

# Relationship between the Instructional Leadership Behaviors of High School Principals and Teachers' Organizational Commitment

Nuray Sarıkaya<sup>1</sup> Çetin Erdoğan<sup>2</sup> \*

1. Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul Aydın University, Bakırkoy, Istanbul, Turkey
2. Faculty of Education, Yıldız Technical University, Esenler, Istanbul, Turkey

## Abstract

The purpose of the current study is to investigate the relationship between the instructional leadership behaviors of high school principals and teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment and to test the extent to which instructional leadership behaviors predict organizational commitment. The study is designed in relational method. The population comprised of secondary school teachers working at public schools located in the European side of Istanbul in 2014-2015 school year. The sampling of the study consists of 441 voluntary teachers from 28 different schools selected by means of simple random sampling method. The data of the study were collected through "School Principals' Instructional Leadership Questionnaire" developed by Şişman (1997) and "Organizational Commitment Scale" developed by Balay (2000). Whether the distribution of the collected data is normal or not was tested using histogram, Q-Q graphs and coefficient of skewness and kurtosis. As the distribution was found to be normal, parametric tests were used. The relationship between instructional leadership behaviors and organizational commitment was analyzed with Pearson-product moment correlation analysis and the extent to which instructional behaviors predict organizational commitment was investigated with multiple linear regression analysis. The findings of the study revealed that the principals most display instructional leadership behaviors involved in the dimension of setting and sharing of school goals and least display the instructional leadership behaviors encompassed by the dimension of supporting and developing teachers. The organizational commitment of the teachers was found to be little at "compliance" dimension and to be medium at "identification" and "internalization" dimensions. As for the adaptation dimension, negative correlation was found between the principals' instructional leadership behaviors and the teachers' organizational commitment and for identification and internalization dimensions, positive and significant correlation was found between the principals' instructional leadership behaviors and the teachers' organizational commitment. It was also found that the "establishment of a well-organized instructional environment and climate" dimension of instructional leadership behaviors significantly predicts the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment.

**Keywords:** leadership behaviors, organizational commitment, high school principals, high school teachers

## 1. Introduction

Educational – instructional process should not only be a process entailing the transfer of learned information but also be a process through which horizons of individuals are expanded far beyond their expectations, a progressive viewpoint is imparted to students so that they could contribute to the development of civilization and creative and innovative ideas are promoted. During the implementation phase of educational process, principals who will lead the process are expected to be effective leaders adopting an innovative and a creative viewpoint for the educational system to accomplish its goals.

As stated by Balcı (1992), effective instruction requires a new administrative perception and a new administrator. This administrator will manage the school from classes and corridors and be available when needed. Moreover, instead of spending his/her time on bureaucratic tasks, he/she will be interested in instructional problems and challenges and will be an indispensable part of instruction by guiding teachers, developing a sense of competency on teachers and motivating them. While traditional school principals focus on maintenance, repair, revenues and many other administrative duties as well as bureaucratic ones, instructional leaders attach the greatest priority to academic achievements of students and instructional process. In this regard, the best leadership approach for schools can be argued to be instructional leadership approach (Kurt, 2012, 137).

### 1.1 Instructional Leadership

The concept of instructional leadership was introduced as a result of the research on effective schools. The research revealed that in the formation of successful schools, principals exerted significant influences; thus, leadership characteristics of the principals in such schools were attempted to be determined. When the literature on the leadership characteristics of the principals in effective schools is examined, it is seen that the term of instructional leadership is at the forefront. What is aimed with the concept of instructional leadership is to convert an educational organization and its surrounding into a more productive and desired environment (Çelik, 2013, 42). Şişman, (2012, 54) defines instructional leadership as “behaviors that should be demonstrated by the principal himself/herself and that are promoted by the principal to be adopted by others in order to achieve the anticipated outcomes at school”.

One of the authors developing the first model of instructional leadership, Thomas Sergiovanni defined the power of leadership under five categories: technical, human, educational, symbolic and cultural. Technical dimension of instructional leadership matches with traditional leadership applications. It covers administrative issues such as organizational development, leadership theory, time management and planning. Human dimension includes interpersonal relations that constitute the basis of instructional leadership such as the principal’s communication skills and capacity to motivate others. Instructional power encompasses all the instructional roles of the principal such as teaching, learning and application of the curriculum. Symbolic and cultural powers, on the other hand, stem from the ability of the instructional leader to be the symbol of what is important for school and what serves the purposes of the school and to integrate with the beliefs and values of the organizations (McEwan, 2000, 2).

Şişman (2012) classified the behaviors of instructional leader into five dimensions which are setting and sharing of the goals of the school; management of educational program and instructional process; evaluation of the instructional process and students; supporting and developing teachers and construction of a well-organized teaching-learning environment and climate. This classification is adopted in the current study and Şişman’s scale is employed.

*Setting and sharing of school goals.* This dimension points out the vision and mission of the school. The vision and mission of the school direct all of the educational and instructional activities in the school and affect working motivation of the people involved in teaching and learning process (Şişman, 2012a, 72). The most important role of the school principal is to develop the goals of the school and to explain them to the individuals within the school organization (Gümüşeli, 1996, 37).

*Management of education program and instructional process.* This dimension includes the behaviors related to supervision and improvement of the instruction and monitoring of students by the school principal. Çelik (2013, 41) states that instructional program should promote active participation of students, encourage the display of correct behaviors and provide explicit feedback on time.

*Evaluation of instructional process and students.* This dimension is related to continuous assessment, monitoring and evaluation of students’ development and achievement levels through various assessment tools so that the strengths and weaknesses of the program can be determined and required changes and arrangements can be made to enhance the program (Şişman, 2012a, 88).

*Supporting and developing teachers.* The teacher should develop professionally and personally to keep up with rapid information growth and constantly changing technologies Gümüşeli (1996, 47) and Şişman (2012, 92) maintain that the school principal should follow the developments in education and learning and share this information with teachers, continuously make teachers informed about changes and developments, prepare the environment necessary to improve the efficiency of teachers and provide opportunities for teacher improvement. In this regard, there are some behaviors to be demonstrated by school principals such as appreciating teachers, encouraging them to take risk, treat them with sympathy and empathy, promote behaviors of cooperation among teachers and make teachers feel that the principal is supportive to their efforts (Özdemir and Sezgin, 2002, 280).

*Construction of a well-organized teaching-learning environment and climate.* The concept of school climate is a comprehensive concept encompassing the behaviors of individuals within the organization and their interaction with the environment. By constructing an appropriate environment for education, the school principal contributes to students’ learning. For the school principal responsible to meet the desires of staff, to promote their integration with the school and to positively affect their morale and performance to accomplish these tasks, an environment in which everybody works with pleasure within an atmosphere of mutual trust and solidarity should be constructed (Şişman, 2012a, 96).

For school organizations to attain their goals, the school principal’s demonstrating some certain behaviors on

his/her own would not be enough. All the staff in the school should be effectively involved in this process. Engagement of teachers in this process is of particular importance. In school organizations, teachers who can directly interact with students and can create behavioral changes on the part of students are the corner stones of teaching-learning process. A teacher committed to his/her school and profession is expected to be willing and active for the school organization to accomplish its goals. High level of teacher commitment to the school organization is a pre-requisite for effective schools to be established. It is clear that the level of teacher commitment is affected from the behaviors of principals. Thus, it is believed that there is a relationship between the teachers' organizational commitment and instructional leadership behaviors exhibited by school principals.

### *1.2 Organizational Commitment*

The issue of "organizational commitment" was first researched by Whyte in 1956 and its first definition was proposed by Grusky in 1966 as "the power of an individual's commitment to an organization" (cited, İnce and Gül, 2005, 3). Though great emphasis was put on the concept of organizational commitment after 1970s, an agreement could not be reached on a common definition of the concept since researchers coming from different disciplines such as sociology, psychology, social psychology and organizational behavior investigated the issue from their discipline-specific viewpoints (Çöl and Gül, 2005, 292).

Organizational commitment is a concept indicating a sincere adoption of the organization's goals and objectives for the organization to come to a better state by its workers, their efforts and contributions made for this purpose (Ada, Alver and Ath, 2008, 495). Baysal and Paksoy (1999) defined organizational commitment as "the approval and adoption of the goals, vision and objectives of an organization with a great eagerness by the worker who is willing to display better performance than expected from him/her for the good of the organization". Teachers working in educational organizations are expected to be more committed to their organizations and duties, to have higher job satisfaction and to be more motivated than workers in other organizations. Teachers' organizational commitment takes shape depending on the attitudes and behaviors exhibited by their principals. Terzi and Kurt (2005) conducted a study on teachers' organizational commitment and found that democratic leadership behaviors increase teachers' commitment to school and in schools managed by indifferent leaders, teachers' commitment is low.

When the literature on the concept of organizational commitment is examined, it is seen that organizational commitment is multi-dimensional construct and different authors focused on its different dimensions. Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) explained the concept of organizational commitment on the basis of three factors that are strong belief in and approval of the goals and values of the organization, eagerness to invest remarkable effort for the good of the organization and a strong desire to maintain the membership to the organization. Etzioni, (1975), O'Reilly and Chatman (1986), Allen and Meyer (1990) viewed organizational commitment as a multi-dimensional construct and proposed a different definition for each dimension. Thus, in literature, it is generally agreed that organizational commitment is a multi-dimensional construct and the constituent dimensions are identified as behavioral, attitudinal and normative commitments (Cited in Bakan, 2011, 11-12).

In the literature, it is possible to encounter different dimension classifications of the concept of organizational commitment. The current study adopted the dimension classification of O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) as compliance, identification and internalization. Compliance commitment occurs when attitudes and behaviors are adopted not for the common beliefs, but for winning certain rewards. In this case, general and specific attitudes may vary. Identification dimension occurs when the individual can be affected in the direction of establishing satisfying human relations. That is, the individual can feel proud of being a part of a community which respects his/her values and abilities. Internalization dimension indicates that one of the attitudes and behaviors displayed is congruent with the individual's own values. That is, when the values of the community or organization and the individual are the same, this dimension occurs. Individuals with the commitment at the dimensions of identification and internalization exhibit behaviors of investing more efforts and time for the interest of the organization and their willingness to stay with the organization is higher. At the compliance dimension; on the other hand, individuals continue to be a part of the organization only for getting certain rewards and do not do more than what is required by their duties; thus, their desire to stay with the organization is relatively lower (O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986, 493).

For commitment to organization to occur, the individual should want to stay with the organization at his/her own volition. In this case, teachers' organization commitment emerges when they demonstrate a performance higher than expected such as taking additional responsibilities within their organizations. As known well, in educational organizations, an important place is occupied by "human" factor. The most important indicators of the commitment of teachers in our country are considered to be job satisfaction, their perception of the profession of

teaching and the degree of their integration with their school (Özden, 1997, 35). The sense of commitment developed by teachers towards their institutions positively affects their professional performance (Okcu, 2011, 51). Stating that one of the objectives of the school should be to promote intrinsic motivation in its teachers, Celep (2000, 138) specified the factors determining the teacher's commitment to the school as the desire to maintain his/her existence in the school, the investment of efforts more than expected and approval of the administrative applications in the school.

One of the most important factors affecting organizational commitment of the teacher, the principal, as an effective instructional leader, should work hard to increase the organizational commitment of the personnel for the school to achieve its goals. As can be revealed by the research, teachers with higher organizational commitment are more sacrificing and successful in their works and thus, share very important duties and responsibilities for the construction of effective schools. When the national studies focusing on the organizational leadership of principals are examined, it is observed that while there are many studies dealing with the organizational leadership in relation to different variables, the amount of research focusing on organizational leadership together with organizational commitment is quite limited (Yüce, 2010; Serin, 2011), and majority of these few studies were conducted at elementary level. Given that there is no study looking at the relationship between instructional leadership and organizational commitment and there are important differences between elementary school organizations and secondary school organizations, it seems to be clear that a study to be conducted on the relationship between instructional leadership and teachers' organizational commitment at secondary education level will make important contributions to the literature.

Thus, the general purpose of the current study was set to be to investigate the relationship between the instructional leadership behaviors of public secondary principals and teachers' organizational commitment. To do so, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What are the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership behaviors of public secondary school principals?
2. What are the organizational commitment levels of the teachers working in these public secondary schools?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership behaviors of the public secondary school principals and teachers' organizational commitment?
4. Is instructional leadership a significant predictor of organizational commitment?

## **2. Method**

In this section, research design, universe and sampling, data collection instruments, reliability and validity studies and data analysis will be presented.

### *2.1 Design*

The current study conducted on the basis of quantitative research design employed one of the general survey models; that is, relational model. Relational survey is a research model aiming to determine the existence of covariance or its level between two or more variables (Karasar, 2015, 81).

### *2.2 Universe and Sampling*

The population of the current study is comprised of the teachers working in the public secondary schools located in the European side of the city of Istanbul. According to the data obtained from the National Education Directorate of Istanbul, the number of the teachers is 22,175. According to Balcı (2011, 106), for a universe whose size is up to 50,000 to be represented at 95% reliability level, at least 381 participants should be included in the sample. Thus, the data of the current study were collected from 28 secondary schools selected from among the secondary schools in 14 provinces of Istanbul (Çatalca, Beylikdüzü, Esenyurt, Küçükçekmece, Bayrampaşa, Avcılar, Güngören, Zeytinburnu, Kağıthane, Şişli, Bağcılar, Bahçelievler, Bakırköy, Arnavutköy) by means of simple random sampling method. The scales were administered to 441 teachers from these schools voluntarily accepting to participate in the study.

### *2.3 Data Collection*

In order to collect the data about the instructional leadership behaviors of the school principals, "School Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors Questionnaire" developed by Şişman (1997) was used. And in order to collect data about the teachers' organizational commitment, "Organizational Commitment Scale"

developed by Balay (2000) was employed.

### *2.3.1 School Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors Questionnaire*

The questionnaire consists of five dimensions and 50 items. The dimensions each including 10 five-point Likert type items are as follows: Setting and sharing of school goals (ILB1); Management of education program and instructional process (ILB2); Evaluation of instructional process and students (ILB3); Supporting and developing teachers (ILB4); Construction of a well-organized teaching-learning environment and climate (ILB5). Answer alternatives to the questionnaire items are; "(1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often, (5) Always (Şişman, 1997).

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value of "School Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors Questionnaire" was found to be 0.978. This value is over 0.5 and moreover, the result of Barlett test shows that the data are suitable for factor analysis ( $p < 0.05$ ). The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the questionnaire were found to be varying between 0.89 and 0.95. The factor analysis revealed that the factor loading values of the items of the questionnaire range from 0.57 to 0.81. The total variance explained by the questionnaire exhibiting a five-factor structure was found to be 63.3%. This result shows that this questionnaire is valid and reliable (Şişman, 1997).

### *2.3.2 Organizational Commitment Scale*

The scale evaluates organizational commitment at three dimensions proposed by O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) as compliance, identification and internalization. The scale consists of 27 items designed in five-point Likert format and answer alternatives are; (1) strongly disagree, (2) little agree, (3) moderately agree, (4) agree and (5) completely agree. There are 8 items in each of the compliance and identification dimensions and 11 items in the internalization dimension (Balay, 2000).

The construct validity of the scale was tested with factor analysis. In order to test whether the scale is suitable for factor analysis, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was conducted and it was found to be 0.919. Moreover, the result of Bartlett test revealed that the data are suitable for factor analysis ( $p < 0.05$ ). The items making up the scale were gathered under three factors; the factors loadings of the items varied between 0.49 and 0.85 and the total variance explained was found to be 59.7%. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale were found to be 0.73, 0.87 and 0.92, respectively. These results show that the scale is valid and reliable (Balay, 2000).

### *2.4 Data Analysis*

In the analysis of the data, SPSS 22.0 program package was used. Whether the data collected through the data collection tools exhibit a normal distribution or not was tested by means of histogram graphs, Q-Q plot graphs, skewness and kurtosis coefficient values. When the data were examined, it was seen that the points in Q-Q plot graph were gathered around 45 degree line, skewness coefficient varies between +1 and -1, kurtosis coefficient varies between +3 and -3 and the data were considered to be exhibiting a normal distribution (Fidell, 1996; cited in Peker, 2015, 328). As the data showed a normal distribution, parametric tests were employed. Pearson product-moment correlation analysis ( $r$ ) was run to determine the impacts such as the direction and the size of the relationship between the variables. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to test the extent to which the dimensions of instructional leadership behaviors predict the dimensions of organizational commitment. The results obtained from the analyses of the study were interpreted at the significance level of 0.05. In addition, in the analysis of the data, some descriptive analyses such as arithmetic mean ( $\bar{X}$ ), standard deviation ( $s$ ) values were also used.

## **3. Results**

In this section, the data regarding instructional leadership and organizational commitment are analyzed and interpreted in line with the sub-purposes of the current study.

Firstly, the findings related to the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership behaviors of the principals are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics regarding the sub-dimensions of the instructional leadership scale

Sub Dimensions	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Level
1. Setting and sharing of school goals	441	3.43	1.09	Mostly
2. Management of education program and instructional process	441	3.30	1.17	Sometimes
3. Evaluation of instructional process and students	441	3.22	1.17	Sometimes
4. Supporting and improving teachers	441	2.78	1.22	Sometimes
5. Construction of a well-organized teaching-learning environment and climate	441	3.28	1.17	Sometimes

When the data presented in Table 1 in relation to the teachers' perceptions are examined, it is seen that the principals display the most behaviors from the dimension of setting and sharing school goals and the fewest behaviors from the dimension of supporting and developing teachers.

The findings related to the teachers' organizational commitment levels are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. descriptive statistics regarding the sub-dimensions of the organizational commitment scale

Sub Dimensions	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Level
Compliance	441	2.03	1.20	Little agree
Identification	441	2.75	1.23	Moderately agree
Internalization	441	3.22	1.14	Moderately agree

As can be seen in Table 2, the teachers' commitment at the compliance dimension is low and their level of commitment at the identification and internalization dimensions is moderately agree.

The results of the correlation analysis conducted to determine the relationship between organizational commitment and instructional leadership behaviors are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The Results of the bivariate correlation analysis of relationship between the sub-dimensions of the organizational commitment and the sub-dimensions of the instructional leadership

	ILB2	ILB3	ILB4	ILB5	Compl.	Ident.	Intern.
ILB1	.825**	.811**	.740**	.824**	-.361**	.502**	.413**
ILB2		.852**	.778**	.815**	-.315**	.485**	.414**
ILB3			.818**	.828**	-.337**	.519**	.401**
ILB4				.825**	-.325**	.498**	.418**
ILB5					-.407**	.544**	.447**
Compl.						-.379**	-.265**
Ident.							.593**

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Pearson correlation coefficients given in Table 3 show that all the correlation coefficients between the dimensions are significant at the level of 0.05. These results show that the relationships of instructional leadership dimensions with each other are positive and high and the compliance dimension is negatively correlated with other dimensions of commitment . It is seen that while sub-dimensions of instructional leadership are in a strong correlation with each other, the correlation between the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment is relatively weaker. Furthermore, it is seen that there is a negative correlation between the compliance dimensions of commitment and its other dimensions. The highest significant relationship between the principals' instructional leadership behaviors and the teachers' organizational commitment was found for the identification dimension and the least significant relationship was found for the compliance dimension.

The results of the regression analysis conducted to elicit the extent to which the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership predict the compliance dimension of commitment are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Multiple regression analysis results regarding the prediction of the compliance dimension of organizational commitment

Variables	B	Std. Error	$\beta$	t	Sig.	Zero-order r	Partial r
Constant	3.01	0.13		22,67	0.00		
ILB1	-0.10	0.07	-0.13	-1.46	0.15	-0.361	-0.070
ILB2	0.10	0.08	0.11	1.18	0.24	-0.315	0.056
ILB3	-0.02	0.08	-0.02	-0.25	0.81	-0.337	-0.012
ILB4	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.36	0.72	-0.325	0.017
ILB5	-0.29	0.07	-0.40	-4.08	0.00	-0.407	-0.192
R= 0.414		R <sup>2</sup> = 0.171		Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = 0.162		F (435) =18.00 p= .000	

The results reported in Table 4, the regression model used in prediction (Compliance= a + B1ILB1 + B2ILB2 + B3ILB3 + B4ILB4 + B5ILB5 + s) is statistically significant. The results show that the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership significantly predict the compliance dimension of organizational commitment [F(435)=18.00, p<0.05]. The sub-dimensions of instructional leadership explain 17% (R<sup>2</sup> =0.171) of the total variance in the compliance dimension of organizational commitment. According to  $\beta$  values, the most important of the predictive variables to predict the compliance dimension was found to be construction of a well-ordered instructional environment and climate (-0.40). The same dimension was found to be the only significant predictor according to t-test results. Thus, linear regression model is expressed as follows;

$$\text{Compliance} = 3.01 - 0.10(\text{ILB1}) + 0.10(\text{ILB2}) - 0.02(\text{ILB3}) + 0.02(\text{ILB4}) - 0.29 (\text{ILB5})$$

The results of the multiple regression analysis related to the prediction of the identification dimension of organizational commitment by the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Multiple regression analysis results regarding the prediction of the identification dimension of organizational commitment

Variables	B	Std. Error	$\beta$	T	Sig.	Zero-order r	Partial r
Constant	0.96	0.15		6.38	0.00		
ILB1	0.11	0.08	0.10	1.28	0.20	0.502	0.061
ILB2	-0.03	0.09	-0.03	-0.37	0.71	0.485	-0.018
ILB3	0.15	0.09	0.16	1.77	0.08	0.519	0.085
ILB4	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.96	0.34	0.498	0.046
ILB5	0.26	0.08	0.29	3.27	0.00	0.544	0.155
R= 0.561		R <sup>2</sup> = 0.315		Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> =0.307		F(435)=40.02 p=0.000	

As can be seen in Table 5, the regression model used for the prediction is statistically significant. The results show that the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership significantly predict the identification dimension of organizational commitment [F(435)=40.02, p<0.05 ]. The sub-dimensions of instructional leadership explain 31% (R<sup>2</sup> =0.315) of the total variance in the identification dimension of organizational commitment. According to  $\beta$  values, the most important of the predictive variables to predict the identification dimension was found to be the construction of a well-organized instructional environment and climate (0.29). The same dimension was found to be the only significant predictor according to t-test results. Thus, linear regression model is expressed as follows;

$$\text{Identification} = 0.96 + 0.11(\text{ILB1}) - 0.03(\text{ILB2}) + 0.15(\text{ILB3}) + 0.07(\text{ILB4}) + 0.26 (\text{ILB5})$$

The results of the multiple regression analysis related to the prediction of the internalization dimension of organizational commitment by the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Multiple regression analysis results regarding the prediction of the internalization dimension of organizational commitment

Variables	B	Std. Error	$\beta$	T	Sig.	Zero-order r	Partial r
Constant	1.78	0.15		11.56	0.00		
ILB1	0.09	0.08	0.09	1.05	0.29	0.413	0.050
ILB2	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.96	0.34	0.414	0.046
ILB3	-0.04	0.09	-0.04	-0.45	0.65	0.401	-0.022
ILB4	0.11	0.07	0.12	1.49	0.14	0.418	0.071
ILB5	0.20	0.08	0.23	2.45	0.01	0.447	0.117
R=0.462 R <sup>2</sup> =0.213 Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> =0.204 F(435)=23.55 p=0.000							

As can be seen in Table 6, the regression model used for the prediction is statistically significant. The results show that the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership significantly predict the internalization dimension of organizational commitment [F(435)=23.55, p<0.05]. The sub-dimensions of instructional leadership explain 21% (R<sup>2</sup>=0.213) of the total variance in the internalization dimension of organizational commitment. According to  $\beta$  values, the most important of the predictive variables to predict the internalization dimension was found to be the construction of a well-organized instructional environment and climate (0.23). The same dimension was found to be the only significant predictor according to t-test results. Thus, linear regression model is expressed as follows;

$$\text{Internalization} = 1.78 + 0.09(\text{ILB1}) + 0.09(\text{ILB2}) - 0.04(\text{ILB3}) + 0.11(\text{ILB4}) + 0.20(\text{ILB5})$$

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusion

In light of the results of the analyses conducted in relation to instructional leadership behaviors, it can be argued that the school principals exhibited the most instructional leadership behaviors in terms of the sub-dimension of setting and sharing of the goals out of the instructional leadership behaviors gathered under five dimensions. The dimension for which the teachers find the principals the least adequate is the sub-dimension of supporting and developing teachers. When similar studies focusing on the instructional leadership behaviors of principals in Turkey are examined, it is seen that in many studies (Gümüseli, 1996; Gökyer, 2004; Aksoy, 2006; Arın, 2006; Yüce, 2010; Serin, 2011; Şişman, 2012; Receptoğlu and Özdemir, 2013; Sezer, Akan and Ada 2014) teachers think that the dimension of “setting and sharing of school goals” is utilized the most and the dimension of “supporting and developing teachers” is utilized the least. Thus, the findings of the current study concur with the findings reported in the literature.

The teachers think that the principals are successful in communicating school goals clearly through meetings, seminars and various documents, in evaluating and developing these goals via open discussions for better performance of both teachers and students and in encouraging teachers for the accomplishment of these goals. The general functioning of the Turkish education system highly depends on bureaucratic efficiency. The goals of the school are centrally set by the central authority and schools function around these pre-set goals. This makes it easier for principals functioning within the bureaucratic organization to gather teachers around school goals.

The findings of the current study revealed that the teachers think that the principals exhibit the fewest instructional leadership behaviors in relation to the dimension of supporting and developing teachers. Similar results reported by the research in the last 20 years in Turkey indicate that shortcomings of principals in this regard could not be overcome through years. First, principals should distance themselves from bureaucratic responsibilities and tendencies and remember that the most important factor in education is the human factor; thus, they should put greater emphasis on teachers' wishes and needs. However, it is understood that the principals are not good enough at exhibiting instructional leadership behaviors such as appreciating the teachers' efforts, promoting them to improve their performance, supporting them for their professional development, informing them about important developments in the field of education and in sharing new information and experiences. The reason for this negative perception might be the principals' spending most of their time on bureaucratic duties and sticking to standard procedures to fulfill their responsibilities and duties.

It is seen that the teachers' responses to the organizational commitment scale items generally little agree with the items in the compliance dimension. Compliance commitment resulting from a desire to win certain rewards in return for performing some organizational duties is not a desired form of commitment. According to Başaran

(1996, 37), compliance behavior is a result of effort invested by the worker to establish a balance in his/her interaction with environment and generally results in compliance with authority, rules and procedures. The individual does the duty assigned not as he/she wants but as he/she is obliged to. As this is advantageous for those holding the authority, it is generally viewed to be a means of finding emergency solutions for short terms (Balay, 2000a, 96). The teachers seem to have adopted compliance commitment. This finding is parallel to the findings reported by Balay (2000a).

The findings of the current study indicate that the teachers' organizational commitment perceptions related to identification commitment are at moderately agree level. Identification commitment occurs in the form of establishing satisfactory relationships with others or maintaining such relationships and in this way, the individual is proud of being a member of a group (Dogan and Kılıc, 2007, 43). This finding shows that the teacher demonstrate commitment to their institutions at a level lower than the required and can not establish as a satisfactory relationship with their institutions as they wish. As the teachers think that they are not supported to reach and share new information about their profession, they become hesitant about exhibiting their talents. In this case, teachers only execute the performance expected from them and are not willing to exhibit a better performance than required.

The findings of the current study, similar to the findings of other studies (Balay, 2000a; Buluç, 2009; Yüce, 2010; Okcu, 2011), show that the teachers' perceptions related to the internalization dimension of organizational commitment are higher than those of the other dimensions. However, even at this dimension, they are the moderately agree level. As the internalization dimension occurs as a result of a match between organizational and individual values, it can be argued that the teachers are in a moderate compliance with the goals and values of the school. However, the quality of education in school organization improves depending on the extent to which teachers internalize the values of the organization. In short, the teachers' organizational commitment was found to be low at the compliance dimension and moderately agree at identification and internalization dimensions. In order to increase teachers' commitment to their organization, there is a need for instructional leaders who do not strictly adhere to bureaucracy and procedures, more support teacher development, have strong communications skills, inspire trust and attach great importance to inter-groups communication.

The results of the correlation analysis conducted to determine the relationship between the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership and the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment revealed that there is a negative correlation between the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership and the compliance dimension of organizational commitment and there is a positive correlation between the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership and identification and internalization dimensions. A positive and medium-level correlation was determined between the all dimensions of instructional leadership and identification and internalization sub-dimensions of organizational commitment. The results of the multiple regression analysis showed that the best predictor of organizational commitment is the "construction of a well-organized learning-teaching environment and climate" sub-dimension of instructional leadership. This dimension predicts organizational commitment at the compliance dimension by 17%, at the identification dimension by 31% and at the internalization dimension by 21%. The conclusion reached by Serin and Buluç (2012) that, as a whole, instructional leadership behaviors are a predictor of organizational commitment is parallel to the finding of the current research.

As a conclusion, it can be argued that efforts to be put forth by principals to organize social activities to promote the interaction with teachers, students and other personnel, to lessen the financial requirements for instructional activities and to obtain the support of parents and other stakeholders for the success of the school will increase teachers' organizational commitment.

## References

- Ada, N., Alver, İ., Atlı, F. (2008). Örgütsel İletişimin Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerine Etkisi, *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 8(2), 487-518.
- Aksoy, E. 2006. *İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Öğretimsel Liderlik Rollerini*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Institute of Social Sciences, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.
- Arın, A. 2006. *Lise Yöneticilerinin Öğretim Liderliği Davranışları ile Kullandıkları Karar Verme Stratejileri ve Problem Çözme Becerileri Arasındaki İlişki*. Osmangazi University, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Eskişehir, Turkey.
- Bakan, İ.. 2011. *Örgütsel Bağlılık*, Ankara: Gazi Bookstore.
- Balay, R. 2000. *Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerde Örgütsel Bağlılık*, Ankara: Nobel Publications.

- Balay, R. 2000a. *Özel ve Resmi Liselerde Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılığı*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara University.
- Balcı, A. (1992). İlköğretimde Öğretimin Niteliğinin Geliştirilmesi, *Hacettepe University Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8: 157-166.
- Balcı, A. 2011. *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma: Yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. 9<sup>th</sup> Edition, Ankara: Pegem Akademi Publications.
- Başaran, İ. E. 1996. *Türkiye Eğitim Sistemi*, Ankara: Gül Publications.
- Baysal, A. C. and PAKSOY, M. 1999. Mesleğe ve Örgüte Bağlılığın Çok Yönlü İncelenmesinde Meyer-Allen Modeli, *İ.Ü.İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28 (1), 7-15.
- Buluç, B. 2009. İlköğretim okullarında bürokratik okul yapısı ile okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri arasındaki ilişki. *Journal of Education and Science*, 34 (152), 71-86.
- Celep, C. 2000. *Örgütsel Adanma ve Öğretmenler*, Ankara, Anı Publications.
- Çelik, V. 2013. *Eğitimsel liderlik*, Ankara, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition, Pegem Akademi Publications.
- Çöl, G. ve Gül, H. 2005. Kişisel Özelliklerin Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerine Etkileri ve Kamu Üniversitelerinde bir Uygulama. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F Dergisi*, 19 (1), 291-306.
- Dogan, S. ve Kılıç, S. 2007. Örgütsel Bağlılığın Sağlanmasında Personel Güclendirmenin Yeri ve Önemi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29, 37-61.
- Gökyer, N. 2004. *İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Öğretim Liderliği Rollerini Gerçekleştirme Düzeyleri ve Bu Rollerini Sınırlayan Etkenler*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Institute of Social Sciences, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Gümüşeli, A. İ. 1996. *İstanbul'daki İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Öğretim Liderliği Davranışları*. Associate Professorship Thesis, Yıldız Teknik University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- İnce, M. ve Gül, H. 2005. *Yönetimde Yeni Bir Paradigma Örgütsel Bağlılık*. Konya: Cizgi Bookstore.
- Karasar, N. 2015. *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*, 28. bs. Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Kurt, T. 2012. Okul Yönetiminde İnsan İlişkileri. In (Editor: Servet Özdemir) *Türk Eğitim Sistemi ve Okul Yönetimi*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- McEwan, E. (2014) *Seven Steps to Effective Instructional Leadership*, retrieved from <http://www.learningdomain.com/Instructional.Steps.pdf> on 11.01.2014.
- Mowday, R. T, Steers, R. M. and Porter, L. W. 1979. The Measurement of Organizational Commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Okçu, V. 2011. *Okul Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Stilleri ile Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılıkları ve Yıldırma Yaşama Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi*, Gazi University Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.
- O'Reilly, C. and Chatman, J. 1986. Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment, The Effects of Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Prosocial Behaviour, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492-499.
- Özdemir, S. ve Sezgin, F. 2002. Etkili Okullar ve Öğretim Liderliği. *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3, 267-282.
- Özden, Y. 1997. Öğretmenlerde Okula Adanmışlık Yönetici Davranışları ile İlişkili Mi? *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 135, 35-41.
- Peker, A. (2015). Ergenlerin Saldırganlık ve Siber Zorbalık Davranışları Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi, *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 19(61), 323-336.
- Recepoğlu, E. and Özdemir, S. (2013). The relationship between principals' instructional leadership behaviors and organizational health of the school, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 19 (4), 629-664.
- Serin, K. 2011. *İlköğretim Kurumlarında Öğretimsel Liderlik ile Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişki*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Institute of Educational Sciences, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Serin, M. K. and Buluç, B. (2012). The Relationship between Instructional Leadership and Organizational Commitment in Primary Schools, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 18 (3), 435-459.

Sezer, Ş. ,Akan, D., & Ada, Ş. (2014). Ortaöğretim Kurumları Yöneticilerinin Öğretim Liderliği Rollerini Gerçekleştirme Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından Değerlendirilmesi, *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(1), 230- 249.

Şişman, M. 1997. *Geleceğin liderlerinin yetiştirilmesi ve eğitimde liderlik*. 21. Yüzyılda Liderlik Sempozyumu. İstanbul: D.H.O. Publications.

Şişman, M. 2012. *Öğretim liderliği*, Ankara, 4.baskı, Pegem Akademi Publications.

Terzi, A. R. ve Kurt, T. 2005. İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin yöneticilik davranışlarının öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığına etkisi , *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 166, 98-111.

Yüce, S. 2010. *İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Öğretim Liderliği Davranışı İle Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Institute of Educational Sciences, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.

**Note :**

This manuscript was produced from the master's thesis of the graduate student Nuray Sarıkaya under the advising of Assist. Prof. Dr. Çetin Erdoğan at the Institute of Social Sciences in Istanbul Aydın University, Istanbul, Turkey.