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**ABSTRACT**

In this study, the concepts of leader member exchange on job embeddedness and psychologıcal contract, which are among the important concepts for organizations, are focused on. Firstly, to explain these concepts, an in-depth literature review was conducted for the variables. After the theoretical discussion of the variables, the importance of these concepts for organizations was discussed and the relations between them were tried to be explained. Three different measurement tools were used for the data collection of the study as well as demographic variables. In this perspective, Leader member exchange were used LMX-7 Scale, Job embeddedness were used measured using composite scale and for measurement of the psychological contract a unilateral view Scale were used into data collection. The sample of the study consists of white-collar individuals working in the service sector in Istanbul. The data obtained from the questionnaire applied on a total of 301 participants were analyzed with the SPSS program, a statistical package used for research in the social sciences. As a result of the regression and moderator analyzes, the relationships between the variables were explained. Leader member exchange had a considerable effect on job embeddedness, according to the study results. Leader member-exchanges have a considerable impact on the community, as evidenced by the statistical significance of all the sub variables (R-value .682, P-value 0.000). The exchange of leadership members has a major impact on the organization's fit (R-value .634, P-value 0.000). Thirdly, it was found that the exchange of leadership members affects communal sacrifice significantly (r value was.727, P-value of 0.000), and finally, it was found that the exchange of leadership members significantly affects organizational suffering significantly (r value,.149, P-value 0.005), because the P-values were less than 0.05. According to the findings, there is a strong correlation between the leader-member exchange and the degree of job embeddedness. The exchange of Leader members had a.787’ percent significant influence on job embeddedness (=.787, R =.787, P=.000, F, 83.3), indicating that Leader member exchange had a considerable impact on job embeddedness. The results of the study reveal that leader-member exchange has a major impact on job embeddedness.
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1. **Introduction**

There are still issues in workplace Training and attracting staff can give companies an edge over their rivals, but the best techniques for doing so remain a mystery (Abdul Hakim Ahmad Dardar, Ahmad Jusoh and Amran Rasli , 2012).Off-the-job integration and the exchange of leadership roles have been studied by researchers to see what factors influence whether a worker stays in a particular position (LMX). Having an emotional connection to one's community outside of work can help a worker stay in the organization and thus help them remain a part of the community (Lee, T., Mitchell, T., Sablynski, C., Burton, J., &amp; Holtom, B., 2004).The formation of an alliance between a leader and a member or a member of the workforce may also be connected to employee satisfaction and plans to leave the company. For many business leaders, finding and retaining skilled employees is one of the most difficult challenges they face. (Melissa Rodrigues Ataide Silva , 2019). Organizational leaders who recognize and enforce strategies to decrease the amount of voluntary turnover of staff would be best prepared to face the related difficulties. It is the degree to which a person is unwilling or unable to resign or leave a job ( (Mitchell, Holtom Lee.Thomas S ablynski, 2001). The term "out-of-the-workplace integration" refers to a person's subjective attachment to a residential group that is strong enough to keep them at their current firm to remain part of the community. For example, community-based social organizations, church attendance and fundraising are all examples of workforce involvement in the local community. It is a social construction known as "out-of-the-job embeddedness" that might influence a person's decision to stay or leave a work ( (Maura Galletta MSc, PhD,Igor Portoghese MSc, PhD,Maria Pietronilla Penna MSc,Adalgisa Battistelli MSc, PhD,Luisa Saiani RN, BNSc, MNSc, 2011).In the context of job integration, employees' personal attachments play an important role in shaping their behavior Unlike on-the-job integration, it is made up of elements that have nothing to do with the job itself, but rather with the desire to remain in the four areas where one currently resides. Family, church, social, educational, charity and community events all play a role. (Saravanakumar, 2019). Off-the-job embeddedness is a subjective attachment that an individual may have to a residential group that would produce emotions intense enough to remain within the current company as a way of remaining within the community (M. Secret & Jennifer E. Swanberg, 2008). Retaining quality employees is a necessity for executives and small business owners (Mohamat-Sabri Hassan Norman Mohd Saleh Aulia Rahman Zaleha Abdul-Shukor, 2010). A recent study by (Uta Wilkens, Daniel Nermerich, 2011) found that an agreement on an understanding or contract between the manager and the workers is a basic basis for the building of relationships, as it establishes an existing understanding between the two parties to the contract. This unwritten contract is the way relationships are formulated, established, (M. Secret Jennifer E. Swanberg, 2008)and if they are ignored, they are reprehensibly destroyed in the workplace. Research from Wilkens and Nermerich (2011, also points out that workers need a flexible and up-front management system to maintain a high level of job satisfaction. In other words, the success of the employee depends heavily on the employer's style of management. More specifically, small business owners stressed the need to fulfill the verbal obligations of workers defined in the verbal contract. These verbal contracts are unwritten partnerships and are seen as a crucial element in the formation and preservation of a quality workforce. ( (Madhavi Raulapati Manasa Vipparthi Sisira Neti, 2010). These unwritten agreements or verbal contracts are referred to as psychological contracts. Representatives and followers enter psychological contracts that determine a variety of workplace outcomes, including productivity and employee loyalty Using the Psychological Contract, you may create a shared understanding of the reciprocal nature of the connection between employer and employee, as well as the implicit responsibility that both parties’ bear (Dulac Tanguy Coyle-Shapiro, Jacqueline A. M Henderson, David J Wayne, Sandy J , 2008)). Despite its lack of formality, the psychological contract aids in determining what tasks must be completed to keep the business viable and profitable ( (David W. Warren David J. Gutierrez Eric R. Keim, 2008)). To improve the psychological contract between the leader and his or her subordinates, this study can be of help. It has been suggested that the psychological contract acts as a moderator of the interaction between leader member exchanges (LMX) and job embeddedness because it was initially designed to establish objectives, values, and obligations as defined by the employer and the employee.

**2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

**The concept of job embeddedness**

"Embeddedness" is a term used by sociologists to describe the ways in which social relationships impact and limit economic activity. This is an example of a social network "stuckness" that can be observed. Job embeddedness was first defined by Mitchell and his colleagues (2001) as an emphasis on employees staying with their employer. A person's level of job embeddedness, according to this theory, is the sum of all the things that maintain them in their current roles. Mitchell and colleagues (2001) first used the sociological notion of embeddedness to describe work embeddedness as being focused primarily on the retention of personnel. They defined job embeddedness as the sum of the factors that retain employees in their current roles. Research into the reasons people join companies, what drives their performance, and why they stick around has been going on for decades. Workplace Embeddedness and Leader-Member Exchange. Job embeddedness, a non-affective concept, questioned the widely held view that disgruntled workers leave their jobs while financial incentives keep them there."In retail enterprises, hospitals (Holtom & O'Neill, 2004; Mitchell (Holtom, B., & O’Neill, B. , 2004) et al, 2001), and financial organizations (Holtom & O'Neill, 2004), work embeddedness has been found to have an impact on employee retention. According to the (Lee et al., 2004). LMX model should be related to the notion of job embedding that prevents employee exit in a larger sense because of this. Employees become entangled with their employers because of a variety of relationships, investments, and emotional and cognitive judgments. Multiple restraining pressures make it more difficult for people to depart a company. Many of the most important aspects of job embeddedness are influenced by an employee's "social network." What a person would give up if they left their current job or town is referred to as their "life space," which includes their connections to other people and activities both within and outside the workplace. March and Simon's model shows how static decision-making occurs in the real world. It's a content model, not a process model, and that's why it's useless for understanding turnover. As a result, this framework does not adequately account for the fact that turnover decisions may be influenced by aspirations for long-term development and may be predicted not only by career type, but also by career stage and an employee's assessment of a specific company's career development opportunities. (Krau, 1981).When it comes to making the decision to leave a job, the options are nearly infinite. People's reasons for quitting their occupations were examined in a previous study (March, J.G. and Simon,H.A, 1958). There has been a shift in the balance of power in the workplace, giving employees greater leverage than ever before. Numerous studies have researched employee turnover and the best ways to keep valuable employees. This is not a new idea. An organization's personnel have the option of either manufacturing or participating, as stated by March and Simon (1958). A worker can determine whether to stay in his or her position, whereas the decision to deliver is a decision that a worker can make about staying in his or her post or leaving. Newer conceptualizations of job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been made possible, in part, thanks to the attitude-driven mechanism of optimism or pessimism (Mitchell et al., 2001). When someone is dissatisfied with their current job, it is customary for them to begin looking for another. Prior theories about employee turnover have given rise to the concept of job embedding. March and Simon developed a wide-ranging voluntary turnover paradigm (1958). On the premise that quitting one's job would be easy and desired, the concept was constructed' (Jiang, K., McKay, P., Liu, D., Lee, T., & Mitchell, 2012) . When it comes to explaining why people leave their jobs, March, and Simon (1958, p. 99) claim that workers' views on the merits of mobility are affected by their level of job satisfaction. Writings on turnover theory typically reference the model of (Hom, P. and Griffeth, R, 1995). There are both organizational and group characteristics that help an individual to stay at work, according to the general attrition model used by Mitchell et al. (2001), which incorporates aspects of Lewin's (1951) Field Theory model. In 1943, (Lewin) Because they are "research linked ideas that define the substance of the construct," field theory (Lewin, 1951) and embedded figures (Witkin, 1950) are critical to comprehending job embeddedness (Lee, Burch, & Mitchell, 2014, p. 200). Field theory, group dynamics, and the three-step model of change are the three key components of Lewin's work on the planned approach to change (Burnes & Cooke, 2013). It is thanks to Lewin's work that academics can better grasp how a stronger or weaker environment could affect intended behavioral change. When it came to creating a formative or composite instrument for assessing work embeddedness, Mitchell et al. (2001) cited as a major inspiration. People's interconnectedness, the extent to which work, and community life are integrated with other aspects of their lives, and the ease with which these connections can be dissolved comprise this construct (Mitchell et al., 2001). There are parts of your personal and professional life covered. According to Lee, Mitchell, Sablynski, Burton and Holtom, there are two sorts of embeddedness: on-the-job and off-the-job (2004). Off-the-job embeddedness predicted turnover and absence more than on-the-job embeddedness did. Each of the three components of job embeddedness is linked to the other two. social exchange theory to better understand the relationship between workers and organizations. Originally developed by (Homans, 1958), the social exchange theory seeks to explain how human connections resemble economic transactions. Influence is traded in social situations for a fee and a bonus. (Lawler, 2001). Affect theory is one of the most recent advances to the subject of social interaction theory. There is new evidence that emotions play an important role in forming both personal and community relationships. This is because of factors related to organizational decision-making. Employee performance and turnover are both affected by these decision-factors, which are tied to either organizational or community embeddedness (Jon Welty Peachey , Laura J Burton, Janelle E. Wells , 2014). Job embeddedness is assessed by looking at three different factors: connections, fit, and sacrifice. In the past, researchers have employed the traditional model, in which dissatisfaction was seen as the key cause of low performance and high turnover ( (Choi, S. and Kim, M, 2015), (Hussain, T.,& Deery,S, 2018).Later, Mitchell et al. (2001) looked at important aspects of Job embeddedness that relate to Voluntary Turnover Intention (VTOI) but are not evident, such as work satisfaction and commitment. "Why do employees stay or leave their jobs?" is a question that Holtom and Inderrieden (2006) attempted to answer using a unique model: "Job embedding." Several researchers have investigated the link between embeddedness, performance, and turnover over the years. The Hussain and Deery (2018) study of self-initiated expatriates' turnover intentions identified a link between employees' on-the-job embeddedness and lower turnover intentions. Of particular interest is the finding that (Hussain & Deery, 2018) found that off-the-job integration reduced the link between shock and intention to leave. While Job Embeddedness can focus on the factors that encourage people to stick with their jobs, it also considers the sacrifices that individuals would have had to make within their workplace and their community for them to leave. Job embeddedness may reduce the cost of employee turnover by examining measures to evaluate and enhance. Participants' knowledge of historical events that occurred at the same time could conceivably create common experiences if they were born at the same time. Various generations may have witnessed distinct historical occurrences, which may lead to other variances in thinking. " It is based on the selective optimization principal compensation (SOC) ( (Paul B. Baltes Alexandra M Freund , 1999), that older adults manage age-related losses by prioritizing important aspects of functioning, allocating additional resources to these aspects, and compensating for losses in other areas of life by lowering standards and recruiting additional help, because of these interactions and biological factors, the personalities that are thought to be stable by the age of 30 are formed. Generational differences in personality traits should be expected because of the experiences people have in their formative years (Schuman & Scott, 1989). It will be increasingly difficult for businesses to recruit employees from different generations due to generational differences in work motivations.(Lyons, S,.& Kuron, 2013). Employees contributions and sacrifices, both within and outside the firm, can be used to better understand how each of these generations will be able to endure.The concept of job embeddedness, on the other hand, focuses on why someone stays rather than why they leave. In 1994, Lee and Mitchell (referred to as the unfolding model) conducted a report on a recent attrition study in which they discovered a variety of methods in which individuals departed their positions (Lee et al., 2004). From focusing on effects like contentment, involvement, and participation to a more objective measure of quality (Lee, Burch, & (Kiazad, K., Hom, P.,Holtom,B.,& Newman, A, 2015) Mitchell, 2014). There was an idea proposed by Mitchell et al. (2001), which they believed was crucial in identifying when employees left. The notion of job embeddedness examines whether an employee should continue to work even if they are dissatisfied. They defined job embeddedness as "individual linkages to other individuals, teams, and organizations; their expectations of fit of work and community; and what they think they would have to lose if they quit their jobs," according to Mitchell et al. (2001). People are more likely to remain in their current jobs when they are "job embedded" (Kiazad, Holtom, & Newman, 2015). Using March and Simon's turnover model, later researchers discovered a few antecedents to the phenomenon. In a 1973 study, Porter and Steers discovered that employees who exceeded their expectations were more likely to leave their jobs than those who did not. A later study by Price (1977) found that employees' attitudes about other areas of employment could impact their decision to leave the company. People who have solid relationships with their superiors as well as their coworkers are less likely to leave their jobs. If the job or task requirements are not properly communicated, or if the pay level is not sufficient, employees are more likely to leave. In a similar vein, (Price, 1986) also found that characteristics that contribute to employee retention can be found in both the workplace and the non-work environment. A sense of family obligation, for example, has been shown to lower employee turnover. It is critical to examine the antecedents of employees' views of embeddedness in their employment and organizations considering the established relationships between embeddedness and critical individual and organizational outcomes. This theory has shown the existence of work embeddedness as a distinct notion and its predictive validity in predicting employee performance and engagement. One of the earliest study streams defined the concept, demonstrated its distinctness, and created an accurate and trustworthy measurement. Researchers have also looked at how embeddedness affects things like job satisfaction, performance in and outside of the role, and employee turnover. Except for Allen (2006) and Felps et al., (2009) studies, few attempts have been made to find elements that may drive employees to get immersed in their jobs and organizations. First, the theory of job embedding sought to explain more variance in employee turnover (Mitchell et al., 2001). In a sample of retail and healthcare employees, Mitchell et al. (2001) found a partial correlation of -.08 and -.14 between the variables.

**Leader-Member Exchange**

Leader-member sharing was first presented by Dansereau, Cashman, and Graen back in 1973. The vertical-dyad connection theory was the initial name for this theory. In contrast to other organizational leadership notions, the phrase stresses the interaction between a leader and a member of an organization. It is borrowed from the larger field. This principle's primary aspect is its focus on the working relationships among the various members of a work unit, squad, department, or organization (Dockery, T. M., & Steiner, D. D, 1990). Researchers use the exchange relationship between a leader and a single individual as a primary unit of analysis (dyad). Organizational and individual outcomes can be predicted by the relationship between the leader and the member, says this idea (Graen & Schiemann, 1978). A leader's limited time and energy means that he or she will only build close working relationships with a select few of their subordinates, according to Graen (1976). According to Dockery and Steiner, "these subordinates are known as the in-group, and leader-member contacts with this group are known as leadership exchanges" (1990). Those who remain in the out-group are referred to as supervisory exchanges, and communications with them are known as such. According to Dienesch and Liden, leader-member exchanges revolve around the concept of mutuality (1986). Both the leader and the member benefit from mutuality, which is characterized by a mutually beneficial exchange of value. (Dansereau, 1973). postulated three dimensions of mutuality: contribution, loyalty, and affect. Perceived contributions (expressed or implied) were referred to as work-oriented activities each member put forth towards the shared goals (expressed or implied) (Dienesch & Liden, 1986, p. 624). Thought high-performing members are entitled to a greater exchange of resources than those who are perceived to be underperforming. It was described as loyalty when the leader and the member openly endorsed each other's activities and character. For a leader-member relationship to thrive, "loyalty is important" (Dienesch, R.M& Liden, R.C, 1986). Addiction is described by Dienesch and Liden (1986) as "the reciprocal connection individuals have for each other based mostly on interpersonal attraction rather than work or professional standards" (p. 625). The leader and the member's first meetings are influenced by the leader's affect, whereas loyalty and contribution grow over time. Depending on the outcome of this first meeting, the relationship may evolve into one of leadership or supervisory type. The relationship begins with the leader delegating and progresses through the stages of member response, leadership attributions, and leadership acts (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). For liden and Maslyn, professional respect is an individual's "perception of how far [he or she] has created] within and/or outside of the company a reputation for success in his or her line of work". (Morrow, P.C., Suzuki, S., Crum, M.R., Ruben, R.,& Pautsch,G., 2005)As Morrow, Suzuki, Crum, Ruben and Pautsch write in their study, the quality of the leader-member exchange in this process is critical to organizational effectiveness". Leadership and subordinates' lack of commitment to and contentment with their work was related by a difficult connection between the two. Quality of supervision has a significant impact on an employee's motivation to stay, according to (Maertz, C.P.,&Griffeth, R.W, 2004). A study conducted by (Dockery, T.M& Steiner, D.D, 1990),examined the impact of the initial meeting between leaders and members on the development of their connection. The authors examined the leaders' level of liking for the members, the employees' tactics for influencing the leaders, and the members' skill. Findings from this research show that a leader's liking for certain subordinates and their assessment of each subordinate's competency determine the quality of the exchange after the initial interaction. According to the research, members can gain from being open to appreciating their leaders, using some ingratiating actions, and refraining from assertiveness during their initial engagement (Dockery & Steiner, 1990). An investigation of the relationship between (Liden,R.C& Maslyn, J.M, 1998) leader-member exchange and job performance, satisfaction, commitment, views of leadership roles and turnover intention by (Gerstner, C.R & Day, D.V, 1997) revealed a consistent relationship. This "lens through which the entire work experience is perceived" was found in the literature examined by the authors, Gerstner, and Day (p. 840). Even though the theory has evolved over the years, the basic unit 55 of analysis, the leader-member exchange, has stayed constant. Standard leadership approaches that emphasize the leader's behaviors are a viable alternative to this new paradigm (Gerstner & Day, 1997).

**The definition of psychological contract**

The core of a company-employee relationship is the psychological contract that they have signed and agreed to. Individual effort at work is influenced by the psychological contract that they sign with their employer (Landry et al., 2014). Employees have opinions regarding the psychological contract, which governs the nature of the exchange relationship between employees and organizations. Psychological contracts have been utilized as an interpretive component in the study of employment relationships, and some researchers believe it is vital to understand employee attitudes and behaviors (Conway and Briner, 2002). A psychological contract, according to (Shivganesh Bhargava, Upasna A Agarwal, 2009), defines what an employee owes to the firm and what the organization wants in return. Studies on the psychological contract, which can have a significant impact on employee attitudes and behavior, include those by (Sharkie, 2005) and others. Relational and transactional psychological contracts are the two main types of psychological contracts recognized by the academic community. In contrast to transactional psychological contracts, relational contracts are based on affective social exchanges that are not exclusively (Landry, G., Vandenberghe, C. and Ayed, A.K.B(n.d.), 2014),economic and involve terms of loyalty in exchange for organizational growth or assistance, such as a promotion (Robinson et al., 1994). In contrast, the psychological contract may be viewed differently by full-time and part-time employees. It has been discovered that part-time and full-time employees have different conceptions of the psychological contract, which is likely to result in or worsen discrepancies in attitudes regarding outcomes. According to Freese and Schalk, part-time and full-time workers have different worries about a psychological contract (199 (Freese, C. and Schalk, R, 1996)6). Rather of focusing on relational psychological contracts, the researchers concentrated on the transactional contract. Researchers focused on the transactional contract because full-time and part-time employees have different interpretations of relational psychological contracts (McLean et al., 1998). Psychological contracts are models of the terms and circumstances of an employee's employment relationship with his or her employer in the employee's brain (Rous- seau, 1995). In psychological contract research, the organization has been the primary focus (Rousseau, 1995)). As a result of interactions with organizational agents, psychological contract theory recognizes that the formation of an individual's psychological contract can be influenced by interviews, performance evaluations, written personnel policies, or organizational practices (e.g., supervisors, human resources staff, senior managers, Rousseau, 1995; (Rousseau, D.M and M.M Greller, 1994), Shore and Tetrick, 1994). Psychological contracts are susceptible to being misinterpreted since they are generated through sense-making processes (Rousseau, 1995). Employees that do well may be promised that they would be provided training and advancement possibilities if they meet their goals. The psychological contract will be violated if the employer does not provide the necessary training and promotion opportunities for the employee. In this situation, the employee compares his or her efforts and achievements to those promised by his or her employer. There is a psychological breach of contract when an employee believes that there is a disconnect between the promises made and the actual deliverables. Innumerable studies have demonstrated that breaking a psychological bond has detrimental impacts on firms, (Bordia, P., S.L.D, Restubog and R.L Tang, 2008), (Morrison, E.W and Robinson, 2000).

**3. METHODOLOGY**

**Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents**

This was based on the gender of respondents, age, education, marital status of respondents, and time of stay in white collar employees in Istanbul. Non-managerial employees This was intended to attain a detailed understanding of the respondent’s key characteristics influences the result of the respondents.

**Table 1.: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Variable  |  | Frequency | Percent |
|  | Gender  | Male | 159 | 53.0 |
|  | Female | 141 | 47.0 |
|  | Total | 300 | 100.0 |
| Age | 18-25 | 32 | 10.7 |
|  | 26-35 | 160 | 53.3 |
|  | 36-45 | 75 | 25.0 |
|  | 46-55 | 31 | 10.3 |
|  | Above 65 | 2 | .7 |
|  | Total | 300 | 100.0 |
| Marital Status | Single | 153 | 51.0 |
|  | Married | 147 | 49.0 |
|  | Total | 300 | 100.0 |
| Education  | Associate Degree | 1 | .3 |
|  | Bachelor | 82 | 27.3 |
|  | Master’s Degree | 202 | 67.3 |
|  | Doctoral Degree | 15 | 5.0 |
|  | Total | 300 | 100.0 |
| Occupation  | Public employee | 157 | 52.3 |
|  | Private employee | 143 | 47.7 |
|  | Total | 300 | 100.0 |
| Working Experience | 1-3 | 47 | 15.7 |
|  | 3-5 | 113 | 37.7 |
|  | 5-7 | 83 | 27.7 |
|  | More than 7 | 57 | 19.0 |
|  | Total | 300 | 100.0 |
| Number of coworkers | 1-5 | 55 | 18.3 |
|  | 5-10 | 120 | 40.0 |
|  | 10-15 | 64 | 21.3 |
|  | 15-20 | 45 | 15.0 |
| Coworkers on you | More than 20 | 16 | 5.3 |
|  | Total | 300 | 100.0 |
|  | 1-5 | 98 | 32.7 |
|  | 5-10 | 113 | 37.7 |
|  | 10-15 | 54 | 18.0 |
|  | 15-20 | 30 | 10.0 |
| No. of work teams | More than 20 | 5 | 1.7 |
|  | 1-5 | 128 | 42.7 |
|  | 5-10 | 93 | 31.0 |
|  | 10-15 | 41 | 13.7 |
|  | 15-20 | 23 | 7.7 |
|  | More than 20 | 15 | 5.0 |
|  | Total | 300 | 100.0 |

 |

 |
|  |

**Survey Instruments**

In the present study, a total of three different scales were used to measure all the variables. All the scales were answered by the employees and the items were rated on a 5-point Likert’s scale ranging from 1 = “Absolutely Disagree “to 5 = “Absolutely Agree”. LMX has been evaluated using a variety of metrics during the past 20 years. First, there were two components to the original negotiation latitude measure. In addition to (Dansereau et al., 1975) and four other items (Graen & Cashman, 1975; Liden & Graen, 1980; Vecchio, 1985). Subordinates' level of leader member exchange has been measured using the scale created by Graen and Uhl-Bien, LMX-7. While Graen and Cashman (1975) provided construct validation support for the 4-item negotiating latitude measure, similar psychometric information for the 7-item LMX measure, which was the most used LMX measure in the 1980s and 1990s (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Schriesheim & Gardiner, 1992), has not been published. The metric has been refined because of our research and theory about LMX. Various methods have been used to tap into and assess the dimensionality of LMX, including the addition of experimental items. The results of this study show that, despite the addition of items to tap into possible many dimensions, the enlarged measure was significantly linked with the more concise measure. Furthermore, even though many factors were formed for the bigger measures, the Cronbach alphas for the single measure were typically in the 80–90% range, and the significant correlations among the factor scales rendered considering these factors as multiple measures inappropriate (Cashman, 1975; Schiemann, 1977; Seers, 1981; Schriesheim & Gardner, 1992; Scott, 1993; Bell, 1994). As a result, we believe that the 7-item LMX, with the centroid item "How effective is your working connection with your leader?" is the most appropriate and suggested LMX measure. Of course, we'll keep working on new and improved LMX versions that are psychometrically reliable. The dimensionality of LMX is the second source of dispute. With their inquiry of whether LMX is unidimensional or multidimensional, Dienesch and Liden (1986, p. 624) were the first to raise the subject. In response to this question, Dienesch and Liden said that LMX is multidimensional, citing perceived contribution, loyalty, and affect as the dimensions. Others have begun to examine the dimensionality of LMX and develop additional LMX measures because of (Schriesheim, 1992)their work (Dienesch, 1985; Schriesheim, Neider, Scandura, & Tepper, 1992; Phillips, Duran, & Howell, 1993; Liden, 1993; Liden & Maslyn, 1994). The most constant conclusion of these studies' testing is uniformity on a single dimension (Cronbach alphas for single measures in the 80–90 percent range) and mixed results. Our own testing of a continuous scale total of 5-point items based on these findings led us to this conclusion (1 left to 5 right). There are the same seven questions asked of the leader's team members (leader in parentheses). Expected agreement between leader and member reports is a good and strong indicator of data quality and is employed in this context. When job embeddedness is combined with the composite level of job embeddedness was measured using a 40-item scale established by Mitchell and colleagues (2001). On a 6-point scale, except for ties to the community and organizations (6 = strongly agree 1= strongly disagree), all other aspects were evaluated. (Law, K. S., Wong, G., & Mobley, W. H, 1998) (MacGallum, R. G., & Browne, M. W, 1993). We used six Likert scale because some items were removed from the original scale items of job embeddedness. The six dimensions of job embeddedness combine to generate this composite term (Law, Wong, & Mobley, 1998). Causes of embeddedness, rather than reflections, are its characteristics (MacCallum & Browne, 1993). There are three aspects of embeddedness measured by the survey instrument: fit, linkages, and sacrifice. These are causal, not effect, indicators of embeddedness. Also, it should be noted that our construct does not alter effect indicators via a latent component! As a result, we don't think that being embedded leads to people getting married, buying homes, or strengthening their ties to their business. Instead, they cause the individual to become more deeply ingrained in the system. There are six dimensions (items) and six aggregate constructs in a path diagram, with causal arrows pointing to each of them (Law et al., 1998). There is no one definition of job embeddedness; rather, it refers to the combination of factors, both on and off the job, that can influence whether someone remains in each position. No one anticipated such a strong correlation between the six dimensions (although some might be). For example, we had no reason to expect that job embedding would be linked to organizational ties. In our opinion, a unilateral view is preferable for assessing the psychological contract. To begin, a psychological contract is, as the name suggests, psychological in nature. It is a subjective opinion. Additionally, a bilateral perspective of psychological contracts is difficult because the side of the organization consists of multiple players (top management, supervisors, HR officers, colleagues) who do not necessarily express a uniform set of expectations (Freese & Schalk, 1993). Rather, it is a collection of distinct and differing expectations held by a wide range of players (see Rousseau, 1995, for an overview of contract makers). Psychological contracts are defined in terms of their influence on behavior. How may employee behavior be affected by the whole of employee and employer conceptions of commitments to each other, if the employee is not aware of variations in perception? We don't know how the psychological contract might be affected by a conflict between organizations that are making contracts. Because of these reasons, we focus our discussion here on metrics that examine employee attitudes from a single perspective. A psychological contract's content and evaluation should be measured in accordance with these 'ideal' standards. The criteria we apply here are based on the standard principles for assessing\content and construct validity for scale construction in psychological assessment (Cronbach &\Meehl, 1955; Murphy & David Hofer, 1988). A first premise is that the constructs to be measured\shave to be placed in a theory-based nomological net (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). Content validity and construct validity are also required. Content validity is the degree to which\the measurement (Murphy, K. R., & Davidshofer, C. O, 1988) ‘provides an adequate sample of a particular content domain’ (Murphy & David Hofer, 1988, p. 95). (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1988, p. 95). Construct validity refers to the question if the results on the measurement\provide a good assessment of the psychological contract (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1988, p. 101). (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1988, p. 101). (Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E, 1995). Rarely are items used in a questionnaire traced back to their theoretical or empirical sources (e.g., Rousseau, 1990, Robinson & Rousseau, 1994, Freese & Schalk, 1996, Herriot, Manning, & Kidd, 1997, Thomas & Anderson, 1998, Robinson & Morrison, 2000). While many studies have attempted to answer these questions, it's not always clear where the new questions came from, or why old ones were altered in the first place. The methodological challenge of measuring the psychological contract is still present. There are both unilateral and bilateral viewpoints on the psychological contract, as previously indicated. There are also three dimensions to the psychological contract: features, content, and evaluations. Mental contracts are commonly tested with numerous response scales, but in the literature, the authors only present the results on one scale, which is remarkable. There still needs to be further investigation into how these response scales relate to one another. Research is needed on the relationship between perceived organizational commitments and perceived employee obligations. To be deemed an investigation into psychological contracts, results must include all three dimensions of the psychological contract. There are two sides to every psychological contract, which necessitates investigation and documentation. Individual perceptions of the psychological contract do not justify this. A researcher cannot assess the psychological contract because of its psychological nature. Instead, the respondent must do so. For example, a researcher may consider an imbalance if the perceived promise and the actual degree of inducements diverge by –1. However, in some circumstances, an employee may fail to see the imbalance. Due to a variety of reasons, such as a lack of equity sensitivity, a low obligation sensitivity, or a single mismatch in the psychological contract. Small discrepancies could be the final drop that causes a "cup to spill over." As a result, the respondent must make a judgment about whether the psychological contract has been violated.

**4. Discussions**

A study of white-collar employees in Istanbul to examine the impact of a leader's member exchange on job embeddedness: the role of psychological contracts. Community fit is influenced by the trade of leaders and members, according to H1. H1.2: Leader-member exchange has a major effect on organizational fit.  H1.3: The leader-member exchange has a substantial impact on the sacrifice of the community and on the organizational sacrifice. The findings of this study will have a substantial impact on the psychology of employees and managers, as well as the psychology of the community at large. As a paradigm for the study's research, flow experiences that have a substantial impact on employee performance are examined. Psychological contracts were discussed as a moderator in the member exchange of this leader. In the most fundamental sense, concepts such as maintaining control over organizations while considering the psychology and desires of employees while also respecting and caring for the exchanges of ideas between leaders and members significantly support job embedders. Dissatisfaction among low-wage employees with clients with disabilities and their plans to quit, as discovered by Treuren and Frankish (2014), is reflected in the findings of this study. Because of their embeddedness with their clients, they believed that this new idea of "client embeddedness" could help them better comprehend why some people may despise the organization for which they work, yet still wish to work for it. According to House & Aditya (1997), the focus switched from just recognizing the existence of different links to assessing the quality of those relationships, and their findings support that conclusion as well. Organizational characteristics are examined in this paper. When employees speak and connect with their coworkers, their success is greatly dependent. People and communities in the workplace stand to gain much from this type of collaboration, which necessitates a range of interactions between employers and employees. The findings are consistent with those of Schermerhorn, Hunt, and Osborn (2011), who argue that the stronger the leader-member exchange relationship is, the more satisfied the follower is at work. For the sake of retaining your personnel, you should aim to form the largest possible in-group. Job embeddedness is generally linked to leader-member exchange. As stated by Kreitner and Kinicki (2010), a leader should not lose faith in his or her ability to accomplish the organization's goals. Organizational bonds and organizational sacrifices are assumed to lessen the influence of leader-member exchange on the employee's willingness to stay with the organization.

Leader-member exchanges are required for the flow of information and the mix of managers in the workplace, as well as for the stances of communication, cooperation, sharing of ideas and tools of work to be appropriately offered. Organizations should do a thorough investigation into whether they require a well-considered method of handling interactions between leaders and employees to improve operational efficiency and effectiveness for employees and organizational operations. According to Mitchell, Holtom & Lee (2001), a competent leader can make leaving the company undesirable by attending to off-the-job sacrifices such as a company automobile or tickets to local athletic or cultural events. According to George & Jones (2008), leaders invest more time and attention in the in-group members (those they expect to achieve well) than the out-group members (those they don't expect to perform well).

**5. Conclusion**

Using reliability and factor analysis tests, this case study of white-collar employees in Istanbul studied the influence of a leader's member exchange on job embeddedness. All values less than 0.5 were removed, and the remaining results were based on a single factor model. Non-experimental quantitative research was conducted to see if low levels of job embeddedness and leader member-leader exchanges affected employee job satisfaction and the significance of psychological contracts. An additional goal of this study is to investigate whether the consistency of a leader-member exchange influences job honesty as well as the importance of the psychological contract. Also investigated is the effect of leader member-exchange communication on job satisfaction as measured by the psychological contract. The value of a leader-member exchange is evaluated from an employee's perspective. Research in science is done mostly through the quantitative approach.

**H1.1: Leader member exchange has a significant effect on the fit to community**

Table 4.7 demonstrates that the leader-member exchange has a 73.3 percent significant influence on the fit to community (=.733, R =.733, P=.000, F, 346.450), Indicating how much the exchange affects a person's ability to integrate into the community. Community fit is a canopy for the exchanges, and this evidence is offered as unambiguous proof that the exchanges are successful because of this connection.

**H1.2: Leader member exchange has a significant effect on the fit to organization**

A significant influence of.682 percent (=.682, P=.000, F, 258.5) is shown in Table 4.8 by the leader member exchange. Organizational fit can be predicted by increased member exchange among Leaders, which led researchers to conclude that effective exchange can result in a better fit for members.

**H1.3: Leader member exchange has a significant effect on the community-related sacrifice**

Results from Table 4.9 reveal that the leader member exchange had a.63.4 percent significant effect on community-related sacrifices (=.634, P=.000; F, 201.3). The willingness of communities and organizations to make community-related sacrifices is greatly influenced by leadership exchanges.

**H1.4: Leader member exchange has a significant impact on organization-related sacrifice**

According to the study, this is what we know, leader-member exchange had a 72.7 percent significant influence on organizational sacrifice (=.634, P = 0.000, F, 334.3). Increase the number of leader member exchange to increase the amount of organization-related sacrifice.
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