



Received: 22.10.2019
Received in revised form: 28.11.2019
Accepted: 31.12.2019

Kiral, B. (2020). The relationship between the empowerment of teachers by school administrators and organizational commitments of teachers. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 7(1). 248-265.

<http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/767>

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EMPOWERMENT OF TEACHERS BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENTS OF TEACHERS

Research Article

Bilgen Kiral

Aydın Adnan Menderes University

bilgen.kiral@adu.edu.tr

Bilgen Kiral is an Associate Professor Dr. in the Educational Administration Department in Aydin Adnan Menderes University in Turkey. She earned her PhD Degree in Educational Administration and Policy Department from Ankara University in 2015. Her research interests are teacher empowerment, educational administration, children rights, values and comparative education.

Copyright by Informascope. Material published and so copyrighted may not be published elsewhere without the written permission of IOJET.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EMPOWERMENT OF TEACHERS BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENTS OF TEACHERS

Bilgen Kiral

bilgen.kiral@adu.edu.tr

Abstract

This research which aimed to investigate the relationship between the empowerment of teachers by high school administrators and school commitments of teachers was designed in relational screening model. The study group of the research was composed of 188 volunteer teachers working in the public Anatolian High Schools in Aydin during 2017. “*Behavioral Teacher Empowerment*” and “*Organizational Commitment*” scales were used. As a result of the research, it was determined that the highest empowerment was in the administrative support dimension and the highest commitment level was in the affective commitment dimension. It was revealed that there was not a significant difference in the dimensions of empowerment according to gender, seniority and branch variables of teachers. In the analyses performed regarding the commitment levels of teachers, while there was not a significant difference in terms of the dimensions according to branch variable, it was found that female teachers had higher affective commitments than male teachers. Teachers with professional seniority of 31-40 years had higher affective commitments than those with professional seniority of 11-20 years. It was determined that the highest level of relationship was between communication and affective commitment dimensions.

Keywords: Administrator, empowerment, teacher, teacher empowerment, organizational commitment

1. Introduction

Increasing the performances of employees by motivating them so that they perform better and supporting them should be among the first in the to-do-list of the organizations and managers. For this reason, it is an inevitable fact that empowerment should be among the administrative activities. Empowerment is used in many areas ranging from management to education and it is utilized as staff empowerment in the field of management and as teacher empowerment in the field of education. The empowerment of teachers by administrators can increase the commitments of teachers to their school by diversifying their relationship with the school. In the study conducted, the concept of teacher empowerment is explained first, which is followed by the concept of organizational commitment, and then the relationship between the empowerment of teachers and their commitment levels is determined.

The concept expressed as teacher empowerment is empowering the teachers by the administrators and trying to make the school achieve its aims by the empowerment of them (Kiral, 2019). According to Klecker and Loadman (1996), teacher empowerment means powering up teachers by their administrators. Melenyzer (1990) states that teacher empowerment means increasing teachers’ job performance, giving the control and decision processes to teachers, supporting teachers to acquire professional knowledge, skills and

power, and providing the attainment to adequate power. Maeroff (1988) states that increasing the status of teachers and their professionalization is empowerment.

According to Terry (1995), it is a necessity for schools to empower teachers by administrators because it is revealed that the administrators have empowered their teachers, struggled to increase their potentials and focused on their professional developments when successful schools are investigated. The reason for focusing on teachers is to increase teacher competency and thus, to improve students' achievements and performances. Blase and Blase (1995, 1996) states that school administrators empower teachers by supporting them, creating vision, making them feel sufficient, and taking their views in the activities into consideration, and that they also create empowerment by influencing their teachers, making them feel that they are competent and professional, letting them participate actively in the school activities, and supporting them in all kinds of activities. Since administrators know that work performance and productivity of teachers will increase and they will perform more willingly and enthusiastically when they empower teachers, they make empowerment consciously (Bredeson, 1989; Goyne, Pedgett, Rowicki & Triplitt, 1999; Keiser & Shen, 2000). Thus, it is the school administrators that should undertake the most fundamental role in teacher empowerment.

School administrators should firstly get to know their teachers very well, analyze their weaknesses and strengths appropriately, and act accordingly. Their communication with their teachers should always be good, and they should inform their teachers about the goals and objectives of the school. If they wish to create a desired change within the school, they should plan this in advance and manage this process in the best way (Dufor & Berkey, 1995; Huge, 1977) because it is observed that job satisfaction, work performance, productivity, motivation, and job quality of the teachers who feel themselves empowered increase, that their sense of self-confidence, self-esteem, and entrepreneurship are prompted, and that they struggle to increase both their own success and the success of their students (Keiser & Shen, 2000; Payne & Wolfson, 2000). If the case is the improvement of students and the education system, the enhancement of educational outputs, professionalization in education, a solution-oriented education, and the acceleration of school development, the empowerment of teachers by school administrators (Melenyzer, 1990) is not only a necessity but also an obligation. Within this context, teacher empowerment is examined under five dimensions. These dimensions can be explained as follows.

Delegation of authority: Delegation of authority is the transfer of existing powers to subordinates (Kiral, 2015). Delegation of authority is implemented in all organizations. The benefits of delegation of authority in schools are teachers' embracement of their jobs and the increase in their commitment to their schools, their job satisfaction, motivation, decision-making and communication skills (Goyne et al. 1999). Whetton and Cameron (2011) state that delegation of authority helps employees to increase their self-confidence and work more effectively, and increase their job performance by supporting them to overcome the negative feelings such as inconvenience and weakness. It is suggested that the delegation of authority has such benefits as increasing the potential of the work to be done, facilitating the supervision of work, acting quickly and fast, approaching the problems rapidly, providing the right and adequate decision-making, determining the responsibilities, and providing the development of employees (Kocak, 2011; Moye, Henkin & Egley, 2004).

Administrative support: The concept of administrative support is the support provided for the employees by the management during the work they have been doing within the organization and is the employees' perception of this support given by the management as support (Eisenberger, Fasolo & Lamastro, 1990). Administrative support for schools is to

provide teachers with professional, personal and environmental support for achieving educational objectives (Melenyzer, 1990; Short, 1992). Administrative support can be time, money, material, project, educational and resource support (Melenyzer, 1990; Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001). In addition to this, creating learning school by school administrators can be considered as support because encouraging the teachers to improve themselves in the professional and personal sense, giving them the opportunity to learn, and leading them to improve themselves mean supporting them (Short, 1992). Supporting teachers from various aspects is empowering them (Kocak, 2013) and commitment of teachers to their schools and professions (Firestone, 1993) and therefore the development of teachers and consequently the enhancement of students and the education system mean the increase of educational outputs. As can be seen, administrators have some influences on teachers. Encouraging the employees in their work increases their work performance (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003; Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001; Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997). Supporting teachers for scheduling their timetable, organizing educational settings, providing materials, providing them assistance for their wishes regarding the lessons both materially and spiritually, and for their professional and personal development, and creating opportunities lead teachers to perform their profession better. (Blase & Blase, 1996; Blase & Kirby, 2000).

Participation in decision making: Participation in the decisions is the fact that the administrators take the opinions of the employees while making decisions within the organization and involves them in the decisions made (Niehoff, Moorman, Blakely & Fuller, 2001). Involving teachers in the decisions regarding the school by school administrators is one of the most significant components of empowerment. Participating in the decisions means providing control in the school environment for teachers and feeling that they are effective on the output. This is, of course, related to empowerment (Hicks & Dewalt, 2006; Martin, Crossland & Johnson, 2001; Short, 1992). According to Blase and Kirby (2000), another method of empowering teachers is to ensure their participation in the decisions made. While school administrators make planning regarding the school in order to achieve the goals within the school and schedule the program related to school activities, participating in the decision-making process will lead teachers to have a voice in the task to be done and be successful. Blase and Blase (1996) state that open communication paths and encouragement so as to ensure that the decisions of teachers are respected in the meetings and they participate in the decisions empower teachers. It is also important in the empowerment of teachers that the administrator trusts teachers in solving problems, crises and conflicts, and enable them to participate in the decisions on these issues. Teachers should be turned into individuals that are consulted on a variety of issues from discipline to program, time regulation, parental relationships, and innovation (Bredeson & Johansson, 2000; Short & Greer, 1997; Short & Rinehart, 1992).

Teamwork: According to Gard, Lindstrom and Dallner (2003), team is the name given to the group of people who work together and in coordination, and support each other to achieve the goals of the organization. Teams are composed of people from different backgrounds, having different knowledge and skills, and perspectives of life that come together in order to achieve organizational goals (Dee, Henkin & Duemer, 2002; Somech, 2005). In organizations, people with different skills are brought together and organizational goals are aimed to be achieved by benefiting from the dominant role, creativity, talents and intellectual aspects of each individual (Everard, Morris & Wilson, 2004).

Different types of teams are significant in teacher empowerment and educational organizations just as in other organizations because it is revealed that the sense of belonging and commitment among the individuals who have come together with team consciousness

strengthens and by forming the consciousness of us, responsibilities are fulfilled, work performance increases, and the members of the team put their individual interests into the background for organizational goals (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; 2000; Somech, 2005). The teams established within school are set to solve various problems in the school (Kiral, Arslan & Kiral, 2011). Since the aim is to solve problems, fulfill and accomplish the work, teams undertake such approaches as working together, sharing responsibility and cooperating (Dee, Henkin & Duemer, 2002; Somech, 2005). Organizations working as teams are more successful and perform as solution-oriented (Kiral, 2015). The teams established within school have a structure that focuses on solving the problems of teachers and the school itself, works together, shares responsibility, influences each other and learns from each other when they are supported by the administrators (Dee, Henkin & Duemer, 2002), and thus, teams are a necessary component for organizational development (Somech, 2005).

Communication: Communication is a useful process in which the message is received and delivered in various ways (Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborn, 2002). Open and direct communication between teachers and administrators is important in terms of being able to establish a channel for sharing information, resources and news so as to achieve educational goals (Moye, Henkin & Egley, 2004) because administrators and teachers should keep in touch in order to achieve the school goals, administrators should inform teachers when necessary and ask their opinions and communicate when making important decisions (Kiral, 2019). Inadequate communication or lack of communication prevents achieving the goals or makes them difficult (Maeroff, 1988). Empowering communication within school is one of the most important tasks of school administrators (Blase & Blase, 1996; Short & Greer, 1997). According to Blase and Kirby (2000), school administrators should be the leader administrator in order to empower teachers and they should convince with a constructive language not by using their authority but by using the leadership power and the ability to influence, without breaking hearts. Besides, administrators should try to integrate the school by adopting a solution-oriented approach. School administrators should approach their teachers by using a positive language and be fair at school. Improper use and expression of the official authority in different ways is negatively perceived by teachers and thus, it undermines their enthusiasm towards their job and their confidence towards the administration. Furthermore, the administrators who are honest, positive, optimistic, thoughtful, and tolerant towards their teachers and who reflect all these to their communication are taken into consideration more by their teachers and thus, teachers make more effort for the school goals. The inconsistent behaviors and expressions of administrators form an environment of distrust by creating a negative atmosphere within the organization.

Byron and Kerchner (1991) state that communication is the most important component of empowerment, and that it is even enough itself to make teachers work efficiently. Short and Greer (1997) express that administrators need to increase communication in order to empower teachers at school and that it is the most important issue to be addressed during their administrative activities. Goyne et al. (1999) reveal that empowered teachers have improved sense of belonging to work and their professional commitments increase.

It can be seen that organizational commitment is defined by Meyer and Allen (1997) as the behavior which is shaped by the employees' relationship with the organization and which allows them to make the decision of becoming a permanent member of the organization; while it is defined by O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) as the degree of accepting the aims of the organization by the employees. Mowday, Steers and Porter (1982) define the concept of organizational commitment as the integrity and harmony of the aims of organization and employees; whereas Luthans (1995) states that it is an attitude of the employees regarding their loyalty towards the organization. Robbins (1993) describes organizational commitment

as the identification of the employees with the organization and their aims, and the desire of the employees to continue their memberships within the organization. In terms of organizational commitment, while the commitment to organizational aims come into prominence in the definitions of Mowday, Steers and Porter (1982), and O'Reilly and Chatman (1986), Meyer and Allen (1997) emphasized the types of organizational commitment, and Luthans (1995) gave importance to the concept of "*devotion*". Based on all these definitions, the concept of organizational commitment can be defined as the indigenization of organizational aims by the employees, their dedication to these aims, and the identification of their aims with those of the organization.

The members of the organization are constantly in interaction with each other. This situation is influential on the employees in discovering each other and revealing their knowledge, skills and abilities. For this reason, in the recruitment of employees, organizations try to select the most appropriate person for the culture of the organization. However, bringing the right staff in the organization is a very difficult task. Yet, it is more difficult to keep this staff within the organization for a long time. While employees get into a number of economic expectations from the organization, they also expect many things regarding the working conditions, job satisfaction, work experience, personal needs, and many other expectations related to the organization. Meeting all these needs is not an easy task. The existence of employees within organizations for years, and sometimes during lifetime can be explained by organizational commitment (Samadov, 2006). Nonetheless, it is important for the individual to obtain a certain reward or output from the organization in their organizational commitment (Balci, 2003).

According to Mowday et al. (1979), the attachment of employees to a certain organization and recognizing themselves with that organization and devoting themselves to it is organizational commitment. Organizational devotion can be classified as value, work and coherence commitment. Value commitment involves the acceptance of organizational aims and values with strong faith; work commitment involves the commitment for the sake of the organization; and coherence commitment involves volunteering to remain as a member of an organization (Chang & Chang, 2008).

Katz and Kahn (1977) discuss the employee's commitment to the organization in two groups as instrumental and narrative. Instrumental commitment is, in a sense, related to external rewards. In narrative commitment, there are internal rewards and it is not possible for other organizations to impress employees that are committed to the organization with narrative commitment. Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) discuss organizational commitment as attitude commitment and behavior commitment. Attitude commitment refers to the identification of the employee with the aims and values of the organization and performing accordingly. Behavior commitment refers to the state of staying in the organization considering the damage that the employee may cause in the event of resigning (Nayir, 2013). Organizational commitment can be classified in three ways as; (1) professional commitment; performing the job with passion and identification with the profession; (2) commitment to colleagues; the identification of the individual with other employees and feeling commitment to them; and (3) commitment to work; the feeling that the employee feels for their work (Gozen, 2007; Basyigit, 2006; Meyer, Allen & Gellatly, 1990). As can be seen, researchers have examined commitment in different ways. In this study, organizational commitment is examined as affective, continuance and normative commitment. These are explained below:

Affective commitment: Affective commitment of the employee to the organization refers to the integration of the employee with the organization. The employee considers the organization as a family and regards themselves as a member of this family. The employee

continues in the organization not because they need to be a member of the organization but because they really want to (Allen and Meyer, 1990, 1996; Boezeman & Ellemers, 2008; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1982).

Continuance commitment: In this type of commitment, employees approach the organization utterly with a cost-benefit understanding. There are three factors that allow this type of commitment to be formed in the employee. These are: (a) The rewards that employees hope for as a result of the investments made in time within the context of seniority, time and labor; (b) The fact that employees have little or no alternative of finding a job in another organization; (c) Due to the fact that the employee is satisfied with their salary and that material facilities of the organization is diverse and attractive, the employee does not want to lose them (Karakus, 2008). As can be noticed, material elements are an effective element in the continuance of the employee within the organization.

Normative commitment: The employee is bound to the organization by the sense of responsibility as they think that staying in the organization is the best and most moral choice. Three factors are effective in the formation of this commitment. These are: (a) Employee's family, cultural and organizational values, (b) The norms of doing good to good and evil to evil that stem from the social contract understanding of the employee; and (c) Psychological contract that is the expression of the mutual responsibilities between the employee and the organization and of those between the employee and the administrator (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

As can be seen, the commitment of employees can increase their organizational efficiency. Therefore, they make more efforts for the organization. Increasing the commitments of employees can be achieved through their empowerment. In an organization where empowerment is implemented, employees will work together in harmony and be able to solve problems together. This spirit of unity can play an important role in increasing the continuance and development of the organization. Organizations can ensure their continuity by means of their entrepreneur and responsible members that can renew themselves (Meyer & Schoorman, 1992; San, 2017).

It can be said that as empowerment improves the sense of belonging and commitment to profession, professional work satisfaction levels, motivations and organizational commitments of teachers working in the schools of the school administrators empowering their teachers increase and their abilities of cooperating, communicating and decision-making are at a high level because self-confidence and work performance of teachers strengthened by their school administrators increase (Goyne et al. 1999). According to Payne and Wolfson (2000), teachers consider their school administrators as a resource for supporting, informing and improving them professionally. This perception of school administrators by their teachers puts the administrators in an important position within schools, which can be made possible by the empowerment of teachers by their administrators. If school administrators expect success in their schools, they should empower their teachers (Acaray, 2010) and thus, increase their teachers' organizational commitment. When the literature was reviewed, it was revealed that the studies were conducted on teachers' psychological empowerment and their commitment levels [e.g. Bogler, Ronit & Somech (2004); Lanschinger et al. (2009); Jha (2011); Joo & Shimm (2010)]. The studies were on psychological empowerment and commitment levels of teachers. There is no research on these two topics (behavioral empowerment and commitment). If you empower the teachers, he/she will be committed to his/her school. So He/she will work better and more efficiently, will be motivated to work. Research results are therefore important. However, in this research, it was aimed to determine

the relationship between teachers' behavioral empowerment and their organizational commitment levels. Based on this general objective, the following questions were aimed to be answered:

1. What are the empowerment and organizational commitment perception levels of teachers?
2. Do teachers' empowerment and organizational commitment perception levels show a significant difference according to seniority, gender and branch variables?
3. Is there a significant relationship between empowerment and organizational commitment perception levels of teachers?

2. Method

This study, which aimed to reveal the relationship between the empowerment of teachers by high school administrators and teachers' commitment to school, was designed in relational screening model (Balci, 2009; Karasar, 1991). The purpose of screening model researches is to picture the current situation related to the subject of the research and make a description about it (Buyukozturk et al. 2008). In this research, it was aimed to describe the relationship between the empowerment of teachers by Anatolian High School administrators and teachers' commitment to school according to the views of teachers.

2.1. Study Group

Prior to collecting the data of the research, official permission was received from Aydin Provincial Directorate of National Education and then, the researcher collected the data by personally going to the schools. The study group of the research was composed of 188 voluntary teachers who worked in all the public Anatolian High Schools in Aydin province during 2017 year. The number of female teachers participating in the study were 104 (55.3%) and male teachers were 84 (44.7%). 24 of these teachers had a seniority between 1-10 years (12.8%), 61 of them had a seniority between 11-20 years (32.4%), 75 of them had a seniority between 21-30 years (39.9%), and 28 of them had a seniority between 31-40 years (14.9%). When the branches of the participant teachers were analyzed, it was revealed that 93 of the teachers (49.5%) were the teachers of verbal courses, 69 of them (36.7%) were the teachers of numeric courses, and 26 of them (13.8%) were the teacher of skills courses.

2.2. Data Collection Tool

In the study, “*Behavioral Teacher Empowerment Scale*” and “*Organizational Commitment Scale*” were used as the data collection tools. The scales used in the research are described in detail below.

Behavioral Teacher Empowerment Scale: The Scale, which was used in order to reveal the empowerment levels of teachers by school administrators, was developed by Kiral (2015). In the scale, five-point Likert grading was used as between “*Always (5)*, *Usually (4)*, *Sometimes (3)*, *Rarely (2)* and *Never (1)*”. In the construct validity analysis performed by Kiral (2015), it was revealed that the scale was composed of 5 dimensions. In the scale, there was a total of 30 items; 5 items in “*delegation of authority*” dimension, 4 items in “*administrative support*” dimension, 9 items in “*participation in decision making*” dimension, 8 items in “*teamwork*” dimension, and 4 items in “*communication*” dimension. The scale did not include any reverse-coded items. The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was found between .87 and .96 in the dimensions. As the study was carried out on the teachers for “*Behavioral Teacher Empowerment Scale*”, construct validity analysis was not performed again in this study. However, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for this study were found to vary between .90 and .95 in the dimensions. These values obtained were the indicator of

adequate validity and reliability for the research. According to Tavsancıl (2014), it is adequate to have alpha values between .60 and .80 to claim that the scale has valid reliability values. Therefore, these values obtained are the sign of the fact that the scale has high reliability (Ural & Kilic, 2005; Balci, 2009).

Organizational Commitment Scale: The Scale was developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). The scale was a 5-point Likert type scale as between “*I totally disagree (1), I disagree (2), I am neutral (3), I agree (4) and I totally agree (5)*.” The scale was composed of 18 items and 3 dimensions as “*Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment*.” Four items in the scale were reverse-coded. The scale was adapted to Turkish language and the validity and reliability analyses were performed by Baysal and Paksoy (1999), and it was used by many researchers (Wasti, 2000; Kurtulmus, 2014; Ozbaşır, 2015, etc.). In the reliability study conducted by the researchers, it was determined that the Cronbach’s Alpha values of the scale varied between .66 and .81 in the dimensions. The Cronbach’s Alpha values in the reliability analysis performed for this research were found to be between .73 and .80.

2.3. Data Analysis

In the analysis of research data; frequency, percentage, mean, parametric (t-test and ANOVA) tests and correlation tests were used. The personal information of teachers was determined with frequency and percentage; their empowerment and commitment levels were determined with mean and standard deviation; whether teachers' behavioral empowerment and commitment levels differed significantly according to independent variables (gender, seniority, branch) was determined with parametrical difference tests (t-test and ANOVA) as the data provided the norms of normality; and Tukey test was used in order to determine which groups the difference stemmed from as a result of ANOVA. The norms of normality were determined by central tendency measures and it was revealed that skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the data groups were between +1 and -1. ($p > .05$) (Can, 2015; Ural & Kilic, 2005). Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the relationship between teachers' behavioral empowerment and their commitment. In the analysis, the fact that the correlation coefficient was between 0.00-0.29 was interpreted as low, and that the correlation coefficient was between 0.30-0.69 was interpreted as moderate, and that the correlation coefficient was between 0.70-1.00 was interpreted as high (Buyukozturk, 2008). The statistics revealed were tested at .05 significance level.

3. Findings

The mean and standard deviation scores of the responses that the participants gave to the scales so as to reveal teachers' empowerment by school administrators and organizational commitment levels of teachers were calculated and the results obtained were given in Table 1.

Table 1. *The empowerment and organizational commitment perception levels of teachers*

Scale	Dimensions	\bar{X}	S
Empowerment	Delegation of authority	3.53	.88
	Administrative support	3.86	.78
	Participation	3.55	.87
	Teamwork	3.57	.98
	Communication	2.96	.99
	Overall	3.52	.81
Commitment	Affective	3.18	.54
	Normative	2.83	.73
	Continuance	2.94	.55
	Overall	2.99	.42

As could be seen in Table 1, teachers perceived empowerment in administrative support dimension at the highest level ($X=3.86$, $S=.78$), which was followed by teamwork ($X=3.57$, $S=.98$), participation in decision making ($X=3.55$, $S=.87$), delegation of authority ($X=3.53$, $S=.88$), and communication ($X=2.96$, $S=.99$) dimensions, respectively. Their overall empowerment perception level is good ($X=3.52$, $S=.81$). When teachers' school commitment levels were investigated, it was found that they had affective commitment at the highest level ($X=3.18$, $S=.54$), which was followed by continuance commitment ($X=2.94$, $S=.55$), and normative commitment ($X=2.83$, $S=.73$), respectively. Teachers' overall school commitment level was above average ($X=2.99$, $S=.42$).

As a result of the tests conducted according to teachers' gender (t-test), seniority and branch (ANOVA test) variables, it was concluded that there was not a significant difference between teachers' empowerment levels. While there was not a significant difference in the tests performed regarding the teachers' commitment levels according to branch variable, it was concluded that there were significant differences according to gender and seniority variables. The results of t-test performed in order to reveal the perceptions of teachers regarding their commitment levels according to gender were given in Table 2.

Table 2. *t test results according to gender variable*

Dimension	Gender	n	\bar{X}	S	Sd	t	p
Affective	Female	104	3.15	.54		.599	.550
	Male	84	3.20	.53			
Normative	Female	104	2.88	.74		.993	.322
	Male	84	2.77	.72	186		
Continuance	Female	104	3.03	.54		2.494	.014*
	Male	84	2.83	.55			
Overall	Female	104	3.02	.42			
Commitment	Male	84	2.95	.42		1.147	.253

When Table 2 was examined, it could be seen that there was not a significant difference in the other dimensions of commitment except for continuance commitment dimension according to teachers' gender [$t(186)=2.494$, $p<.05$]. It was found that the perceptions of female teachers regarding continuance commitment ($X=3.03$, $S=.54$) were significantly higher than those of male teachers ($X=2.83$, $S=.55$). The results of ANOVA test performed so as to reveal the perceptions of teachers regarding their commitment level according to their seniority were given in Table 3.

Table 3. *ANOVA test results according to seniority of teachers*

Dimension	Seniority	n	\bar{X}	S	Sd	F	P	Sig. Diff.
Affective	1-10 years	24	3.13	.52		3.165	.026*	2-4
	11-20 years	61	3.03	.55				
	21-30 years	75	3.23	.47				
	31-40 years	28	3.38	.60				
Normative	1-10 years	24	2.75	.95		1.476	.223	-
	11-20 years	61	2.99	.73				
	21-30 years	75	2.75	.66				
	31-40 years	28	2.76	.69				
Continuance	1-10 years	24	2.89	.52		3;184		
	11-20 years	61	2.92	.59				
	21-30 years	75	2.95	.53				
	31-40 years	28	3.02	.57				
Overall	1-10 years	24	2.95	.37		245	.865	-
	11-20 years	61	3.00	.45				
	21-30 years	75	2.98	.41				
	31-40 years	28	3.04	.46				

When Table 3 was examined, it was revealed that there was not a significant difference in the other dimensions of commitment except for affective commitment dimension according to teachers' seniority [$F_{(3-184)} = 3.165$; $p < .05$]. Tukey multiple comparison test was performed in order to determine from which seniority group the difference stemmed and it was found that affective commitment levels of teachers with 31-40 years of seniority were higher than those of teachers with 11-20 years of seniority ($X=3.03$, $S=.55$). Correlation test results regarding the relationship between the empowerment of teachers by school administrators and teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment were given in Table 4.

Table 4. Pearson Product-moment Correlation Coefficient results regarding the relationship between the empowerment of teachers by school administrators and organizational commitments of teachers

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Authority	-							
Support	.716**	-						
Decision	.745**	.737**	-					
Team	.713**	.725**	.842**	-				
Communication	.625**	.601**	.764**	.782**	-			
Affective	.078	.070	.119	.098	.732**	-		
Normative	-.048	-.042	-.063	-.081	-.070	.260**	-	
Continuance	.165*	.175*	.169*	.081	.584**	.365**	.113	-

** $p < .01$ and * $p < .05$

When Table 4 was examined, it could be seen that there were positive, high and moderate level relationships between among the dimensions of empowerment and that the highest relationship was between the participation in decisions and communication dimensions ($r=.84$). It was found that there were moderate and low level relationships among the dimensions of commitment and that the highest relationship was between affective and continuance commitment dimensions ($r=.37$). It was also revealed that there were significant, positive relationships among the dimensions of empowerment and dimensions of commitment, and it was determined that the highest relationship was between communication and affective commitment dimensions ($r=.73$).

4. Conclusion and Discussion

When the results of the research were examined, it was concluded that the highest empowerment was in administrative support dimension. In the study conducted by Kiral (2015), the teachers stated that their administrators exhibited empowerment in administrative support dimension at most. Both studies are similar in this respect. It was also concluded in the analyses performed that there was not a significant difference among the dimensions of empowerment according to gender variable. This finding of the research is in parallel with the researches conducted. In the research conducted by Gardenhour (2008), the relationship between work setting and empowerment according to the perceptions of teachers was investigated. According to the research, it was found that gender did not have a significant relationship with empowerment. In addition to this research, it was revealed in the researches carried out by Kiral (2015), Short and Rinehart (1992) that there was not a significant difference in the empowerment of teachers according to gender. In the research, it was concluded in the analyses performed that there was not a significant difference among the dimensions of empowerment according to seniority variable. Similarly, in the research conducted by Dincer (2013), it was revealed as a result of the responses given by teachers that formal authority using behaviors of school principals did not show a significant difference according to seniority. No significant difference was found between the views of senior teachers and the views of teachers with high seniority. In the research carried out by Egriboyun (2013) on the administrators and teachers working in secondary education

institutions, it was determined that seniority variable did not show a significant difference in the administrative support dimension in the administrators and teachers. In the researches conducted by Kiral (2015) and Aslan (2006), it was found that seniority did not reveal a significant difference in empowerment.

In the current research, it was concluded that the highest level of commitment was in affective commitment dimension. The results of the researches by Balcik (2018), Balay (2000), Kursunoglu, Bakay and Tanriogen (2010), Maral (2015), Meyer, Stanley and Parfyonova (2012), Odabasi (2014), and Ozbakir (2015) were found to be similar with the current research. The fact that teachers' affective commitment mean score was the highest is a positive and desirable result because the employee with high affective commitment is identified with the organization and enjoys being a member of the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1996). The fact that affective commitment was higher than other dimensions of commitment may be the indicator that teachers are satisfied with the school they work for, that they identify themselves with the school, and that they are struggling for the success and development of the school. While there was not a significant difference in the analyses performed regarding the commitment levels of teachers according to branch variable, it was concluded that there were significant differences according to gender and seniority variables. As a result of t test performed regarding gender variable, it was concluded that there was a significant difference between the views of female and male teachers in continuance commitment. While there are researches similar to current research revealing that commitment did not differ according to gender variable [Balcik (2018), Kiral and Kacar (2016), Kurtulmus (2014), Ozbakir (2015), Sharma, Mohapatra and Rai (2013), Yuksel (2015)]; there are also researches revealing that commitment differed according to gender [Aksanaklu (2018), Gok (2014), Odabasi (2014), Maral (2015), Meyer, Stanley and Parfyonova (2012), Scandura and Lankau (1997)]. When teachers' state of commitment was examined, it was concluded that teachers with 31-40 years of seniority had higher affective commitment levels than teachers with 11-20 years of seniority. In the studies by Aksanaklu (2018), Balcik (2018), and Allen and Meyer (1991), it was found that there was a significant difference according to seniority.

It was revealed that there were positive, high and moderate level relationships among the dimensions of empowerment and that the highest relationship was between participation in the decisions dimension and communication dimension. It was found that there was a moderate and low level relationships between the dimensions of commitment, and that the highest relationship was between affective commitment dimension and continuance commitment dimension. It was also revealed that there were positive, low, moderate level and high, significant relationships between the dimensions of empowerment and the dimensions of commitment. The highest relationship was found between communication and affective commitment dimensions.

When the studies investigating the relationship between empowerment and commitment were examined, it could be seen that the studies focused mainly on psychological empowerment. In fact, no similar study was found investigating the relationship between "*behavioral empowerment and commitment*". In the study conducted by Bogler, Ronit and Somech (2004) on secondary school and high school teachers in Israel, they examined the relationships among teacher empowerment, teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship. As a result of the research, a significant relationship was found between teachers' empowerment perception levels and their organizational-professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. The positive relationship between psychological empowerment and organizational commitment is similar to the studies conducted by Lanschinger et al. (2009), Joo and Shimm (2010), San

(2017), and Jha (2011). While Jha (2011) found a significant relationship between psychological empowerment and affective commitment and normative commitment dimensions of organizational commitment, he revealed that there was not a relationship with continuance commitment dimension. As a result of the research, no positive relationship was found between psychological empowerment and affective commitment dimension of organizational commitment, and in the meaning, competence and autonomy perceptions of psychological empowerment.

According to the results of the research, administrators can increase in-school activities and organizational associations in order to enhance continuance commitment levels of male teachers. So as to increase affective commitment levels of teachers with 11-20 years of seniority, platforms where they will be able to share ideas with experienced teachers can be created. By enhancing their communication with teachers, school administrators can help teachers increase their school commitment levels. The same research can be conducted in different school types and the difference between the views of teachers can be revealed. With the researches carried out by using mixed method, administrator strategies that will enable teachers to be committed to their schools can be revealed. By using the Psychological Empowerment Scale, various researches can be conducted aiming to determine organizational commitment levels of teachers.

References

- Acaray, T. (2010). *Ankara ili ilköğretim ve ortaöğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretmenleri güçlendirme örüntüleri* [The teacher empowerment patterns of principals in the public schools of central districts in Ankara province] (Master Thesis). Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Aksanaklu, P. (2018). *Okul yöneticilerinin örgütsel bağımlılıkları ile tükenmişlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [With organizational contributions of school administrators the investigation of the relationship between binding levels] (Master Thesis). Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.
- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18.
- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3), 252–276.
- Aselage, J. & Eisenberger, R. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 491-509.
- Balay, R. (2000). *Yönetici ve öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık* [Organizational commitment in managers and teachers]. Ankara: Nobel.
- Balci, A. (2003). *Örgütsel sosyalleşme kuram strateji ve taktikler* [Organizational socialization theory strategies and tactics]. Ankara: PegemA.
- Balci, A. (2009). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma* [Research in social sciences]. Ankara: PegemA.
- Balcik, E. (2018). *Örgüt kültürü, psikolojik güçlendirme ve örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkiler* [The relationships between organizational culture, psychological empowerment and organizational commitment] (Master Thesis). Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey.
- Basyigit, A. (2006). *Örgütsel iletişimin örgütsel bağlılık üzerine etkisi* [The effect of organizational communication on organizational commitment] (Master Thesis). Dumlupınar University, Kutahya, Turkey.
- Baysal, A. C. & Paksoy, M. (1999). Mesleğe ve orgüte bağlılığın çok yönlü incelenmesinde Meyer-Allen Modeli [Meyer-Allen Model in a multi-dimensional study of commitment to the profession and organization]. *Istanbul University Journal of Business Research*, 28(1), 7-15.
- Blase, J. & Blase, J. (1995). Facilitative school leadership and teacher empowerment: Teacher's perspectives. *Social Psychology*, 1, 117-145.
- Blase, J. & Blase, J. (1996). The micropolitical orientation of facilitative school principals and its effects on teacher's sense of empowerment. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(2), 138-164.
- Blase, J. & Kirby, P. (2000). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do*. London: Corwin.
- Boezeman, E. J. & Ellemers, N. (2008). Pride and respect in volunteers' organizational commitment. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 159-172.

- Bogler, R. & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and teacher education*, 20(3), 277-289.
- Bredeson, P. V. (March 27-31, 1989). *Redefining leadership and the roles of school principals: Responses to changes in the professional worklife of teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Bredeson, P. V. & Johansson, O. (2006). The school principal's role in teacher professional development. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 26 (2), 385-401.
- Buyukozturk, S., Cakmak, E. K., Akgun, O. A., Karadeniz, S. & Demirel, F. (2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri [Scientific research methods]*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Buyukozturk, S. (2008). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı istatistik, araştırma deseni SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum [Data analysis handbook for social sciences statistics, research design SPSS applications and interpretation]*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Byron, K. & Kerchner, C. T. (1991). *Defining principal leadership in an era of teacher empowerment*. Chicago: The American Educational Research Association.
- Can, A. (2015). *SPSS ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde veri analizi [Data analysis in the process of scientific research with SPSS]*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Chang, C. S. & Chang, H. C. (2008). Perceptions of internal Marketing and Organizational Commitment by Nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 65 (1), 92–100.
- Dee, J. R., Henkin, A. B. & Duemer, L. (2002). Structural Antecedents and Psychological Correlates of Teacher Empowerment. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(3), 257-277.
- Deniz, A. (2013). *Okullarda güç mesafesi ve örgütsel bağlılık [The relationship between power distance and organizational commitment at schools]* (Master thesis). Balikesir University, Balikesir, Turkey.
- Dincer, A. (2013). *İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin yetki kullanma eğilimlerine ilişkin öğretmen ve müdür görüşleri [Reviews of teachers and principals about the primary school principals' tending to use the authority]* (Master thesis). Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale, Turkey.
- Dufor, R. & Berkey, T. (1995). The principal as staff developer. *Journal of Staff Development*, 16 (4).
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P. & Lamastro, V. D. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51-59.
- Egriboyun, D. (2013). *Ortaöğretim okullarında görev yapan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel güven, örgütsel destek ve örgütsel bağlılıklar arasındaki ilişki [Relation among organizational trust, organizational support and organizational commitment of the administrators/teachers who are charged in secondary education schools]* (Doctoral dissertation). Abant Izzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey.
- Everard, K. B.; Morris, G. & Wilson, I. (2004). *Effective school management*. California: Sage.
- Firestone, W. A. (1993). Why "professionalizing" teaching is not enough. *Educational Leadership*, 6-11.

- Gard, G., Lindstrom, K. & Dallner, M. (2003). Towards a learning organization: The introduction of a client-centered team-based organization in administrative surveying work. *Applied Ergonomics*, 34(2), 97-105.
- Gardenhour, C. (2008). *Teachers' perceptions of empowerment in their work environments as measured by the psychological empowerment instrument* (Doctoral dissertation). East Tennessee State University
- Goyne, J., Pedgett, D., Rowicki, M. A. & Triplitt, T. (1999). *The journey to teacher empowerment*.<http://files.eric.ed.gov> (Retrieved date: 14.10.2016).
- Gok, E. E. (2007). Örgütsel kültür bağlamında örgütsel vatandaşlık olgusu ve bir araştırma [Organizational citizenship behaviour in terms of organizational culture] (Master thesis). Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey.
- Gozen, E. D. (2007). *İş tatmini ve örgütsel bağlılık sigorta şirketleri üzerine bir uygulama/A research on job satisfaction and organizational commitment insurances companies* (Master thesis). Atilim University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Huge, J. (1977). The Principal as Staff Development Leader. *Educational Leadership*, 384-386.
- Joo, B. K.,& Shim, J. H. (2010). Psychological empowerment and organizational commitment: The moderating effect of organizational learning culture. *Human Resource Development International*, 13(4), 425-441.
- Jha, S.(2011).Influence of psychological empowerment on affective, normative and continuance commitment- A study in the Indian IT industry. *Journal of Indian Business Research*,3(4),263-282
- Karakus, M. (2008). *İlköğretim okul yöneticilerinin ve öğretmenlerin duygusal zekâ yeterliklerinin, öğretmenlerin duygusal adanmışlık, örgütsel vatandaşlık ve iş doyumu düzeylerine etkisi* [The effect of emotional intelligence competencies of primary school administrators and teachers on organizational commitment, organizational citizenship and job satisfaction levels of teachers] (Doctoral Dissertation). Firat University, Elazig, Turkey.
- Karasar, N. (1991). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* [Scientific research method]. Ankara: Nobel
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1977). *Social psychology of organizations*. H. Can & Y. Bayar (Trans. Edts.). Ankara: TODAIE.
- Kirkman, B. L. & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond self-management: Antecedents and consequences of team empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 58-74.
- Keiser, N. M. & Shen, J. (2000). Principals' and teachers' perceptions of teacher empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 7, 115-121.
- Kiral, B. (2015). *Lise yöneticilerinin öğretmenleri güçlendirmesi ve öğretmenlerin kayıtsızlık (sinizm) davranışları ile ilişkisi* [The relationship between teacher cynicism of high school administrators and cynicism behaviors of teachers] (Doctoral dissertation). Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Kiral, B. (2019). Eğitim yönetiminde öğretmen güçlendirme [Teacher Empowerment in Educational administration]. (627-668). *Eğitim yönetimi* [Educational administration]. N. Cemaloglu ve M. Ozdemir (Edt). Ankara: PegemA.

- Kiral, B., Arslan, M. M. & Kiral, E. (2011). Okulda oluşturulabilecek takımlar [Teams that can be created at school]. *Journal of Education and Training in the World*, 1(1), 49–55.
- Kiral, E. & Kacar, O. (2016). The relationship between teachers' school commitment and school culture. *International Education Studies*, 9(12), 90-108.
- Klecker, B. & Loadman, W. E.(1996). *Exploring the relationship between teacher empowerment and teacher job satisfaction*. Chicago: The Mid-Western Educational Research Association.
- Kocak, E. (2011). *ilköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin yetki devri, otonomi ve hesap verebilirliklerine ilişkin algılarının belirlenmesi* [A research on empowerment, autonomy and accountability perception of teachers who work in Turkish elemantary schools] (Master thesis). Osmangazi University, Eskisehir, Turkey.
- Kocak, O. (2013). *Ortaokullarda görev yapan okul yöneticilerinin sosyal iletişim becerileri ile branş öğretmenlerinin motivasyonu arasındaki ilişki* [The relation between the social communication skills of school administrators in secondary schools and the motivation of branch teachers] (Master thesis). Cumhuriyet University, Sivas, Turkey.
- Kurtulmus, M. (2014). *Farklılıkların yönetimiminin öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıklarına ve vatandaşlık davranışlarına etkisi* [The diversity management's effects on high school teachers' organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors] (Doctoral dissertation). Dicle University, Diyarbakır, Turkey.
- Kursunoglu, A., Bakay, E. & Tanriogen, A. (2010). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri [Organizational commitment levels of elementary school teachers]. *Pamukkale University Journal of Faculty of education*, 28(1),101-115.
- Lashinger, H. K., Finegan, J. E., Shamian, J. & Wilk, P. (2004). A longitudinal analysis of the impact of workplace empowerment on satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 25, 527-545.
- Luthans, F. (1995). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Maeroff, G. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers*. New York: Teachers College.
- Maral, S. (2015). *İlkokul ve ortaokul müdürlük yardımcılarının örgütsel bağlılıklarının bir yordayıcısı olarak okul kültürü* [Vice of primary and secondary school as predictors of organizational commitment culture] (Master thesis). Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Melenzyer, B. J. (1990). *Teacher Empowerment: The discourse, meanings and social actions of teachers*. The Annual Conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, Orlando, Florida.
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: theory, research and application*. California: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1991). A Tree-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L. J. & Parfyonova , N. M. (2012). Employee commitment in context: The nature and implication of commitment profiles. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 1–16.

- Meyer, J. E., Allen, N. J. & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and Continuance Commitment to the Organization: Evaluation of Measures and Analysis of Concurrent and Time-Lagged Relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(6), 710-720.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- Meyer, R. C., & Schoorman, F. D. (1992). Predicting participation and production outcomes through a two dimensional model of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 671-684.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L.W.,& Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic.
- Moyle, M. J., Henkin, A. B. & Egley, R. J. (2005). Teacher-principal relationships exploring linkages between empowerment and interpersonal trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(3), 260-277.
- Nayir, F. (2013). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyi [Primary school administrators' organizational commitment level]. *Elementary Education Online*, 1, 179 – 189.
- Niehoff, B. P., Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. & Fuller, J. (2001). The Influence of Empowerment and Job Enrichment on Employee Loyalty in a Downsizing Environment. *Group & Organization Management*, 26(1), 93-113.
- Odabas, I. (2014). *Yapısal güçlendirme ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkide psikolojik güçlendirmenin ara değişken rolü: Öğretmenler üzerinde bir çalışma* [The role of structural and psychological empowerment on realization of commitment to the organization: Study on teachers] (Master thesis). Istanbul Kultur University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- O'Reilly, C. A. & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492-499.
- Ozbakır, R. (2015). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı merkez teşkilatında görev yapan milli eğitim uzman yardımcılarının örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi* [Research of the organization of commitment among the assistant specialist at Ministry of National Education] (Master thesis). Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Payne, D. & Wolfson, T. (2000). Teacher professional development-the principal's critical role. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84, 13-21.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R. & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective Commitment to the Organization: The Contribution of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5). 825-836.
- Robbins, S. P. (1990). *Organization theory structure, design and applications*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Samadov, S. (2006). *İş doyumu ve örgütsel bağlılık: Özel sektörde bir uygulama* [Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A application on private sector](Master thesis). Dokuz Eylul University, Izmir, Turkey.

- Scandura, T. A. & Lankau, M. (1997). Relationship of gender, family, responsibility and flexible work hours to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 377-391.
- Schermerhorn, J. R.; Hunt, J. G. & Osborn, R. N. (2002). *Organizational behavior*. America: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sharma, B. R., Mohapatra, M.,& Rai, S.(2013).Organizational commitment as a measure of administrative motivation search for its predictors in a multinational organization. *Management and Labour Studies*, 38(3), 139–153.
- Short, P. M. & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). *Teacher empowerment and school climate*. The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Short , P. & Greer , J. (1997). *Leadership in empowered schools*. USA: Quebecor Book.
- Short, P. M. (1992). *Dimensions of Teacher Empowerment*.<http://files.eric.ed.gov> (Retrieved date: 10.12.2014)
- Somech, A. (2005). Teachers' personal and team empowerment and their relations to organizational outcomes: Contradictory or compatible constructs? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(2), 237-266.
- San, B. C. (2017). *Öğretmenlerin ve okul yöneticilerinin psikolojik güçlendirme ve örgütsel bağlılıklarına ilişkin algıları [Perceptions of teachers and school managers on psychological empowerment and organizational commitment]* (Master thesis). Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey.
- Tavsancıl, E. (2014). *Tutumların ölçülmesi ve SPSS ile veri analizi [Measurement of attitudes and data analysis with SPSS]*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Terry, P. M. (1995). *Empowering teachers as leaders*.www.nationalforum.com. (Retrieved date: 10.12.2015)
- Ural, A. & Kılıç, I. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve SPSS ile veri analizi [Scientific research process and data analysis with SPSS]*. Ankara: Detay.
- Wasti, S. A. (2000). *Meyer and Allen's three-dimensional organizational commitment scale validity and reliability analysis*. 8th National Management and Organization Congress, Nevşehir.
- Whetton, D. A. & Cameron, K. S. (2011). *Developing Management Skills*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Yumusak, H. (2013). *İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin bezdiri (mobbing) yaşama düzeyi ile örgütsel bağlılıklar arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [The relationship between the mobbing experience of primary school teachers in the education institution they work and their organizational commitment]* (Master thesis). Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Yüksel, R. F. (2015). *Okul çalışanlarının örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel sessizlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi [Analyzing the relationship between the levels of organizational loyalty and organizational silence of school employees]* (Master thesis). Okan University, Istanbul, Turkey.