



The Relationship between Teachers' Perception of School Principals' Instructional Leadership and Organisational Commitment Level¹

Erkan KIRAL* - Aynur SUÇİÇEĞİ **

¹This the extended version of a paper presented at the 2nd Eurasian Educational Research Congress (Hacettepe University &EJER, 08-10 June , 2015).

*Corresponding Author, Dr., Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences Department, 09100, Aydin, Turkey, E-mail address: erkankiral74@gmail.com; Tel: +90(505)3197336

** Bilim Uzmanı, Atburgazi İlkokulu 09100, Aydin, Turkey. sucicegi@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to determine the relationship between teachers' perception of school principals' instructional leadership and organizational commitment level. Correlative investigation model was adopted in the research. Study group of this research is composed of 329 voluntary teachers. "The instructional leadership behaviors of school principals' scale" and "The organisational commitment scale" were used to collect data. Descriptive and probative statistical techniques were used. In the results of the research; it is found that determination and sharing school purposes by school principals were at the highest, teacher support and development were at the lowest level according to the views of teachers. The views of teachers concerning school principals' instructional leadership behaviors showed significant differences in all dimensions according to age factor, working period in the same school showed significant differences in all dimensions except for determination and sharing of school purposes dimension. Teachers showed affective commitment at the highest and normative commitment at the lowest level. Teachers' views concerning school commitment showed significant differences in affective commitment dimension according to gender and educational situation; affective and normative dimensions according to age and working period in school factors. It was found out that there were positive and medium level significant correlations in all dimensions of School Principals' instructional leadership behaviors and teachers' affective and normative commitment. Perception of teachers concerning school principals' instructional leadership behavior is high in all dimensions; their school commitment is good in the affective commitment and this perception is medium in the other dimensions. There were medium level and positive correlation between normative commitment and affective commitment with perception of teachers concerning school principals' instructional leadership behavior. The causes of the low commitment levels of the teachers should be examined by a qualitative research to push teachers' organizational commitment to higher level. Causative comparative research can be done to clarify the effect of the instructional leadership to the teachers' commitments.

Keywords: Leadership, commitment, teacher, school, principal

Introduction

School is one of the important educational institutions in human life. Hence, a lot of things from actualization of the learning to characterization of someone are offered to students in schools by teachers and principals. Principals and teachers are responsible for keeping school steady as proper for purposes of school and educational system. Yet, nowadays principals' and teachers' duties become more complex day by day. In this chaotic setting, expectations of shareholders of the school raised compared to past. Principals cannot provide the sustainable management with their management skills alone. Self renovating of schools and shaping the future are dependent to principals' leadership. For this reason, school principals should exhibit contemporary leadership behaviors to manage their schools effectively and beneficially and to commit their staff with organisation.

School principals' leadership behaviors which they perform against people whom they are in interaction have substantial role to fulfill the purposes of the school. Instructional leadership that was revealed by effective school studies done especially after 1980's (Bickel, 1983; Cuban, 1984) became the most expected behavior from the principals (Hallinger, 2005). Since, school principals as instructional leaders must focus on the teaching and learning process to form effective schools (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Hallinger & Heck, 1998). Thus, a school principal can coordinate all the existing resources of the school

skillfully, takes under control, inspects them to actualize educational purposes of the school and also provides required conditions (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). So, instructional leaders have knowledge, implementations to make learning and teaching easier, an impact to motivate people (Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Actually, instructional leaders are aim-oriented relatively other leaders and focus on students' academic success. Hence, instructional leaders try to create a school culture including high expectations and standards for both teachers and students, in addition they move cooperatively with the shareholders of school and try to keep their motivation high, care about teamwork and rewarding (Blase & Blase, 1999; Niqab, Sharma, Wei, & Maulod, 2014). Instructional leadership behavior has been examined by different researchers (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; Murphy, 1990) in sense of different scales. However, those scales were similar to each other and include factors to make school effective.

In this study, school principals' instructional leadership scale developed by Sisman (2004) and used by a lot of researchers (Aytekin, 2014; Ozkaynak, 2013 etc.) in Turkey, is examined under five sub-scales as (1) determination and sharing of school purposes, (2) management of curriculum and teaching process; (3) evaluation of teaching process and students; (4) teacher support and development and (5) creation of regular teaching-learning environment and climate. As is seen, instructional leadership contains other functions contributing to learning process of the student included instructional leadership behaviors and focuses on learning and related directly to education (Murphy, 1990). Thus, school principals' instructional leadership behaviors can be in a relationship with the school staff especially with teachers' commitments (Ail, Taib, Jaafar, Salleh & Omar, 2015; Niqab et al., 2014). Organisational commitment, taken part in modern management concepts and subjected to many researches (Eslami & Gharakhani, 2012; Yuksel, 2015 etc.) concerning especially organisational behavior recently, reflects attitudes and behaviors of employee against his/her organisation (Zeinabadi, 2010). Organisational commitment is actually mutual changes between person and organisation and the adoption of the organisational process by employees. Hence, as an organisation, organisational commitment in school can be provided by all shareholders as accepting the purposes of the school like their own and working with others and internalizing them and revealing their secret powers voluntarily to reach these purposes.

In the literature, organisational commitment was held by different researchers (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972; O'Reilly & Chatman 1986 etc.) by different scales and in this research, it was examined with its organisational commitment sub-scales; (1) affective commitment, (2) continuance commitment and (3) normative commitment that were developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) who were mentioned a lot in the literature. This commitment can be in a correlation with its components and with school principals' instructional behaviors that they perform individually. Hence, cooperation between administrators and teachers that can cause mutual effects for education, fortification, teamwork, constant improvement studies, can cause changes in commitments of teachers (Anderman et al., 1991; Marks & Printy, 2003).

Commitment feeling that teachers have to school is vital to make school reach their purposes, in forming effective schools. School principals have a critical role for the creation of this commitment sense (Razak, Darmawan, & Keeves, 2009). Determination of how teachers perceive instructional leadership behaviors that school principals exhibited in the elementary schools which is the key point of primary education and revealing this perception's correlation with organisational commitment are seen as important. As the number of studies directly subjected to correlation between elementary school teachers' perception of school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and school commitment level is relatively limited, it is thought that this study will make contribution to literature.

Moreover, it is hoped that revealing this correlation can be beneficial for policy makers and practitioners for taking necessary pre-cautions. Hence, the purpose of this research is to determine the relationship between perceptions of elementary school teachers concerning school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and school commitment. To this aim, answers have been sought for the following questions:

1. What is teachers' perception of school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and their school commitment level?
2. Do teachers' perception of school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and school commitment levels differ according to demographic factors (gender, age etc.)?
3. Is there any significant relationship between teachers' school commitment level and their perception concerning school principals' instructional leadership behaviors?

Methods

Research Design

Correlational investigation model was used in this research with the purpose of revealing the perception of teachers concerning school principals' instructional leadership behaviors, their school commitment levels and revealing the correlation between them (Peers, 2006). With this design, the existence of the changes has been revealed between these two factors.

Research Sample

Target population of the study consists of totally 399 teachers who worked in Söke district of Aydın city in 2013-2014 academic year. Researchers tried to reach the target population due to relatively smallness of the target population of the study and problems could be occurred in feedback process and improper fulfilling. So 329 voluntary elementary school teachers attended to research and researchers worked with 326 proper data collection tool. Voluntary teachers were the working group of this research.

Participants of the research were as follows; 60.4% are female (n=197), 39.6% are male (n=129); 80.7% are married, (n=263); 19.3% are single (n=63); 17.8% are at the age of 30 and under (n=58); 36.5% are between the age of 31-40 (n=119), 27.9% are between the age of 41-50 (n=91), 17.8% are over the age of 51 (n=58); 81.6% are composed of primary teachers (n=266), 18.4% are branch teachers (n=60); 56.7% have been working in the same school for 5 and less (n=185), 25.8% have been working in the same school for 6-10 years (n=84); 17.5% have been working for 11 years and more in the same school (n=57); 76.4% are graduated from faculty of education (n=249), 5.5% are graduated from faculty of arts and science (n=18), 2.8% have master degree (n=9) and 15.3% are graduated from other faculties (n=50).

Research Instruments and Procedures

In this study "The Instructional Leadership Behaviors of School Principals Scale" (Sisman, 2004) and "Organisational Commitment Scale" (Meyer and Allen, 1991) were used as data collection tools.

The instructional leadership behaviors of school principals scale: The instructional leadership behaviors of school principals scale is a 5 point likert scale [Never (1)- Always (5)] which was developed by Sisman (2004) and consists of 5 sub-scales, includes 10 items each, and totally 50 items. These sub-scales are (1) determination and sharing of school purposes (DSSP), (2) management of curriculum and teaching process (MCTP), (3) evaluation of

teaching process and students (ETPS), (4) teacher support and development (TSD), (5) creation of regular teaching-learning environment and climate (CRTLEC). Cronbach's Alpha level was calculated as .94 for the overall of the scale in reliability study of the research. Cronbach's Alpha level of the factors was calculated as between .93 and .96 while Sisman (2004) calculated Cronbach's Alpha level as .92 in his work.

Organisational commitment scale. The organisational commitment scale is a 5 point likert scale [I totally do not agree (1)- I totally agree (5)]. It consists of three sub-scales, each of which has six items, and totally 18 items. This sub-scales are (1) affective (AC), (2) continuance (CC), (3) normative (NC) commitments. Four items of the scale were coded reversely. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Baysal and Paksoy (1999). Researchers stated that reliability coefficient was .81 and this scale could be used in three sub-scales for the studies that will be used in Turkey. Cronbach's Alpha level was calculated as .72 in the reliability study of this research and Cronbach's Alpha level of the sub-scales were calculated as between .60 and .75.

Data Analysis

In the analysis of data, considering research's sub-problems and the features of collected data; frequency, percentage, average, standard deviation were used. Also, parametric tests (t- Test, ANOVA, LSD test) were used in case of normal distribution of data, on the other hand non-parametric tests (Kruskal Wallis, Mann Whitney U test) were used in case of abnormal distribution (n<30) and lastly Pearson Moment's Correlation analysis tests were used (Peers, 2006).

Results

Findings of the study are given on the following tables as instructional leadership, organisational commitment and relationship between them.

Findings Concerning Perception of Teachers' Concerning School Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors

The result of the analysis was summarized on Table 1 related to perception of teachers' concerning school principals' instructional leadership.

Table1. *Descriptive statistics related to perception of teachers' on school principals' instructional leadership behaviors*

Dimensions	n	Mean	S.D.
DSSP		4.00	.795
CRTLEC		3.94	.869
MCTP	326	3.91	.816
ETPS		3.85	.824
TSD		3.47	.919

As is seen on Table 1, teachers perceived "determination and sharing of school purposes" at the highest level, "teacher support and development" at the lowest level in the scale of principals' instructional leadership behaviors. Teachers perceived that principals exhibit instructional leadership behaviors in all sub-scales "most of the time". Perception of teachers does not show a significant difference concerning School Principals' Instructional Leadership Behavior according to gender, educational level, marital status, and job status, but shows significant differences according to age and working period in the same school.

Perception of teachers concerning school principal's instructional leadership behaviors shows a significant difference in all dimensions according to their ages. It is determined by the LSD test that teachers who are at the age of 30 and less ($M=3.74$; $S=.85$) have significantly lower perception than aged 41-50 ($M=4.18$; $S=.66$) and aged 51 and above teachers and teachers who aged 31-40 ($M=3.96$; $S=.66$) have significantly lower perception than the teachers who belong to group of aged 41-50 concerning the determination and sharing of school purposes [$F_{(3;322)} = 4.051$; $p<.05$]. Teachers who are at the age of 30 and less ($M=3.59$; $S=.86$) have significantly lower perception than aged 31-40 ($M=3.85$; $S=.87$), aged 41-50 ($M=4.07$; $S=.71$) and aged 51 and above ($M=4.12$; $S=.72$) and teachers aged between 31-40 have significantly lower level perception than aged 51 and above concerning the perception of management of curriculum and teaching process [$F_{(3;322)} = 5.775$; $p<.05$]. Teachers who are at the age of 30 and less ($M=3.60$; $S=.85$) have significantly lower perception level than the teachers aged 41-50 ($M=3.93$; $S=.81$) and aged 51 and above. Teachers aged 51 and above have significantly higher perception levels than teachers aged 31-40 ($M=3.83$; $S=.84$) and 41-50 concerning evaluation of teaching process and students [$F_{(3;322)} = 3.066$; $p<.05$]. Teachers who are at the age of 30 and less ($M=3.16$; $S=.93$) have significantly higher perception levels than teachers aged 31-40 ($M=3.39$; $S=.96$), aged 41-50 ($M=3.63$; $S=.85$) and aged 51 and above ($M=3.70$; $S=.84$). Teachers who are at the age of 31-40 have significantly lower perception levels than teachers aged 41-50 and aged 51 and above. Teachers at the age of 51 and above have significantly higher perception levels than the teachers who are at the age of 41-50 concerning teacher support and development [$F_{(3;322)} = 4.846$; $p<.05$]. Teachers who are at the age of 30 and less ($M=3.66$; $S=.95$) have significantly lower perception levels than teachers aged 41-50 ($M=4.09$; $S=.73$) and aged 51 and above concerning creation of regular teaching-learning environment and climate [$F_{(3;322)} = 4.261$; $p<.05$].

Perception of teachers concerning school principals' instructional leadership behaviors show significant difference in all dimensions except for determination and sharing of school purposes, according to working period of teachers in the same school. It is determined by the LSD test that teachers who worked for 11 years and more for same school ($M=4.19$; $S=.66$) have significantly higher perception level than teachers who worked for 6-10 ($M=4.15$; $S=.77$) for the same school and teachers who worked 5 years for the same school and less concerning management of curriculum and teaching process [$F_{(2;323)} = 4.162$; $p<.05$], and teachers who worked for 11 years and more ($M=4.15$; $S=.70$) for the same school have significantly higher perception level than teachers who worked 6-10 years ($M=3.76$; $S=.81$) and teachers who worked 5 and less ($M=3.80$; $S=.85$) for the same school concerning evaluation of teaching process and students [$F_{(2;323)} = 4.647$; $p<.05$], teachers who worked 11 years and more ($M=3.79$; $S=.81$) for the same school have significantly higher perception level than teachers who worked 6-10 years ($M=3.32$; $S=.92$) and teachers who worked 5 years and less ($M=3.44$; $S=.91$) for the same school concerning teacher support and development [$F_{(2;323)} = 4.756$; $p<.05$], teachers who worked 11 years and more ($M=4.23$; $S=.68$) for the same school have significantly higher perception level than teachers who worked 6-10 years ($M=3.86$; $S=.77$) and teachers who worked 5 years and less ($M=3.88$; $S=.95$) for the same school concerning creation of regular teaching-learning environment and climate [$F_{(2;323)} = 4.152$; $p<.05$].

Findings Concerning Elementary School Teachers' School Commitment Level

The result of the analysis concerning teachers' school commitment level is summarized on Table 2 below.

Table 2. *Descriptive statistics concerning teachers' school commitment level*

Dimensions	n	Mean	S.D.
AC		3.47	.811
CC	326	2.86	.674
NC		2.78	.654

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that teachers show commitment in “Affective” dimension at the highest level, then “Continuance” and the last “Normative” dimension in order. It was determined that affective commitment of the teachers was seen in good level, and other commitment sub-scales was seen in average level. Teachers’ organisational commitment does not show significant difference according to their duties and marital status but shows a significant difference according to teachers’ gender, age and working period in the same school.

Teachers’ affective and normative commitment levels do not show a significant difference. Nevertheless, female teachers’ (M=2.93; S=.86) continuance commitment [$t_{(324)} = 2.232$; $p < .05$] is higher than males’ (M=2.76; S=.66). Teachers’ affective [$F_{(3,322)} = 4.304$; $p < .05$] and normative commitment [$F_{(3,322)} = 4.384$; $p < .05$] levels show a significant difference according to age; while there is not a significant difference according to age variable in continuance commitment. According to LSD test, teachers who are at the age of 30 and less (M=3.34; S=.76) and teachers aged 31-40 (M=3.32; S=.82) have significantly lower affective commitment perception level than teachers aged 41-50 (M=3.60; S=.76) and aged 51 and above (M=3.70; S=.82). Normative commitments of the teachers who aged 51 and above (M=3.03; S=.77) have significantly higher than teachers who are at the age of 30 and less (M=2.73; S=.58), teachers aged 31-40 (M=2.67; S=.65) and teachers aged 41-50 (M=2.81; S=.59).

Teachers’ affective [$F_{(2,323)} = 15.036$; $p < .05$] and normative [$F_{(2, 323)} = 4.701$; $p < .05$] commitment levels show a significant difference according to working period in the same school, while it does not in continuance commitment level. According to LSD test, teachers who worked 5 years and less for the same school (M=3.27; S=.81) have significantly low affective commitment than teacher who worked 6-10 years (M=3.68; S=.78) and 11 years and more (M=3.81; S=.67) for the same school. Normative commitment of the teachers who worked 11 years and more (M=3.02; S=.74) for the same school is found significantly higher than teachers who worked 5 years and less (M=2.74; S=.63) and 6-10 years (M=2.72; S=.62) for the same school.

According to the educational situation of the teachers, there is a significant difference in the average of ordinal numbers belong to affective ($\chi^2 = 8.40$; $p < .05$) commitment level. According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test done to find the source of the difference; affective commitment level of teachers graduated from different faculties ($\chi^2 = 196.74$) is significantly higher than teachers graduated from faculty of education ($\chi^2 = 158.86$) and teachers having master degree ($\chi^2 = 127.06$).

Findings Concerning Correlation Between Teachers' Perception About Instructional Leadership Behavior and School Commitment Level

Relationship between teachers’ perception about school principals’ instructional leadership behaviors and school commitment level is examined and results are summarized on

Table 3. *Correlation coefficient results between teachers' perceptions about principals' instructional leadership behaviors and school commitment level*

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. AC	-							
2. CC	-.052	-						
3. NC	.353**	.275**	-					
4. DSSP	.302**	.002	.347**	-				
5. MCTP	.356**	-.031	.370**	.874**	-			
6. ETPS	.340**	.002	.334**	.806**	.879**	-		
7. TSD	.313**	.036	.340**	.719**	.792**	.805**	-	
8. CRTLEC	.360**	-.008	.319**	.819**	.857**	.817**	.812**	-

**p < .01

As is seen on Table 3, there is a positive and medium level significant correlation between teachers' normative commitment and affective commitment; and a positive and low significant correlation between normative and continuance. There is a positive and medium level significant correlation between affective and normative commitment with instructional leadership behaviors. It is seen that affective commitment has the highest relationship with creation of regular teaching-learning environment and climate relatively ($r=.360$; $p < .01$). Normative commitment has higher correlation with the management of curriculum and teaching process relatively ($r=.370$; $p < .01$). Teachers' perceptions have positive and high level correlation with principals' instructional leadership behaviors. Relatively the highest relationship is between education program and management of teaching process and evaluation of teaching process and students ($r=.879$; $p < .01$).

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of the study is to determine the relationship between teachers' perception of school principals' instructional leadership and organisational commitment level. Teachers' perceptions about "determination and sharing of school purposes" is at the highest level, and "teacher support and development" at the lowest. Ail et al., (2015); Aytakin (2014) revealed similar results and they found "determination and sharing of school purposes" at the top level. Researchers like Aytakin (2014), Ozkaynak (2013) found "teacher support and development" at the lowest level. According to teachers, school principals show instructional leadership behaviors most of the time. Yuce (2010) obtained the same results in his study.

It is crucial that teachers perceived "determination and sharing of school purposes" at the highest level concerning school principals' instructional leadership behaviors. It is an important indicator that principals create a vision for their schools, have purposes for their school and they are pioneers to share these purposes, and teachers realize this situation (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). Hence, other processes in the school keep steady based on the determination and sharing of school purposes (Cross & Rice, 2000). According to Hallinger & Murphy (1985), school principals should provide the comprehensiveness of these purposes and they should review them periodically. Yet, they should provide parents' contribution and employee who worked for improvement and setting of these purposes (Khoza, 2012). Actually, setting and sharing of purposes performed by school principals are substantial tools to provide collaboration of parents, students and teachers.

In the current study, teachers perceived school principals' instructional leadership behavior concerning teacher support and development at the lowest level which is challenging when compared to other instructional leadership behaviors. As teachers may think that their

principals do not support them adequately and provide adequate opportunities for improvement and exhibit a sharing leadership. Whereas, an instructional leader should be the guide for teacher support and development (Glickman, 1985; Marks & Printy, 2003). Principals should provide opportunities for teachers' improvement (Blase & Kirby, 2000, Kırıl, 2015), improve effectiveness of the teachers who contribute students' learning process (Hallinger & Heck, 1998), help them in order to improve their capacities (Harris, 2004) and help them for professional careers (Blase & Blase, 1999). Principals should create a suitable school climate for change and development. They should provide the motivation of their staff and help teachers for using educational sources, and should know the weaknesses and strong sides of their staff about using sources (Celik, 2003, Kırıl, 2016). Also, Nayir (2012), and Gündoğdu and Yıldırım (2010) found that school principals strongly affect the nature and level of organizational commitment in schools. In brief, an instructional leader should be holistic concerning education and should examine it at all aspects.

Perceptions of teachers showed significant difference concerning principals' instructional leadership behaviors according to age and working period in the same school factor. Same results are obtained in the study of Aksoy (2006). According to age, teachers' perception concerning principals' instructional leadership behaviors shows significant differences in all dimensions. Younger teachers have lower perception of instructional leadership behavior than older ones. With the rising ages, teachers consider more that their principals are more sufficient. Teachers who had higher service years in the same school have significantly higher perception level in all dimensions in which difference is observed, than the teachers who had lower service years in the same school. It can be thought that teachers perceive their principals' instructional leadership behaviors better and they can observe it better over time as their period of service gets longer.

It was found that teachers show "affective commitment" at the highest level among all dimensions of organisational commitment and then continuance and normative commitment follows. It was found out that the dimension which is stated at the highest level is similar in the studies of Besiroğlu (2013), Kırıl & Kacar (2016), while the dimension which is stated at the lowest level is similar in the study of Tezcan (2010). In this study, affective commitment dimension is relatively high but other dimensions are medium level. Meyer & Allen (1984) found normative commitment as high, affective and continuance commitment as medium; Dee, Henkin & Singleton, (2006) found organisational commitment as high. In this study, high affective commitment levels of teachers can be an important indicator explaining that as teachers's working length in schools rises, they love the school, work for success of it; they are happy with it and satisfied with their own profession (Currivan, 1999; Allen & Meyer, 1993). Hence, affective commitment is an expected component of overall commitment and wanted by management of organisation. Individuals who show more commitment to their organisation and their profession, show better performance for organisation's effectiveness. Other commitment components' levels are relatively medium and even if this may show that teachers behave purposively for school's purposes and targets, it can actually be an important signal for the problems which can be occurred when individual values and organisational values face each other and an important signal for lack of harmony with the school.

Organisational commitment levels of teachers show significant difference according to their gender, age and period of service in the same school. It was found out that female teachers have significantly higher continuance commitment than males, but there is no significant difference in other dimensions. Female teacher's having higher levels of education inspite of many difficulties, community stereotype that teaching in elementary school is relatively suitable for women and the difficulty of finding opportunities in another profession compared to primary school teaching may be signals that female teachers do not give up their

organisation easily. There are studies arguing that gender creates a significant difference in organisational commitment (Dee & et al., 2006; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) as well as gender does not in some others (Ail et al., 2015; Currivan, 1999).

It was found out that older teachers have higher affective and continuance commitment than younger ones. It can be said that teachers integrate with their school and they are in harmony with it in time. A person's working in the same school for long years, his/her integration and struggles can be the reasons of high level affective commitment; while on the other hand, decreasing job opportunities due to the age, absence of new job opportunities, lack of courage due to age even if job opportunities appear, can be the reasons of high level continuance commitment. Similarly, there are studies indicating that commitment improves with the rising age (Balay, 2000; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Also, there are some studies which expressing different results concerning the relationship between age and organisational commitment (Besiroğlu, 2013; Dee et al., 2006).

Teachers having longer period of service have higher affective and normative commitment than teachers having less. Time spent in an organisation has positive effects on a person's organisational commitment. It can be said that teachers feel more responsible about activities to be done and strive more for school's purposes and coalesces with the school by their increasing period of service in the school. There are studies suggesting relationship between organisational commitment and period of service (Dee et al., 2006; Mathiuge & Zajac, 1990) while some suggesting no relationship between organisational commitment and period of service (Uysal, 2014; Kiral & Kacar, 2016).

It was found that, teachers graduated from faculty of education and having master degree have significantly high affective commitment, but there is no significant difference in other dimensions. As literature investigated, it is seen that there are some studies concerning educational situation does not create a significant difference (Balci, 2009; Mowday et al., 1979) as well as some others concerning that educational situation creates a significant difference (Currivan, 1999; Kiral & Kacar, 2016). As the reason of this revealed difference, it can be thought as people who graduated from other faculties in spite of different challenges (KPSS, education of formation) have bigger adaptation to teaching profession and school.

Normative commitment of teachers has positive and medium correlation with affective commitment, low level correlation with continuance commitment. It was determined that there is positive and high level correlation between teachers' perceptions of school principals' instructional leadership behavior. The highest correlation is stated between the determination and sharing of school purposes and evaluation of teaching process and students relatively. It was determined that there is positive and medium level correlation between teachers' perception of school principals' instructional leadership behavior with affective and normative commitment level. Affective commitment has the highest correlation with the creation of regular teaching-learning environment and climate, normative commitment has the highest correlation with management of curriculum and teaching process. Ail et al., (2015), Anderman et al. (1991), Balci (2009), Currivan (1999) state the similar results in their studies but Cevahiroğlu (2012) states different results. Ail et al. (2015) found medium level positive correlation between commitment and instructional leadership generally. Teachers having higher school commitment correlation strive more, at the same time they improve their performance to higher level (Dikmen, 2012).

Teachers, who have high school commitment, fulfill the duties given by the principal eagerly, respond expectations and directives immediately, and are satisfied with their job. School principals' instructional leadership affects both individuals and existing school system (teachers, students and parents etc.) (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). An instructional leader is in a

social interaction with the shareholders in the school. Instructional leader should reveal his/her personal sources effectively like responsibility, cooperation and commitment. School principal can not be successful if teachers have no commitment to school. Thus, principals need to show instructional leadership behaviours especially towards teacher support and development of teachers (Niqab et al., 2014). As the harmony level of employee purposes and the purposes of the organization rises, employee commitment rises, too (Mowday et al., 1982).

Recommendations

Principals always need to show instructional leadership behaviors and this should be observed by the teachers. For this reason, administrators and teachers should be trained about this subject. Relatively younger teachers and teachers who have worked in the same school less generally have lower perceptions of instructional leadership. So, the reasons of this can be studied by a qualitative research. Trainings can be implemented for principals and teachers to raise teachers' organisational commitment. Male teachers have less continuance commitment, young teachers and teachers who come from other faculties have higher affective commitment. So, the causes of these issues can be investigated by a qualitative research. Causative comparative researches can be done concerning what is the effect of instructional leadership in the revealed relationship between teachers' commitments and the instructional leadership perception.

References

- Ail, N. M. B. M., Taib, M. R. B., Jaafar, H. B., Salleh, W. A. R. B. M., & Omar, M. N. B. (2015). Principals' instructional leadership and teachers' commitment in three mara junior science colleges (MJSC) In Pahang, Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 191, 1848-1853.
- Aksoy, E. (2006). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin öğretimsel liderlik rolleri [Instructional leadership roles of primary school administrators]*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Çanakkale On Sekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Çanakkale.
- Allen, J. N., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effect? *Journal of Business Research*. 26 (1), 49-61.
- 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.
- Anderman, Eric M., & Others. (1991). *Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: The role of school culture and principal leadership*. Paper Presented at The Annual Meeting of The American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7).
- Aytekin, H. (2014). *Ortaöğretim okulu müdürlerinin öğretmenler tarafından algılanan durumsal liderlik stilleri ile öğretimsel liderlik rolleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Kartal ilçesi örneği) [Study on correlation between secondary school principals' situational leadership styles and educational leadership roles that perceived by teachers (Kartal district sample)]*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Balay, R. (2000). *Yönetici ve öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık [Organizational commitment in administrators and teachers]*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

- Balci, Y. (2009). *İlköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmen ve yöneticilerin örgütsel bağlılığı ile yöneticilerin öğretimsel liderlik ve dönüştürücü (transformatif) liderlik davranışları arasındaki ilişkilerin analizi [The analysis of relationships between teachers and administrators of organizational commitment with educational and transformational leadership behaviours of administrators in primary school]*. Unpublished Doctor's Thesis. Ege Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Besiroğlu, A. (2013). *Ortaöğretim kurumları yöneticilerinin liderlik stillerinin örgütsel bağlılıkla ilişkisi [Relationship between managers' leadership styles, organizational commitment secondary education institutions]*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Bickel, W. E.(1983). Effective schools: Knowledge, dissemination, inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 12(4), 3-5.
- Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 35 (3), 349-378.
- Blase, J., & Kirby, P. C. (2000). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What successful principals do*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Cevahiroğlu, E. (2012). *İlköğretim branş öğretmenlerinin algıladıkları liderlik davranışları ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki [Branch elementary teachers perceive the relationship between leadership behaviors and organizational commitment]*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Cross, C.T., & Rice, R. C. (2000). The role of the principal as instructional leader in a standards-driven system. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84 (620), 61-65.
- Cuban, L. (1984) Transforming the frog into a prince: Effective schools research, policy, and practice at the district level. *Harvard Educational Review*, 54 (2), 129-152.
- Currihan, D. B. (1999). The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. [Human Resource Management Review](#). 9 (4), 495–524.
- Celik, V. (2003). *Eğitimsel liderlik [Educational leadership]*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Dee, J. R., Henkin, A. B., & Singleton, C. A. (2006). Organizational commitment of teachers in urban schools. Examining the effects of team structures. *Urban Education*, 41(6), 603-627.
- Dikmen, B. (2012). *Liderlik kuramları ve dönüştürücü liderlik kuramının çalışanların örgütsel bağlılık algıları üzerindeki etkisine yönelik uygulamalı bir araştırma [Leadership theories and converter for leadership theory applied research impact on employees 'perceptions of organizational commitment]*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Eslami, J., & Gharakhani, D. (2012). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Science and Technology*, 2 (2), 85-91.
- Glickman, C. D. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gündoğdu, K. and Yıldırım, A. (2010). Voices of home and school on democracy and human rights education at the primary level: a case study. *Asia Pacific Education. Review*. 11:525–532

- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86, 217-247.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, 94 (3), 328–355.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980–1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9 (2), 157–191.
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: a passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership & Policy in Schools*, 4 (3), 221-239.
- Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement leading or misleading? *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, 32 (1), 11-24.
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972) Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 555-572.
- Khoza, J. F. (2012). *The relationship between the school principals' instructional leadership role and the academic performance of pupils in Swaziland primary schools*. Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education. Education Management at the University of South Africa.
- Kıral, B. (2015). *Lise yöneticilerinin öğretmenleri güçlendirmesi ve öğretmenlerin kayıtsızlık (sinizm) davranışı ile ilişkisi [The relationship between teacher empowerment of high school administrators and cynicism behaviors of teachers]* unpublished Doctor's Thesis. Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Kıral, B.(2016). *Öğretmenlerde Kayıtsızlık ve Güçlendirme [Cynicism and Empowerment in Teachers]*, Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Kıral, E.& Kaçar, O. (2016). The relationship between teachers' school commitment and school culture. *International Education Studies*; 9 (12), 90-108.
- Marks H. M., & Printy. S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39 (3), 370-397.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta- analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108 (2), 171-194.
- Meyer, J. P., and Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1 (1), 61-89.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R. M. & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224–247.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W. & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: the psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). New directions in the professional development of school administrators: A synthesis and suggestions for improvement. In J. Murphy & P.

- Hallinger (Eds.), *Approaches to Administrative Training in Education*, 245-282. Albany, NY: Suny Press.
- Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In R. S. Lotto & P. W. Thurston (Eds.), *Advances in educational administration: Changing perspective son the school*, 163-200. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Nayir, F. (2012). The relationship between perceived organizational support and teachers' organizational commitment, *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 48, 97-116.
- Niqab, M., Sharma, S. Wei, L. M., & Maulod, S. B. A. (2014). Instructional leadership potential among school principals in Pakistan. *International Education Studies*, 7(6), 74-85.
- 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.
- Özkaynak, D. (2013). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışları [*Instructional leadership behaviours of the primary schools' principals*]. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Peers, J. I. (2006). *Statistical analysis for education & psychology researchers*. The falmer press (A Member of The Taylor & Francis Group). London: USA Falmer Press.
- Razak, N. A. Darmawan, I. G. N. & Keeves, J. P. (2009). *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching. teacher commitment*, 343-360. Springer Science & Business Media
- Spillane, J. P., & Diamond, J. B. (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sisman, M. (2004). *Öğretim liderliği [Instructional leadership]*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Tezcan, F. (2010). *Vakıf ve devlet üniversitelerinde görev yapan yabancı diller İngilizce bölümü öğretim elemanlarının iş doyumunu ve kuruma bağlılıklarının incelenmesi. [The analysis of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of language instructors working in foreign language department of state and foundation universities]*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Uysal, U. (2014). *Lise öğretmenlerinin örgütsel güven algıları ile örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between high school teachers' organizational trust perceptions and organizational commitment levels]*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Yuce, S. (2010). *İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Ankara ili örneği)[A research on relatinship of instructional leadership behaviour of elementary school principals and organizational commitment of teachers (Ankara Sample)]*. Unpublished Master's Thesis].Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Yuksel, 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]*.

Unpublished Master's Thesis. Okan Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Zeinabadi, H.(2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of teachers. *Procedia –Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 998–1003.