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Abstract

Problem statement: Talent Management (TM) has been recently seen as a critical success factor in the development of educational organizations. The problem this study addresses is whether there is a relationship between teacher perceptions about school managers’ TM leadership and their level of organizational commitment (OC). The level of school managers’ TM leadership characteristics could influence the teachers’ OC either positively or negatively. Within this context, in this study, great importance is attached to the determination of the way teachers perceive the school leaders’ TM behaviors and to the examination of whether these behaviors have a relationship with teachers’ OC.

Purpose of Study: The purpose of this study is to determine the relationships between the school managers’ Talent Management Leadership and teachers’ organizational commitment based on the perception of teachers who are working for Anatolian High Schools.

Method: For the calculation of the relationships between the variables, Pearson moments two-way correlation analysis (r) was used. Pearson relationship coefficient and multiple linear regressions have been used for data analysis. A total of 402 teachers participated in the study. During this study, the “Talent Management Leadership Scale” developed by Davies and Davies has been used to determine the school managers’ talent
management leadership level, and the “Organizational Commitment Scale” developed by Meyer and Alien has been used to determine the teachers’ OC levels.

**Findings and Results:** Analyzing the data, a significant, high-level relationship in a positive direction between TM Leadership and OC is observed ($r=0.80, p<.01$). Findings show that teachers’ perception about school leaders’ talent management leadership is a significant variable predicting their organizational commitment. Based on the regression analysis results, the regression equation (mathematical model) for the prediction of organizational commitment is as follows: $OC=0.64+0.44$ Strategic acumen$+ 0.31$ Interoperability$+ 0.05$ Values$- 0.01$ Personal qualities.

**Conclusions and Recommendations:** The TM leadership of the school managers as observed by the teachers has been found to be a significant variable which predicts teachers’ organizational commitment. The efficiency of school managers in strategic acumen and interoperability seems to be a significant predictor of teachers’ OC. Within the context of the results of this study, it may be suggested that various qualitative and quantitative research should be undertaken to raise consciousness about the TM leadership approach and to determine the school managers’ and teachers’ views on this issue in terms of different variables.
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**Introduction**

The Talent Management (TM) concept was brought into popularity at the beginning of the year 2000, following research on the “talent wars” conducted by an American consulting firm called Mckinsey in 1997. The results of the research showed that all successful organizations have a consistent and continuous TM practice. This research revealed the fact that business organizations find themselves competing with other business organizations to find and retain talented employees. Within this context, a “talented employee” was regarded as the most significant resource in both private business organizations and educational organizations (Axelroad, Michaels, & Hanfield, 2001). Since this study is dedicated to the examination of the relationship between school leaders’ (head teachers and deputy head teachers) TM leadership and teachers’ OC, it would be useful to first explain the concepts of TM and OC.

**Talent Management (TM)**

TM is a process covering the definition of the talents and efficiencies needed; making career plans for the whole workforce for organizational purposes; evaluation evaluating their performance; and, creating and realizing a high performance culture (Lewis & Heckman, 2006). TM is comprised of a combination of efficiencies of the leaders such as strategic thinking, communication skills, emotional maturity and attracting and motivating talented personnel, developing them and maintaining their
commitment (Garrow & Hirsh, 2008). TM is a process intended to employ, develop, place, maintain and integrate those who are highly qualified and have a potential for high performance per the long-term strategies of the organization in order to gain competitive advantages.

Within this context, the question “why do educational organizations need TM?” has been on the agenda recently. Educational organizations, undergoing continual change and facing uncertainty within the context of globalization and postmodernism, have difficulty in both adapting to these changes and attaining and maintaining superiority over others in the competition for jobs. In such an environment, educational organizations need to choose their resources of manpower and use them efficiently in order to survive.

TM has recently been seen as a critical success factor in the development of educational organizations. Talents of the employees and school leaders’ TM skills provide the basis for the success of the educational organizations (Cross, 2007; Davies&Davies, 2011). Within the context of the McKinsey study, the difficulty with employing and maintaining talented school leaders continues to be a problem. There is a strong need to undertake research on the assumption that school leaders as talent managers may create efficient schools, or that efficient schools can create talented leaders and employees in practice. Educational organizations and other private enterprises, when considered in terms of TM, are often found to be inefficient in their implementation of attracting, maintaining, stimulating, developing and substituting employees (Davis, 2007). One of the important contributors to the creation of successful educational organizations is TM.

Research has put forth the particular need for TM in educational organizations. TM is one of the new topics that has started to be mentioned in educational organizations. The lack of talented leaders and employees in schools has led to a competition between the schools operating in the field; and, schools, particularly those that adopt a TM understanding, have established “talent pools” that will carry them into the future. In addition, the fact that such schools are the ones which are chosen and preferred by teachers and managers is a significant issue, especially in today’s competitive environment (Davies&Davies, 2011; Lewis,& Heckman, 2006). One of the most influential ways schools apply can meet their need for difference and innovation is to implement TM efficiently. Educational organizations (public/private schools, Ministries of Education) now also want to have and retain talented employees like profit-oriented private enterprises. In this process, it has gradually become important for schools to have knowledge of and the skills for determination, maintenance, and employment of talented managers, teachers, specialists and other talented employees (Davies & Davies, 2011).

Organizational Commitment (OC)

OC is the individual’s acceptance of the organization’s objectives and values; his effort to reach these objectives; and, his desire to continue his membership in the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) classify OC at two levels as behavioral commitment (individual’s process of remaining committed to the organization due to his/her behaviors in the past) and attitudinal commitment (power of the individual’s integration and his/her participation in the
Meyer and Allen developed a new model in 1984, adding emotional and continuance commitments to this model. Researchers later on have added normative (ethical) commitment to their models. Meyer and Allen (1990) point out the fact that OC is comprised of three components; emotional, normative, and continuance:

i) Emotional Commitment: It is a kind of commitment that emerges from respect for the organization’s objectives and values; admiration for and respect for the managers; emotional closeness; sharing of organizational vision and mission. Emotional commitment is the kind of commitment organizations most prefer.

ii) Continuance commitment: This type of commitment involves being aware of the cost of and difficulties resulting from leaving the organization. Those who have continuance commitment continue to work in order not to suffer a loss, so as to serve their own personal interests and to benefit from the organization. This type of commitment results from an individual’s willingness to stay in the organization just because of his past personal investments in the organization (Balay, 2001).

iii) Normative Commitment: Normative commitment is the one which depends on the beliefs of the members of an organization. They stay with the organization because of their sense of responsibility and obligations towards the organization. In this type of commitment, the sense of ethical obligation and the idea of being loyal to the organization are influential.

TM in educational organizations focuses more on attracting qualified teachers, retention of them, and support and motivation of their career development (Lewis & Heckman, 2006). Within this context, school managers need to increase the organizational commitment of the employees, particularly of teachers. Support of school managers and the relationships between managers and teacher affects organizational commitment of teachers (Balay, 2001). Leadership styles executed by school managers have positive or negative effects on teachers’ organizational commitment. Various researchers suggest that school leadership and teacher commitment might play a significant role in the success and efficiency of the school (Balay, 2001). While there are a lot of factors that are either directly or indirectly affected by the leadership behaviors of school managers, one of the most important factors among them is considered to be teacher organizational commitment. The leadership approach of school managers is accepted as an important variable in ensuring teacher commitment to the school (Balay, 2001; Sezgin, 2010). Lewis and Heckman (2006) and Rhodes (2012) suggest that there is a significant relationship between TM and teacher organizational commitment; and, they argue that an increase in the employees’ longevity in and commitment to the organization and a decrease in personnel mobility are observed through the development of TM leadership approaches in the institution. In the TM leadership approach, managers are required to ensure the organizational commitment of the employees; in other words, they are required to convey the organization’s primary values to the employees and thus ensure their emotional commitment. Ensuring the environment and opportunities suitable for employees to develop their skills is regarded as an important factor in ensuring their organizational commitment (Stairs, Galpin, Page, & Linley, 2006).
Global concerns over the lack of leadership in schools have put the leadership talent and TM leadership on the agenda. Particularly, a need to develop school managers’ TM skills has recently emerged. The need to determine, attract, develop and retain talented employees in schools has made the development of leaders’ TM skills compulsory in the field of education in which competition and variations are on the forefront (Rhodes, 2012). The ability of schools to attract talented employees (teachers and managers), to employ them in a convenient position, to develop, maintain and substitute them is considered to be a challenging leadership problem as the educational community proceeds towards the future. Iqbal, Qureshi, Khan and Hijazi (2013), in their research, suggest a positive relationship between TM practices and the emotional commitment of employees, as well as the performance of the organization. Cheese, Thomas and Craig (2008) state that the existence of talented managers and teachers in schools has little value without the existence of their organizational commitment and dedication.

Although a great deal of research in which organizational commitment is considered as an independent variable has been conducted in Turkey and across the world, there has been almost no research that examines the teachers’ commitment levels in terms of TM leadership behaviors of school managers. Within this context, in this study, great importance is attached to the determination of the way teachers perceive the school leaders’ TM behaviors and to the examination of whether these behaviors have a relationship to teachers’ organizational commitment. Given the literature in the field, this study may be regarded as the first on TM leadership in schools. The overall purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between the school leaders’ TM leadership as perceived by the teachers working for Anatolian High Schools and their organizational commitment; and, thus, to put forward a prediction of degree of organizational commitment by talent management leadership. To that end, answers to the following question have been sought:

1. Is there a significant relationship between the teachers’ perceptions about the school managers’ TM leadership and their perceptions about their own organizational commitment levels?

2. Are teachers’ perceptions about school managers’ TM leadership (personal qualifications, strategic acumen, interoperability, dimensions of value) a significant predictor of organizational commitment level (emotional, continuance and normative)?

Method

Research Design

In this descriptive study, in which the relationship between the school managers’ TM leadership as perceived by the teachers and the OC was examined, the relational screening model was used (Büyüköztürk, 2008).

Research Sample

The target population of this study includes 5,691 teachers working for a number of Anatolian High Schools located in metropolitan districts of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality. According to Büyüköztürk (2008), a sample of 390 people with “an
error margin of 0.05" represents a target population of 5.691 people. The sample in this study is comprised of 402 teachers chosen at random from the target population.

Research Instrument and Procedure

Data collection tools of this study consist of two scale:

Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS): OCS, which was developed by Meyer and Allen (1990), was adapted by Demirkiran (2004). The alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale is 0.85 for all items. The results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) conducted through final data to confirm the three-factor nature of OCS showed that the goodness-of-fit index of the three-factor model is at an acceptable level. Fitness indexes with the CFA conducted are calculated as \( \chi^2=288.6, \text{sd}=156, p<0.001 \), \( \chi^2/\text{sd}=1.85, \text{RMSEA}=0.05, \text{GFI}=0.92, \text{AGFI}=0.89 \).

Talent Management Leadership Scale (TMLS): TMLS was developed by Davies and Davies (2011) and permission to use it has been granted. In this study, CFA was used to confirm the dimensions in their original forms. As a result of the CFA, fit indices were found to be \( \chi^2=305.76, \text{sd}=156, p<0.001 \), \( \chi^2/\text{sd}=1.95, \text{RMSEA}=0.05, \text{GFI}=0.91 \) and \( \text{AGFI}=0.88 \). Findings show that fit indices are within the acceptable limits in accordance with GOF criteria (Hair, Anderson, Tahtam and Black, 1998). As a consequence, the four-dimensional structure of the scale was also confirmed through CFA. Factor loads of the items were found to be between .67 and .90.

TMLS’s cumulative variance explanation rate was found to be 69.85% based on the four dimensions. Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was 0.87. As a result of the validation test, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient has been found to be .85 in OCS, whereas it has been found to be .87 in TMLS. As a consequence of Barlett’s Test being conducted, the coefficient in OCS has been found to be 2.958.40, while it has been found to be 1.786.01 in TMLS.

Data Analysis

For the calculation of the relationships between the variables, Pearson moments two-way correlation analysis (r) was used. Moreover, multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to determine the level of independent variables’ (TMLS) prediction of dependent variables (OC) During the interpretation of regression analyses, standardized Beta (\( \beta \)) coefficients and the results of t-test on the significance of these coefficients were taken into account (Büyüköztürk, 2008; Hair et al., 1998; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Results

The relationship between teachers’ perceptions of the TM leadership and their OC related with the first question is answered. Analyzing the data, a significant, high-level relationship in the positive direction between TML and OC is observed \( r=0.80, p<.01 \). Thus, it is possible to state that as teachers’ perceptions of their school leaders’ TML grows, their organizational commitment is influenced positively.

Teachers have stated that school managers have TM leadership qualities at a “medium” level. In accordance with teachers’ opinions, their organizational
commitment was found to be at a “medium” level. The findings obtained from Pearson multiple linear regression analysis aimed at determining the relationship between TM leadership as perceived by the teachers and their organizational commitment are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Results of the Correlation Analysis Aimed at Determining the Relationship between TML and OC Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal qualities</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strategic acumen</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.56 **</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interoperability</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.83 **</td>
<td>.51 **</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Values</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.85 **</td>
<td>.52 **</td>
<td>.90 **</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional commitment</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.83 **</td>
<td>.51 **</td>
<td>.93 **</td>
<td>.91 **</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Continuance commitment</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.16 **</td>
<td>.33 **</td>
<td>.22 **</td>
<td>.17 **</td>
<td>.27 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Normative commitment</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.53 **</td>
<td>.88 **</td>
<td>.47 **</td>
<td>.48 **</td>
<td>.46 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

Based on Table 1, it may be stated that the perception level of teachers who have participated in the study for continuance commitment is relatively higher than those for normative commitment and emotional commitment. The coefficients of the correlation between the variables demonstrate that there is a positive and medium-level relationship with low-level significance between normative commitment and emotional commitment (r = .27, p < .01). The highest point average in terms of TM leadership has been observed in the personal qualities dimension, while the lowest point average has been observed in the interoperability dimension. TM leadership has been observed to have positive relationships with low-level significance with personal qualities, values and interoperability, whereas it has been found to have a positive relationship with medium-level significance with personal qualities and strategic acumen. A positive relationship with medium-level significance has been found between strategic acumen and values, as well as between strategic acumen and interoperability and personal qualities. A positive relationship with high-level significance has been found between interoperability and values.

Among the dimensions of TM leadership and teacher emotional commitment, interoperability, values and personal qualities have been found to have positive relationships with high-level significance, while a positive relationship with medium-level significance has been observed between emotional commitment and strategic acumen. It has been observed that there exists a positive relationship with medium-level significance between the continuance commitment and the dimensions of strategic acumen. Continuance commitment has been found to have a positive relationship with low-level significance with personal qualities, values and interoperability dimensions. A positive relationship with high-level significance has been observed between normative commitment and strategic acumen. Findings
related to the second question of this study concerning whether school managers’ TM predict teachers’ organizational commitment are given in Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5.

**Prediction of Emotional Commitment**

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis on the prediction of emotional commitment are reflected in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Dual ( r )</th>
<th>Partial ( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Acumen</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R = .95 \quad R^2 = .90 \quad Corrected \ R^2 = .90 \)

\( F(4, 397) = 970.70 \quad p = .00 \)

Analysis of Table 2 demonstrates that TM leadership provides a significant relationship together with strategic acumen, interoperability and the values dimensions with emotional commitment (\( R = .95, p < .01 \)). These predictive variables explain 90% of the total variance in teachers’ perception about their emotional commitment. The dimensions of personal qualities (\( \beta = .07, p < .05 \)), interoperability (\( \beta = .58, p < .01 \)) and values (\( \beta = .32, p < .01 \)) predict the emotional commitment positively and at a significant level. When it comes to strategic acumen (\( \beta = -.00, p > .05 \)), it may be said that it is not a significant predictor of emotional commitment.

**Prediction of Continuance Commitment**

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis on the prediction of continuance commitment can be seen in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Dual ( r )</th>
<th>Partial ( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Acumen</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R = .35 \quad R^2 = .12 \quad Corrected \ R^2 = .11 \)

\( F(4, 397) = 14.379 \quad p = .00 \)

When Table 3 is considered, it is seen that TM leadership, together with personal qualities, strategic acumen, and the dimensions of interoperability and values, presents a significant relationship with the continuance commitment (\( R = .35, p <
These predictive variables constitute 12% of the total variance in teachers’ perception about the continuance commitment. Strategic acumen (β = .33, p < .01) and interoperability (β = .30, p < .05) dimensions predict the continuance commitment positively at a significant level. The dimensions of personal qualities (β = -.16, p > .05) and values (β = -.13, p > .05) are not predictors of the continuance commitment.

**Prediction of Normative Commitment**

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis on the prediction of normative commitment can be seen in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Dual r</th>
<th>Partial r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Acumen</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Table 4 is considered, TM leadership, together with personal qualities, strategic acumen, and interoperability and values dimensions, demonstrates a significant relationship with normative commitment (R = .89, p < .01). These predictive variables explain 79% of the total variance in teachers’ perception about normative commitment. Strategic acumen (β = .86, p < .01) predicts normative commitment positively at a significant level. Personal qualities (β = .07, p > .05), interoperability (β = -.00, p > .05) and values (β = -.02, p > .05) are not significant predictors of continuance commitment.

**Prediction of Organizational Commitment**

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis on the prediction of organizational commitment are given in Table 5. When Table 5 is considered, it is seen that TM leadership, together with personal qualities, strategic acumen, and interoperability and values dimensions, presents a significant relationship with organizational commitment (R = .85, p < .01). These predictive variables constitute 72% of the total variance in teachers’ perception of organizational commitment. In accordance with the standardized regression coefficient (β), order of significance of the predictive variables upon organizational commitment may be listed as follows: strategic acumen, interoperability, values and personal qualities.
Table 5.
Results of the Regression Analysis on the Prediction of Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Dual r</th>
<th>Partial r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Acumen</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R = .85 \quad R^2 = .72 \quad \text{Corrected } R^2 = .72 \]

\[ F (4,397) = 261.44 \quad p = .00 \]

Considering the results of t-test aimed at determining the significance of regression coefficients, it would not be wrong to say that strategic acumen and interoperability variables are significant predictors of organizational commitment. Personal qualities and values variables do not have a significant influence. It may, finally, be said that the most significant dimensions affecting teachers’ organizational commitment are the strategic acumen and interoperability dimensions of TM leadership. Based on the regression analysis results, the regression equation (mathematical model) of the prediction of organizational commitment is as follows:

\[ \text{OC} = 0.64 + 0.44 \text{ Strategic acumen} + 0.31 \text{ Interoperability} + 0.05 \text{ Values} - 0.01 \text{ Personal qualities} \]

Discussion and Conclusion

Findings show that teachers’ perceptions about school leaders’ TM leadership are a significant variable predicting their OC. A positive, high-level and significant relationship is observed between TM leadership and OC. TM leadership, along with personal qualities, strategic acumen, interoperability and values dimensions, seems to have a high-level and significant relationship with OC. The efficiency of school managers in strategic acumen and interoperability seems to be a significant predictor of teachers’ organizational commitment. These results are in parallel with the results of studies conducted by Davies and Davies (2011) and Yörük and Sağban (2012), suggesting that the leadership styles modeled by school managers (cultural, bureaucratic, distributed, educational, servant, transactional, transformational, etc.) have an influence on and are predictors of teachers’ organizational commitment. The results of this study indicating the fact that teachers have a medium-level organizational commitment are consistent with the results of the studies conducted by Nayir (2012), Çoban and Demirtaş (2011), while contradicting the results of the studies conducted by Balay (2001) and Yörük and Sağban (2012) suggesting that teachers have high-level organizational commitment. The fact that studies which demonstrate high-level organizational commitment are mostly at the primary school level is meaningful.

The results of this study show that the level of teachers’ emotional commitment is lower than that of continuance and normative commitments. This result may be perceived as indicative of teachers’ unwillingness to make any effort to achieve the
school’s goals (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Balay, 2001; Mowday and etc., 1979; Nayir, 2012; Riehl & Sipple, 1996). In addition, results show that teachers’ emotional commitment is positively correlated with the personal qualities, interoperability and values dimensions of TM leadership.

Balay (2001) and Sezgin (2010), in their studies, state that a bureaucratic school environment and a strict sense of hierarchy reinforce the continuance and adaptation commitments, while they decrease teachers’ emotional commitment. Similarly, in this study, the results show that, in parallel with the above-mentioned studies, personal qualities, interoperability and values dimensions of school managers’ TM leadership have a significant and positive effect on teachers’ emotional commitment. Moreover, in the interoperability dimension of school managers’ TM leadership, school leaders’ inefficiency in motivating the teachers and being sensitive to their personal problems may affect teachers’ continuance and emotional commitments negatively.

The finding of Sezgin (2010) that a bureaucratic organizational culture increases the continuance commitment may be perceived as a suggestion that school managers need to develop their TM leadership skills. The findings of this study demonstrating the fact that teachers generally have continuance commitment towards their school, rather than emotional or a normative commitments, may be interpreted as a sign that teachers are committed to work because they consider it a means to gain more and to not to lose what they possess (Balay, 2001; Davies & Davies, 2011). This result may be evaluated as a sign of teachers’ lack of sincere emotional commitment to their jobs and of their commitment to their schools when they serve the teachers’ personal interests.

As a result, based on the teachers’ opinions, it may be said that school managers do not possess these efficiencies at a desired level, and this results in teachers’ low level of organizational commitment. It has been observed that school managers’ TM leadership is an important variable which predicts teachers’ OC. Within the context of the results of this study, it may be suggested that various qualitative and quantitative research should be undertaken to raise consciousness about TM leadership approaches and to determine the school managers’ and teachers’ views on this issue in terms of different variables.
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Öğretmenlerin Okul Yöneticilerinin Yetenek Yönetimi Liderliği Algısı ile Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeyi Arasındaki İlişki
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http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2015.59.10

Özet
Problem Durumu: Okullarda liderliğin eksikliği ile ilgili küresel kaygılarda, okul liderlerinin Yetenek Yönetimi (YY) becerilerinin geliştirilmesi ihtiyacı ortaya çıkmıştır. Okulda yetenekli çalışanların belirlenmesi, okula çekilmesi, geliştirilmesi ve elde tutulması rekabetin ve farklılığın ön plana çıktığı eğitim alanında özellikle liderlerin YY becerilerinin geliştirilmesini zorunlu kılmıştır. Okulların nitelikli çalışanları (öğretmenleri ve yöneticileri) çekme, uygun pozisyonda kullanma, geliştirmme, elde tutma ve yedekleme yeteneği, okul toplumunun geleceğe doğru ilerlerken önemli bir liderlik sorun alanı olarak görülmektedir. Örgütsel bağlılık ve
okul yöneticilerinin liderlik yaklaşımları (dönüşümcü, öğretim liderliği vb.) ile ilgili farklı değişkenlerin bir dizi araştırmada yapılmış araştırmaların sonuçları irdeленdikinde okul yöneticilerinin çeşitli liderlik davranışları sergilemeleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı arasında farklı ilişkiler bulunmaktadır. Bu bağlamda araştırmının problemi okul yöneticilerinin sergilediği YY liderlik davranışlarının öğretmen tarafından nasıl algılanıp belirlenmesi ve bu davranışların öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı ile ilişkili olup olmadığını ortaya koymak için temel alınmıştır.

Araştırmının Amacı: Bu araştırmının amacı; Anadolu lisesi öğretmenlerinin algıları, anticipated leadership modelinde betimsel bir aralığı boyutları arasındaki ilişkiye belirlerek, örgütsel bağlılığın algılanan YY liderliği tarafından yorunan derecesini ortaya koymaktır. Bu amaca aşaçıklığı sorulara yant aranmıştır.

1. Öğretmenlerin okul yöneticilerinin YY liderliği ile örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri algıları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki var mıdır?

2. Öğretmenlerin okul yöneticilerinin YY liderliği (kişisel nitelikler, stratejik yetenek, bağımlılık) birlikte çalışma, değerler boylamaları (duygusal, devam ve normatif) anlamalar bir yordayıcı mıdır?


Araştırmının Buluşları: Veriler analiz edildiğinde, YY liderliği ile OB arasında pozitif yönde, yüksek düzeyde ve anlamlı bir ilişki sonucu görülmektedir (r=0.80, p<.01). Öğretmenlerin duygusal bağlılığı ile YY liderliği boylamaları içeriği bireysel bir ilişki ile ilişki (r=.93, p<.01), değerler (r=.91, p<.01) ve kişisel nitelikler (r=.83, p<.01) arasında pozitif yüksek düzeyde ilişkiler bulunmamıştır, duygusal bağlılık ile stratejik yetenek (r=.51, p<.01) arasında ise pozitif yönde ve orta düzeyde anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmaktadır. Devam bağlılığı ile stratejik yetenek boylamaları arasında pozitif yönde ve orta düzeyde anlamlı bir ilişki sonucu görülmektedir (r=.33, p<.01). Devam bağlılığı ile kişisel nitelikler (r=.16, p<.01), değerler (r=.17, p<.01) ve bağımlılık birlikte çalışma (r=.22, p<.01) boylamaları arasında ise pozitif yönde ve düşük düzeyde anlamlı bir ilişki sonucu görülmektedir. Normatif bağlılık ile stratejik yetenek boylamaları arasında pozitif yönde yüksek düzeyde anlamlı bir ilişki sonucu görülmektedir (r=.88, p<.01). Normatif bağlılık ile kişisel nitelikler (r=.53, p<.01), değerler (r=.48, p<.01) ve bağımlılık birlikte çalışma (r=.47, p<.01) boylamaları arasında ise pozitif yönde ve orta düzeyde anlamlı bir ilişki sonucu görülmektedir. YY liderliğinin kişisel nitelikler, stratejik yetenek, bağımlılık birlikte çalışma ve değerler boylamaları birlikte devam bağlılığı ile anlamlı bir ilişki verildiği görülmektedir (R=.35, p<.01). Bu yordayıcı değişkenler, öğretmenlerin devam bağlılığı algılarından toplam
varyansın yaklaşık %12'sini açıklaymaktadır. Stratejik yetenek (β = .33, p < .01) ve başkalarıyla birlikte çalışma (β = .30, p < .05) boyutları devam bağlılığını pozitif yönde ve anlamlı düzeyde yordamaktadır. Kişisel nitelikler (β = -.16, p > .05) ve değerler (β = -.13, p > .05) boyutları ise devam bağlılığının anlamlı yordayıcısı değildir. YY liderliğinin kişisel nitelikler, stratejik yetenek, başkalarıyla birlikte çalışma ve değerler boyutlarının birlikte duygusal bağlılık ile anlamlı bir ilişki verdiğini görülmektedir (β = .95, p < .01). Bu yordayıcı değişkenler, öğretmenlerin duygusal bağlılıkları algılarındaki toplam varyansın yaklaşık %90'ını açıklamaktadır. Kişisel nitelikler (β = .07, p < .05), başkalarıyla birlikte çalışma (β = .58, p < .01) ve değerler (β = .32, p < .01) boyutları duygusal bağlılığı pozitif yönde ve anlamlı düzeyde yordamaktadır. Stratejik yetenek (β = -.00, p > .05) boyutu ise, duygusal bağlılığın anlamlı yordayıcısı değildir. YY liderliğinin kişisel nitelikler, stratejik yetenek, başkalarıyla birlikte çalışma ve değerler boyutlarının birlikte, öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı ile yüksek düzeyde ve anlamlı bir ilişki verdiğini görülmektedir (R=.85, p<.01). Bu yordayıcı değişkenler, öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık algılarındaki toplam varyansın %72'sini açıklamaktadır. Standardize edilmiş regresyon katsayısına (β) göre yordayıcı değişkenlerin örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki göreli önem sırası; stratejik yetenek, başkalarıyla birlikte çalışma, değerler ve kişisel niteliklerdir. Regresyon katsayılarının anlamlılığına ilişkin t-testi sonuçları incelendiğinde ise, stratejik yetenek ve başkalarıyla birlikte çalışma değişkenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık üzerinde önemli bir yordayıcı olduğu görülmektedir. Regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığının yordanmasına ilişkin regresyon eşitiği (matematiksel model) şöyledir: ÒB= 0.64+0.44 Stratejik yetenek+0.31 Başkalarıyla birlikte çalışma+0.05 Değerler+0.01 Kişisel nitelikler.
