance to have a hieratical promotion, they will feel that they are stuked to their organization. This case makes them start to do negative reaction towards the organization like harming others, subverting the service, and deliberately delaying to the official work hours. All these behaviors may be considered as a protest towards the inability to leave the organization especially when it fails to give the challenges, promotions, or financial advantages that the employee deserves. However, there is a stream of research focused on types of employees that feel satisfied with their CP (Darling & Cunningham, 2023; Farivar et al., 2023; Greenberg, 2008). So, we can almost be sure that the state of plateau affects sharply the competent employees because the incompetent ones are unwilling to enhance their abilities or try to perform challenging tasks.
Hence, our results fully support the existence of a significant positive relationship between the CP and CWB. Furthermore, the dimensions of the CP have a significant impact on CWB, especially the personal CP which has the most significant effect on CWB. This means that in many cases the imbalance between the personal growth and challenges that the employees face led to negative impact like the CWB. These results agreed with (Hershcovis et al., 2007; Hu et al, 2022; Moore et al., 2012) as they asserted that it is notable that the CWB is a reaction to the lack of progress in the career but differs from the results of (Jian & Chhabra, 2024). The faculty staff members might find many challenges in Egypt. these challenges impede their timely promotion. A portion of these challenges relate to their inadequate salaries and lack of sufficient social recognition. This is what eventually causes them to focus entirely on this problem in their thoughts. This diverts them from developing their careers. Faculty members' frustration with certain poor facilities and infrastructure also lowers their motivation for promotion. In addition, among faculty members, personal career plateau has the most significant impact on CWB. This means that the main causes of the plateau emerge from people who are unwilling to enhance their abilities and skills to get promoted.

Secondly, by reviewing the previous studies, it can be noted that the behavior is counterproductive if it meets three conditions: it is volitional rather than unintentional, it may be harmful even if it does not always have negative organizational consequences, and it conflicts with valid values (Mehmood et al., 2023). However, if the organization enhance the emotional and psychological stability of employees this will reduce the tendency of making negative behaviors (Chan et al., 2019). In line with the social identity theory, our result came to the existence of a significant negative relationship between the dimensions of JE (organizational and community) and the CWB. These results agreed also with (Darrat et al., 2017; Hotlom et al, 2012; Mehmood et al., 2023) who found a negative relationship between JE and CWB. Thus, the benefits like healthcare services, pension plans, admitting new challenges to the tasks, and reinforce the employee's knowledge consistent with the social exchange theory and decrease CWB. These results asserted that enhancing the organizational climate in universities helps reduce any negative behaviors. Facilitating learning resources and improving wages and salaries prompt staff to devote time and effort to achieving scientific
progression. However, JE isn't always trustworthy. It also implied a negative aspect. Because of the ties that bind an employee to their current employment, it poses obstacles for those who choose to quit. Therefore, JE is the mechanism via which social ties both limit and shape economic conduct. It is evident when individuals are unable to transfer their job skills to another business or do not receive the same degree of benefits there (Allen et al., 2016; Greene et al., 2018; Marasi et al., 2014).

Finally, this study also hypothesized that JE moderates the relationship between CP and CWB. The results found that when the JE increases it may alleviate the negative effect of CP on CWB unlike the results of (Jian & Chhabra, 2024) as they found that JE can't moderate the relationship between the CP and CWB. For more explanation, the employee's job stability, the emotional attitude toward the surrounding environment, the fitness between the individual and organizational culture, and the promotion opportunity all these together are necessary to make the employee more able to adapt with the organization especially the flat hierarchy one. Moreover, when the organizations start to add a challenging task to its jobs it will decrease the desire of plateaued employees to leave which in turn lead to decrease the CWB. However, we can't deny that the negative outcomes of JE may occur if employees are embedded in a toxic work environment. As we mentioned before both CP and JE may implies a type of stuckness and the inability to exist from the negative situations in the harmful environment (Allen et al., 2016; Mitchell et al., 2001).

5.2 Theoretical implication:

Firstly, based on the existence of a very little research on CWB in the developing countries (Mehmood et al., 2023). This paper contributes to knowledge on the mechanism that explaining the impact of career plateau and JE on CWB. By employing social identity theory and social exchange theory.

Secondly, previous studies have shown the effect of CP on consequences like turnover intention, organization commitment (Drucker-Godard et al. 2015), job satisfaction (Salami, 2010) and performance (Hurst et al., 2017) between airlines, hospitality employees, and bankers. This paper is one of the first study which shows that CP may lead to CWB between the university staff members.
Thirdly, many studies classify the CP as the hierarchal and content dimensions or the subjective and objective dimensions. However, this study sheds lights upon the personal dimension of the CP and the results showed that this dimension has the most significant effect on the CWB. Moreover, according to the JE dimensions this study adopted the community embeddedness besides the organizational one as we see that when the employee feels that his job can protect his social life this will reduce emerging of CWB.

Fourthly, the study employs the JE as a moderator between the CP and CWB. It validates the embeddedness theory by showing the positive impact of JE on employee outcomes and its impact in buffering the negative relationship between the CP and CWB. We choose JE particularly because some studies have shown that although being embedded in a hostile work environment, JE can be detrimental to employee well-being. It mitigates the effect of negative shocks on organizational outcomes (Allen et al., 2016; Weinert et al., 2024).

5.3 Practical implication

Beside the above-mentioned theoretical implications, our study has some practical implications:

First, the new digital era decreases the creation of new job and increase the cost of employees’ turnover especially the qualified employees. So, in one hand, organizations today foster the long-term employment relationships to reduce its costs. On the other hand, employees may be forced to stay even in an abusive environment because there is a scarcity in new jobs. This issue appears significantly in the important organizations like universities, hospitals (Donnelly & Quirin, 2006).

To handle this dilemma our results showed a positive significant relationship between the CP and CWB. So, manger must anticipate the effects of their decisions and actions and seek to manage negative experiences such as being passed over for a promotion, experiencing disagreements between coworkers, or feeling pressured to leave. These results can be enhanced through the existence of proactive organization. For more explanation, in the point where the job ladder become rigid, it must spread the spirit of challenge through for example adding new activities to the current job, providing training course, and honoring distinguished employees. These will eventually eliminate the negative attentions towards the organizations.
Also, this study found a negative significant relationship between the JE and CWB. This means that if the organizations give the employees the welfare both inside and outside it, there is no need to make any protest behavior whether intentional or not. This occurs because both the emotional stress and job frustration decrease which in turn reduce the turnover intention and intentional service sabotage. So, JE is a cornerstone for improving the social exchange the organizations and employees.

Finally, we noted that although the CP is a negative phenomenon led to more CWB, the JE can reduce the negative relationship between CP and CWB. However, we can't clarify accurately if this JE in a toxic environment or not. We can say that healthy environment, job security, motivation, and challenge can enhance the employee's awareness of his importance to the organization. In sum, this paper provides a simple overview about the CP and CWB and the role of JE in enhancing this relationship in governmental organization like Mansoura university. I hope that this paper will be a starting point for the papers that is interested in employees' behaviors.

5.4 Where can we go from there?

This study provides several fruitful avenues for future research. For instance, we previously said that the causes of career plateau can be attributed to individuals or organizations (Greenberg, 2011; Turnover & Reynolds, 2010). Also, The CWB implies in somewhat violating the ethical and social norms. It also affected by both personal traits and surrounded environment (Zaghini et al., 2016). I believe that in the long term, individuals begin to recognize that their organization not only does not value their abilities and talents, but also ignores their psychological requirements. The only way an individual may feel his identity is to engage in aggressive actions as a sort of appearance and self-promotion. Thus, this study suggest that future research should focus on the role of personality trait differences between employees in fostering CP and CWB.

Moreover, some employees feel comfortable and succumb to positions that do not offer difficulties or the development of skills and abilities, whilst others face frustration and a loss of identity. However, studies have not addressed the role of the employee's evaluation of his competence, i.e., sometimes the employee believes that his qualifications exceed the current job demands, whereas in fact he may be under qualified but is
unaware of it. This will result in a gap between what employees believe about
themselves and their reality. Thus, I suggest to the future research to measure
CP from two faces, one of them concentrated on the employee's opinion to
his current job, and other focus on the employer opinion about the employees'
qualifications.

The reduction of the CP state and the existence of JE play a significant
role in retaining employees. However, we must not forget that both concepts
CP and JE include the meaning of stuck. As JE occur when employees feels
that they don't want to leave despite the existence of adverse work
environment, and CP and lack of challenge and lack of opportunity
growth/current job don't give them promotion. So, in many times one of them
may lead to the other. This means that in an adverse work environment, the
stuckness of employees may lead to negative consequences. So, there is a key
consideration that should be regarded in this stream of research: what is the
effect of toxic environments on the JE of employees? We need to see the
negative side of being embedded in an adverse environment. The reactance
theory& power dependence theory can be employed to differentiate
embedded and non-embedded employees.
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The title: The role of professional burnout in the relationship between professional flattening and counterproductive behaviors among lecturers at the University of Menoufia

The abstract: The aim: Based on my theories of social exchange and organizational identity, I examined the current study the role of professional burnout in the relationship between professional flattening and counterproductive behaviors among lecturers at the University of Menoufia.

Design and methodology: The data were collected using an electronic questionnaire distributed among a sample of (240) lecturers at the University of Menoufia. The data were analyzed using SPSS V.26.

Results of the study: The study's results showed a significant positive impact of professional flattening on counterproductive work behaviors. In addition, there was a negative impact of professional burnout on counterproductive work behaviors. Furthermore, the study concluded that professional burnout undermines the positive impact of professional flattening on counterproductive work behaviors.

Theoretical implications: The reliance on my theories of social exchange and organizational identity is one of the contributions of this current study to the existing literature in the area of relationship between study variables. This in addition to the study of professional flattening through highlighting its impact on counterproductive work behaviors. Moreover, the study examined the role of professional burnout in the relationship between professional flattening and counterproductive behaviors among lecturers at the University of Menoufia.

Originality/Value: The current study clarifies the nature of the relationship between professional flattening and counterproductive behaviors among lecturers at the University of Menoufia, and clarifies the impact of professional burnout on counterproductive work behaviors in an official organization similar to the University of Menoufia. It is considered one of the first studies to examine the role of professional burnout in the relationship between professional flattening and counterproductive behaviors among lecturers at the University of Menoufia.
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