The Relationship Between Leadership Capacity and Organizational Commitment in Educational Institutions

Ramazan Sırıklıgil, Gökhan Demirhan

Abstract. The purpose of this research was determine the relationship between perceived leadership capacity and teachers' organizational commitment levels in Primary and Secondary Schools under the Ministry of National Education. The sample of the research consists of teachers working in the Primary and Secondary Schools in the city center of Uşak in the 2018-2019 academic year. The research was designed according to the correlational design; data were collected with likert type measurement tools. In the interpretation of the data regarding the answers given by the teachers for the questionnaires, the obtained data were interpreted by evaluating them in terms of frequency (f), percent (%), arithmetic mean ($\bar{x}$) and standard deviations (ss). In order to determine the relationship between the perceived leadership capacity level and the organizational commitment levels of teachers, a pearson moment product correlation analysis was performed. A positive, moderate and significant relationship was found between the organizational commitment levels of teachers and the level of perceived leadership capacity sub-dimensions of the distributed leadership level, shared school vision, collaboration and shared responsibility, perceived student achievement and total leadership capacity perceptions. As teachers' distributed leadership characteristics, shared school vision, collaboration and shared sense of responsibility, and perceived student success increase, total commitment levels also increase.

Keywords. Leadership, leadership capacity, organizational commitment.

Ramazan SIRIKLIGİL. Ministry of National Education, Research and Development Office, Usak, Turkey

e-mail: ramazan1396@hotmail.com

Gökhan DEMİRHAN. Usak University, Faculty of Educatıon, Usak, Turkey

e-mail: gokhandemirhan64@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

With the rapid increase in the world population, cities became crowded and accordingly, the population of schools increased. Many schools in the city centers have surpassed village populations and even town and county populations. The development and development of educational institutions has made it difficult for a single person to lead. Today, a school principal should be more professionally and technically equipped than in previous periods. The increase in the expectations of the sociologically more developed society from the school administrators has shifted from the understanding of the leadership of one person in school management to the participation of all teachers in the school according to their abilities. In other words, the leadership of the school principal is important but not sufficient for a better education and training. It will be more effective in developing teachers' leadership capacity and student learning in order to make a better education in the formation of the school's goals, teaching strategies, to make decisions about the school and to manage the school budget (Blase & Blase, 2001). Better teaching at the school is to continue the change and development without any problems by turning from the 'hero leader' approach to the participant and distributor leader understanding. In other words, it increases the school's leadership capacity (Harris & Lambert, 2003).

Leadership behavior is one of the factors that affect dedication. Organizational commitment, which is seen as a "psychological link" between the organization and the employee, can be defined as accepting the goals and values of the organization and doing its best to be useful in the organization. School administrators' inclusion of teachers in decision-making while managing the school, that is, assuming the role of a distributor leader, will increase the motivation of teachers, make them feel valuable and increase their organizational commitment. The fact that teachers act with a sense of dedication towards their school and use their abilities and energy to achieve the goals of the school will increase the quality of the school's education (Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian, 1974, p. 603-609).

Considering that the development of the educational institution in all aspects will be the result of an effective leadership process, the importance of increasing the leadership capacity and increasing the organizational commitment of teachers is better understood. When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that the studies on leadership capacity are insufficient. The research is important in terms of determining the relationship between teachers' perceptions of leadershipcapacity and organizational commitment.

Leadership

The leader, who is defined as guiding the accompanying people by walking in the front, comes from the word `` lira '', which means a plow trace in Latin. An effective leader is a person with different thinking skills (Hurst, 2000, p. 175). Leadership ability is the ability to persuade people to work towards specified goals. The leader is also the person who sees what others cannot see, feels that other people cannot feel and takes the necessary precautions, and who leads the group energy of the people who are connected to the organization to the goal (Kaya, 2002, p. 15). Leader is the person who has high level thinking skills, has high communication skills, simplifies the problems, dedicates himself to the institution he works for, activates people towards a certain goal (Davis, 1988, p. 141). The leader is in his own field, he knows his job well and does it in the best way, he is strong in communication and makes people feel confident and never abuse this trust (Bennis 2001, p. 184).

The theories put forward in studies on leadership show differences. Featured theories; traits, behavioral and contingency approaches (Gümüşeli, 1996, p. 4) The trait theory emerged in the early 1900s and advocated the idea of "Leaders are born, not made". According to this theory, the leader is born with some features and these features make him a leader. According to the features theory; motivation ability should include elements such as high energy, coping with stress, high self-confidence, good communication skills, being tall, looking good, healthy, and having a strong physical structure. This is where the feature theory is most criticized. In some sectors, being tall or overweight has no effect on the performance of the leader (Hellriegel, Slocum, & Wodman, 1998). Anotherpoint where feature theory is criticized is that leadership argues that it is innate and that these features cannot be acquired later (English, 2006). Behavioral theories have argued that the leader will emerge with positive behavior. According to this theory, the behaviors shown in the leadership process are more important than leadership characteristics (Keçecioğlu, 2001). Contingency theory; leadership exhibits different leadership styles and behaviors depending on the situation and circumstances. The important thing is not to find the best leadership style, but to find the best leadership style for a particular situation. There is no single best leader type, leader; it exhibits different leadership characteristics in different situations (Rollinson, 2002).

The fact that the school principal's being a good leader is one of the most important factors for schools to reach the specified goal. The school principal with leadership qualities has a positive effect on students and teachers. In recent years, various studies have been made as to how it should

be in Turkey of school administrators, school principals contemporary result of this research was aimed to determine the roles. Although there are many different leadership models, the most prominent ones are; distributed leadership, transformational leadership, visionary leadership, organizational leadership and cultural leadership (Tahaoğlu, 2007, p. 9).

Leadership Capacity

Leadership capacity means the self-management of the organization, the ability of people with critical importance in the organization to survive, restructure and develop even when they leave the organization. The most important issue in the definition of leadership capacity is the understanding of cooperating learning together. In this process, different perceptions, different values, different beliefs, mutual tolerance, understanding and dialogue are overcome. New ideas are generated by making reflections on the applications to be made, developing common beliefs, attaching meaning to the work done, and taking action from these new meanings. The essence of leadership is to provide learning together in this process (Lambert & Haris, 2003). There are two important issues when defining leadership capacity. 'Broad-based' and 'Skill-based' participation. Teachers, students, families and the environment should participate in the leadership process. This refers to broad-based participation. However, the participants must have a knowledgeable, skillful and competency level and reflect these skills in the process. This is called "skill-based" participation (Lambert, 1998a).

Some researches have revealed the view that school leadership is associated with increasing the quality of teaching and student learning. For this reason, the concept of leadership should not only be viewed as the leadership of the school principal, but an understanding that leads all members of the school to lead. It can be said that effective participation in schools with high leadership skills, values created by self-confident school members play an active role in student success (Lambert, 1998). In the discussions on leadership recently, leadership capacity has started to come to the fore. Even though leadership and capacity are not a very new concept, they have different meanings when used together. Two different types of capacity are mentioned, individual and organizational capacity. While individual capacity means individuals' existing potential skills; organizational capacity means the skills that members of the organization have (Lambert, 2009).

Leadership capacity has six dimensions;

1- "Broad-based and skill-based participation in the leadership process"; It means the participation of all the staff in the school with their knowledge, skills and specialties.

2- "Shared vision that provides program integrity"; It means a common vision that everyone in the school accepts, adopts and provides integrity.

3- "Research-based data use in decisions and practices"; It refers to the use of realistic data rather than individual decisions during decisions and applications.

4- "Roles and behaviors that reflect broad participation, cooperation and shared responsibility"; expresses the participation of all the staff in the school by taking responsibility for the decisions to be made about the school, the policies to be followed, and the practices aimed at increasing student success.

5- "Reflective practices"; It refers to the evaluation of the applications of school administrators and teachers during the teaching process.

6- "Continuously increasing student success"; It expresses the development of students in all aspects (Lambert, 2003; Act. Kılınç 2013).

Organizational Commitment

Although organizational commitment, in other words, commitment to the organization has been among the most emphasized management concepts recently, no common idea has been developed on this concept in the literature. The most important reason for this is that the experts who take different subjects approach the concept with their pedagogical understanding.

Çöl (2004), in his study he defined organizational dedication as the attachment of the employee to the organization, seeing himself as a member of the organization and as a result, the desire to act for common goals. Organizational dedication; Employees identify with an organization and join forces and are strong indicators of participation in the organization (Şahin & Balkar, 2008). According to McDonald and Makin (2000), organizational commitment is the psychological agreement between the organization and the employee. There is a clear relationship between the psychological agreement and the commitment of employees to the organization. Organizational commitment is the main purpose of organizations' survival because individuals who are committed to the organization work more harmoniously, are more productive and are more beneficial to their organizations because they are responsible (Balcı, 2003). Organizational commitment is the degree of the individual's integration with an organization and its commitment to the organization (Mowday et al., 1982).

In line with all these definitions, it is possible to mention three different characteristics of organizational commitment; "Accepting the goals and value judgments of the organization, striving for the benefit of the organization and volunteering for continuous development, and being willing to remain part of the organizational culture." (Balay, 2000; Ölçüm-Çetin, 2004).

In the definitions made for organizational commitment, it is seen that devotion focuses on behavioral and attitudinal devotion. In other words, employees are devoted to the organization for either a behavioral reason or an attitudinal reason. Behavioral devotion: It refers to the experience of the employees in the organization and the process of acting in harmony with the organization. In behavioral devotion, employees are attached to a specific job they do, not to the organization itself. According to the attitude devotional approach, the individual evaluates the organization he / she works with and is integrated with the organization. In other words, attitudinal devotion is the total degree of employee identification and participation in the organization (Çöl, 2004). Attitude devotion focuses on employees' relationships with their organizations. The goals of employees in this devotional type must match those of the organization. Attitude devotion consists of three important elements. These; the values and goals of the employees and the values and goals of the organization should coincide, intensive participation should be ensured in the activities held in the organization, and the employee should be loyal to the organization (Özsoy, Ergül and Bayık, 2004).

Many researchers about organizational commitment have worked and have contributed to the literature;

Classification of Etzioni; Etzioni is one of the first researchers to classify organizational dedication. According to Etzioni, three types of organizational commitments can be made;

1- Moral devotion; It is based on the employee's adoption and internalization of the organization's goals, norms, values and identification with it.

2- Calculativedevotion; It is a type of devotion based on the exchange of employees with their organizations. Employees are the type of dedication they have earned for the reward they receive for their organizations (Güney, 2001).

3- Alienating devotion; It is a type of devotion that occurs in environments where organizations restrict employee behavior. In this type of devotional organization, a negative attitude is taken against the organization, it is not psychologically devoted to the organization, but it continues its membership (Varoğlu, 1993).

Classification of O'Reilly and Chatman; Seeing organizational commitment as a psychological agreement between the employee and the organization, O'Reilly and Chatman divided the organizational commitment into three.

1- Dedication to Compliance; Employees in this devotional type are committed to getting rewards and getting rid of punishment. The attractiveness of the award and the deterrence of punishment are important.

2- Dedication to Identification; It is a type of dedication created by the employee to establish and maintain good relations with other members of the organization. Working in this way is proud to be a member of the organization.

3- Devotional Commitment; In this devotional type there is a complete harmony between the employee and the organization's value judgments. The employee digests and integrates the organization and other employees of the organization (O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986).

Elements that make up the commitment to the organization

The elements that make up the commitment to the organization; It is possible to divide it into three as emotional devotion, continuous devotion and normative devotion (Balay, 2000; Wasti, 2000).

Emotional devotion; It is the dedication of the employees to the extent that they internalize the values, norms and goals of their organizations. This type of employee is the most wanted by employers, committed to the organization, loyal, and accepting themselves as part of the organization. Employees with emotional commitment have a positive attitude towards the organization and their work and, when necessary, make additional efforts for their work.

Constant devotion; It is the dedication created by the efforts of the employees for their organizations. The employee is of the opinion that it is an obligation to remain in the organization as a result of this investment in the organization. There may be several reasons for the constant commitment to the organization; fear of not being able to find another job, family pressure, health reasons, compelling reasons such as being close to retirement. Employees with persistent commitment may display negative attitudes towards the organization and are a potential source of problems for managers.

Normative devotion; is mandatory devotion. Employees are grateful to the organization and the employer for various reasons, and they find it imperative to stay in the organization.

Factors affecting organizational commitment

The fact that employees feel devoted to the organization has positive results in the organization and increases efficiency. There are many different reasons that affect organizational commitment. These are the factors that arise from the employee "age, gender, marital status, experience, desperation" and organizational factors "intra-organizational justice, job satisfaction, importance of the work done, participation in decision-making mechanism, job security, reward, leadership behaviors, interest shown to employees" can be listed as. In a study conducted to determine the reasons affecting organizational commitment, it has been revealed that the rewards and business values given within the organization are more important than demographic factors (Oliver, 1990).

In this study, the main research problem is; to determine the the relations between the level of teachers' receptions of leadership capacity in schools and organizational commitment. Due to this research problem, the following research questions are tried to be answered;

What is the Level of Teachers' Perception of Leadership Capacity in Schools?

Is there any significant correlations between the level of teachers' receptions of leadership capacity in schools and age, seniority, seniority at school, managerial experience?

What is the organizational commitment levels of teachers?

Is there any significant correlations between organizational commitment levels of teachers and age, seniority, seniority at school, managerial experiance?

Is there any significant correlations between the level of teachers' receptions of leadership capacity in schools and organizational commitment?

METHOD

Research Model

In this study, correlational research design was used, which aims to determine the relationship between leadership capacity and organizational commitment in educational institutions, according to the perceptions of primary and secondary school teachers'. Correlational research designs that aim to identify the relationship between multiple variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006).

Study Group

The population of there search consists of 1359 teachers working in public primary and secondary schools in the city center of Uşak in the 2018-2019 academic year. Highschools have been left out of the population due to the differences in their administrative structures. The sample of the research consists of 499 teachers determined through there search population, using a convenience sampling method. The return rate of the data collection tools deployed within the scope of there search is 99%. As a result of the calculation made to determine the sample's ability to represent the population; the confidence intervalvalue was found to be 3.49, for the 95% confidence level. The distribution of the sample according to demographic characteristics is given in Table 1.

Table 1. *Demographic Information About Sampling*

			f	%
Gender	Female		256	51,3
	Male		243	48,7
Marital status	Single		38	7,6
	Married		461	92,4
Education	Associate Degree		39	7,8
	Undergraduate		424	85,0
	Graduate		36	7,2
Directorate	Yes		364	72,9
	No		135	27,1
	Min.	Max.	$\overline{X}$	ss
Age	23,00	66,00	42,1663	8,61599
Seniority	1,00	41,00	18,6112	8,72017
Seniority at school	1,00	30,00	8,4870	6,09079

Data Collection Tools

The data of the search was collected with the Organizational Commitment Scale developed by Yücel and implemented by Yıldırım (2009) and with the Leadership Capacity Scale in Schools developed by Lambert (2003) and adapted toTurkish by Kılınç (2013). The dimensions of the measuring tools used in the research were determined by adhering to the original studies. Leadership capacity scale in schools consists of four dimensions as; Distributed Leadership: Shared School Vision, Cooperation and Shared Responsibility, Perceived Student Success. Organizational Commitment Scale has a one-dimensional structure. The cronbach's alpha coefficients calculated for the sub-dimensions of the leadership capacity scale in schools varies between 0.909 and 0.926.

The cronbach's alpha coefficient of the organizational commitment scale was calculated as 0.962. The reliability features of the scales are similar to their original studies. Data collected within the scope of the research were analyzed with; skewness-kurtosis for determination of normality and pearson's product-moment correlation analysis to determine relationships between variables and the demographic properties. Parametric correlation analysis were used since the kurtosis and skewness values were in the range of -1.5to +1.5.

RESULTS

1. Findings about the Level of Teachers' Perception of Leadership Capacity in Schools

The first problem of the research is "What level of teachers' perception of leadership capacity in schools? In order to answer the question, data related to teachers' perception of leadership capacity were analyzed. The findings are given in Table 2.

Table 2. *Level of Teachers' Perception of Leadership Capacity in Schools*

	N	$\bar{X}$	SS
Leadership Capacity, Distributor Leadership	499	2,7332	,68444
Leadership Capacity, Shared School Vision	499	2,8138	,64576
Leadership Capacity, Cooperation Joint Responsibility	499	2,8701	,65900
Leadership Capacity, Perceived Student Success,	499	2,8983	,64874
Total Leadership Capacity	499	2,8288	,62020

The average of the leadership capacity scale of the teachers in the sample in the distributor leadership sub-dimension = 2.73; averages in the shared school vision sub-dimension = 2.81; averages in cooperation and joint responsibility sub-dimension = 2.87; averages in the perceived student achievement sub-dimension = 2.90; total leadership capacity averages are calculated as = 2.73. According to these average values, it can be said that teachers' perceptions of distributed leadership, shared school vision, collaboration and shared responsibility, perceived student success and total leadership capacity level are at a medium level.

2. Findings Regarding Whether Teachers' Perceptions of Leadership Capacity in Schools Are Age, Seniority at School, Time Spent in School-Management Experience

The second problem of the research is "Teachers' perception of leadership capacity levels in schools; Is there a relationship between the teachers' age, seniority at school, the time they spend at school - whether they have management experience? " was tried to be answered. The findings are given in Table 3.

Table 3. *Pearson Moments Multiplication Correlation Analysis Showing the Level of Teachers' Perception of Leadership Capacity in Schools with Age, Seniority, Time in School, and Whether or Not They Have Management Experience (N = 499)*

	Age	Seniority	Seniority at School	Managerial Experience
Leadership Capacity, distributor leadership	,202**	,196**	,118**	,140**
Leadership Capacity, Shared School Vision	,155**	,145**	,097*	,108*
Leadership Capacity, Cooperation Joint Responsibility	,100*	,090*	,018	,085
Leadership Capacity, Perceived Student Success,	,070	,049	-,006	,062
Total Leadership Capacity,	,141**	,128**	,063	,105*

Note: ** *Signed Correlations are Significant at .01 Level.*
Signed Correlations are Significant at .05 Level.

Perceived distributor leadership level, teachers' ages (r = 0,202, p <.01), seniority (r = 0,196, p <.01), time spent in school (r = 0,118, p <.01) and management experience time (r = There is a positive, low and significant relationship between 0,140, p <.01). As the ages, seniority, time spent in school and management experience of teachers increase, perceived distributor leadership characteristics increase.

With the shared school vision, the ages of the teachers (r = 0.155, p <.01), their seniority (r = 0.145, p <.01), the time they spent in school (r = 0.097, p <.05) and their managerial experience (r = 0.108). , p <.05), there is a positive, low and significant relationship. As the ages, seniority, time spent in school and management experience of the teachers increase, the shared school vision increases.

There is a positive, low level and significant relationship between the level of collaboration and shared responsibility and the ages of teachers (r = 0,100, p <.05), seniority (r = 0.090, p <.05).

No significant relation was found between the time spent in school (r = 0.018, p> .05) and the duration of management experience (r = 0.085, p> .05). As the age and seniority of the teachers increase, the level of cooperation and common responsibility increases.

With perceived student success, the ages of the teachers (r = 0.070, p> .05), their seniority (r = 0.49, p> .05), the time they spent in school (r = -0.006, p> .05) and their duration of management experience (r = 0.062, p> .05), no significant relationship was found.

Positive, low and significant between total leadership capacity level and teachers' ages (r = 0.141, p <.01), seniority (r = 0.148, p <.01) and duration of management experience (r = 0.105, p <.05) a relationship has been found. No significant relationship was found between the time they spent at school (r = 0.063, p> .05) and their total leadership capacity. As the ages, seniority and managerial experience of teachers increase, their total leadership capacity also increases.

3- Findings Related to Teachers' Organizational Commitment Level

The third problem of the research is "What is the organizational commitment of teachers? The answer to the question "was sought. Data on teachers' organizational commitment levels were analyzed. The findings are given in Table 4.

Table 4. *Organizational Commitment Levels of Teachers*

	N	$\bar{X}$	Std.Dev.
Total Commitment	499	2,9551	1,04603

The total commitment level average of the teachers in the sample was calculated as = 2.95. According to this average value, it is seen that the total commitment levels of teachers are at medium level.

4- Findings Regarding Whether Teachers' Total Commitment Levels Are Age-Seniority-Time Spent at School-Management Experience

The fourth problem of the research is "Teachers' organizational commitment levels in schools; Is there a relationship between teachers' age - seniority - the time they spent at school - whether they have management experience? " was tried to be answered. The findings are given in Table 5.

Table 5. *Pearson Moments Multiplication Correlation Analysis Showing the Relationship of Teachers' Total Commitment Levels with Age, Seniority, Duration of School and Duration of Management Experience (N = 499)*

	Age	Seniority	Seniority at School	Managerial Experience ++
Total commitment	,298**	,267**	,145**	,109*

Note: ** *Signed Correlations are Significant at .01 Level.*
*　　 * Signed Correlations are Significant at .05 Level.*

Teachers'total organizational commitment level and teachers' ages (r = 0.298, p <.01), seniority (r = 0.2267, p <.01), time spent in school (r = 0.145, p <.01) and managerial experience times (r = 0.109, p <.05), there is a positive, low and significant relationship. As the ages of teachers, their seniority, the time they spent at school and their management experience increased, their total organizational commitment levels also increase.

5- Findings Regarding Teachers' Total Commitment Levels and Their Perceptions of Leadership Capacity in Schools

The fifth problem of the research, "Is there a relationship between teachers' total organizational commitment level and their perception of leadership capacity in schools? " was tried to be answered. The findings are given in Table 6.

Table 6. *Table 6 Pearson Moments Product Correlation Analysis Showing Teachers' Total Commitment Levels and their perceptions of leadership capacity in schools (N = 499)*

	Leadership Capacity Distributor Leadership	Leadership Capacity Shared School Vision	Leadership Capacity Cooperation Shared Responsibility	Perceived Student Success	Total Leadership Capacity
Total Commitment	,592**	,531**	,480**	,464**	,550**

Note: ** *Signed Correlations are Significant at .01 Level.*

Teachers' total organizational commitment level and teachers' distributive leadership levels (r = 0.592, p <.01), teachers' shared school vision (r = 0.531, p <.01), collaboration and shared sense of responsibility (r = 0.480, p <.01), a positive, moderate and significant relationship was found between perceived student achievement (r = 0.464, p <.01) and Total Leadership capacity perceptions (r = 0.550, p <.01). As the distributional leadership characteristics of teachers, shared

school vision, collaboration and shared responsibility, and perceived student success increase, total organizational commitment levels increase.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The following results have been achieved in this research conducted to evaluate the relationship between the leadership capacity and organizational commitment of educational institutions.

It can be said that teachers' perceptions of distributed leadership level in schools, perceptions of shared school vision level, perceptions of cooperation-shared responsibility level, perceptions of student achievement level and perceptions of total leadership capacity are at a medium level.

A positive, low, and significant relationship was found between the total leadership capacity level and the teachers' ages, seniority and management experience time. There was no significant relationship between the time they spent at school and their total leadership capacity. As the ages, seniority and managerial experience of teachers increase, their total leadership capacity also increases.

By looking at the average value, it can be said that the total commitment levels of teachers are at a medium level.

A positive, low level and significant relationship was found between the total commitment level of teachers and their ages, seniority, time spent in school and management experience. As teachers' ages, seniority, time spent in school, and managerial experience increase, total commitment levels increase.

A positive, moderate and significant relationship was found between the total commitment level of the teachers and the distributive leadership levels of the teachers, the shared school vision of the teachers, the sense of cooperation and shared responsibility, perceived student achievement and Total Leadership capacity perceptions. As teachers' distributional leadership characteristics, Shared school vision, Cooperation and common sense of responsibility and perceived student success increase, total commitment levels increase.

In the research, there is a significant difference in the shared school vision, distributed leadership, cooperation and common responsibility sub-dimensions, which are the sub-dimensions of leadership capacity according to the variable of whether educational institutions have leadership

experience or not, and there is no significant difference in perceived student achievement. The average of those with management experience is significantly higher than the average of those without management experience. In the study of Kılınç (2013), while the average of those with managerial experience in distribution leadership, shared school vision, cooperation and shared responsibility sub-dimensions was significantly higher than those without management experience, there was a significant difference between those with managerial experience and those with no managerial experience. They do not. In this respect, the study of Kılıç (2013) shows parallelism in all sub-dimensions. In Doğan's (2016) research, there is no significant difference in all sub-dimensions of leadership capacity between those with management experience and those without management experience. The research differs from this aspect with the work of Doğan (2016). School administrators' being more accustomed to managerial roles than teachers may have given more positive answers towards sub-dimensions of leadership capacity. In other words, the teachers may still think that the schools will be managed with the principal of the school and think that they have no administrative responsibility. In addition, it can be thought that teachers do not raise awareness about leadership as much as school administrators and they do not have as much responsibility as school administrators. Although Deal and Peterson (1999) also have a role in the process of creating a culture based on shared responsibility, teachers support our research to say that this is primarily the responsibility of the principal.

As a result of the research, while there was a significant difference between distributive leadership, shared school vision, cooperation and shared responsibility sub-dimensions, there was no significant difference between perceived student achievement and seniority. In other words, as the seniority of teachers increases, they have more positive thoughts in shared school vision, distributor leadership, collaboration and shared responsibility sub-dimensions. In Kılıç's (2013) research, there is a meaningful difference in all sub-dimensions of leadership capacity that changes positively with increasing seniority. Apart from the perceived student success, which is the sub-dimension of leadership capacity, Kılıç's (2013) research is in parallel. In Doğan's (2016) research, there is no significant difference between all sub-dimensions of leadership capacity and seniority. The research contradicts the student achievement perceived by Doğan's (2016) research. As a result of this research, as teachers gain experience in their professions, they can be interpreted as being more attached to their institutions and developing a sense of belonging. When the relevant literature is analyzed (Duran, Sezgin & Çoban, 2011; Erdemir, 2007; Yeşilyurt & Karakuş, 2011; Yilmaz & Tepebaş, 2011), it is seen that teachers experienced various problems in the first years of their

profession. As a result, it can be said that low-opinion teachers' negative opinions about the distribution capacity of distributorship leadership, shared school vision, cooperation and shared responsibility, perceived student success sub-dimensions are in line with expectations. In other words, it can be said that those who spend a certain period of time in the teaching profession try to feel responsible in their efforts to exhibit leadership behavior, to cooperate with school members, to try to create a school vision, to increase student success. Beycioğlu and Aslan (2012) found that teachers with higher seniority years have higher perception averages than teachers with less senior years in the sub-dimensions of institutional development, professional development and collaboration with colleagues. This finding is in line with the findings of the research.

Considering the working time in the same school, while there was a significant difference in favor of those working longer in the same school, there was no difference between collaboration and shared responsibility and the perceived student success. In Gidiş's (2017) study, no significant difference was found in all sub-dimensions of leadership capacity according to the variable of working time in the same school. According to these results, the vision of the school shared with the distribution leadership contradicts the research of Gidiş (2017), while the perceived student success overlaps with cooperation and shared responsibility.

In the research, it was seen that the organizational commitment level of teachers is at a medium level. While this contradicts some of the previous researches, Ulusoy (2014) overlaps with some researches.

In the research, there is a positive meaningful relationship between teachers' ages and their organizational commitment. Organizational commitment increases as the age of teachers increases. This result overlaps with Ulusoy's (2014) research. In addition, it is compatible with many studies on this subject in the literature (İmamoğlu, 2011; Kaygisiz, 2012).

In addition, there are some studies that contradict the research; In his study, Kaya (2002) states that as the age of the employees increases, their commitment to the organization decreases. In the research, there is a positive relationship between the seniority of teachers and their organizational commitment. Organizational commitment also increases as the professional seniority of teachers increases. The research coincides with that of Ulusoy (2014). This result overlaps with other studies in the literature (Durna & Eren, 2005; İmamoğlu, 2011; Sarıkaya, 2011; Zeyrek, 2008).

There is a positively significant difference between teachers' service time at school and their organizational commitment. The teachers' organizational commitment increases as their service time increases. In this respect, the research overlaps with the research of Ulusoy (2014) and Zöğ (2007). Özkalp and Kırel (2001) stated that increasing the service period of employees in the organization is a factor in reducing the negative effects of the employees' desire to leave the organization. The fact that teachers work in the school where they live for many years may enable them to adopt and own the school. In other words, it can be said that the teachers have increased their dedication since they have been working in the same school for many years to adopt that school.

In the research, a meaningful difference was found between whether there is a managerial experience or not and organizational commitment. The average of teachers with management experience is significantly higher than teachers without management experience. In this respect, the research is in parallel with the research of Yörük and Sağban (2012). School administrators may feel that they are more responsible for the teachers than the school, and the feeling of belonging to the school may increase the organizational commitment.

Recommendations

With in-service trainings, the concepts of leadership and leadership capacity should be explained to teachers, documents related to the subject should be prepared and supported by distance and formal education.

In particular, school principals should be given training to take advantage of teachers' leadership behaviors. In addition, regulations can be made in the legislation to encourage teachers' leadership behaviors.

Teachers who have low organizational dedication should be investigated the reasons for low devotion, and their effects should be minimized and teachers can work more efficiently. Teachers who have recently started working at schools can be trained in their professions and school-related seminars, conferences, and in-service training in order to adopt the school culture and strengthen their sense of belonging to the school. It can be felt that teachers are a valuable member of the school and are important.

Research can be conducted to examine school principals' perspectives on leadership capacity and teacher leadership.

In the literature, it is seen that researches about Leadership and leadership capacity are limited. Researches can be carried out with different research methods and different variables regarding the leadership behavior and leadership capacity of teachers.

About Authors

First Author: Ramazan SIRIKLIGİL is currently working as an administrator at a public secondary school in Uşak under Ministry of National Education. He completed his MS at Uşak University and his main subject of interest is educational administration.

Second Author: Gökhan DEMİRHAN is an Assistant Professor at Uşak University. He is currently working at the Faculty of Education. He completed his PhD at Eskişehir Osmangazi University. He mainly works in the fields of educational administration, educational administration philosophy and organizational behaviour.

Conflict of Interest

Funding

ORCID

Ramazan SIRIKLIGİL https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2538-2087

Gökhan DEMİRHAN L https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8342-0160

REFERENCES

Balay, R. (2000). *Yönetici ve öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık.* Ankara: Nobel.

Balcı, A. (2003). *Örgütsel sosyalleşme* (2. baskı). Ankara: Pegem A.

Bennis, W. (2001).*Bir Lider Olabilmek* (2. bs.). (U. Teksöz, Çev.). Sistem Yayınları, İstanbul.

Beycioğlu, K. & Aslan, B. (2012). Öğretmen ve yöneticilerin öğretmen liderliğine ilişkin görüşleri: Bir karma yöntem çalışması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim* Yönetimi, 18*(2), 191-223.*

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2001). Effective instructional leadership teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administiration, 38, 130–141.*

Çöl, G. (2004). İnsan Kaynakları Örgütsel Bağlılık Kavramı ve Benzer Kavramlarla İlişkisi. *Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 6* (2), 4-11.

4–11. Davis, K. (1988*). İşletmede insan Ddvranışı: Örgütsel Davranış*. (3. bs.). (Kemal Tosun vd. Çev.). İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi İşletme İktisadı Enstitüsü Yayınları, İstanbul.

Doğan, S. (2016). *İlköğretim Okullarının Liderlik Kapasitesinin Belirlenmesi, Bursa İli Örneği* [Unpublished master thesis]. Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi.

Duran, E., Sezgin, F. & Çoban, O. (2011). Aday sınıf öğretmenlerinin uyum ve sosyalleşme sürecinin incelenmesi. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *31*, 465-478.

Durna, U. & Eren V. (2005). Üç bağlılık unsuru ekseninde örgütsel bağlılık. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi (6),* 210-219.

English, F.W.(2006). *Edocational Leadership and Administraration.* NY Publication.

Erdemir, N. (2007). Mesleğine yeni başlayan fen bilgisi öğretmenlerinin karşılaştıkları sorunlar ve şikâyetleri. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(22), 135-149.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Harris, A. & Lambert, L. (2003). *Building leadership capacity for school improvement.* Maidenhead, Philadelphia: Open University.

Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J.W., & Woodman, R.W. (2001). *Organizational Behavior.* USA: South-Western College Publishing.

Hurst, D. K. (2000). *Kriz ve Yenilenme*. (E. Güldemir, Çev.). Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul.

Gidiş, Y. (2017). *Öğretmenlerin liderlik kapasitesi algıları ile örgütsel özdeşleşme arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished master's thesis].Uşak Üniversitesi.

Gül, H. (2002). Örgütsel bağlılık yaklaşımlarının mukayesesi ve değerlendirmesi. *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi, 2*(2), 37-55.

Gümüşeli, A. İ. (1996). İstanbul ilindeki ilköğretim okulu müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışları. Retrieved 3rd September 2014 from http://www.agumuseli.com/dokumanlar/arastirma/liderlik_01.pdf.

Güney, S. (2001). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon.* Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

İmamoğlu, G. (2011). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri ve örgütsel adalet algıları arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.

Kaya, Ç. (2002). *Liderler: Liderliğe Giden Yollar*. Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.

Kaygısız, A. (2012). *İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri ve karara katılma durumları arasındaki ilişki Kütahya örneği* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Osmangazi University, Eskisehir, Turkey.

Kelman, H.C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2*(1), 51-60.

Kılıç, A. Ç. (2013). "İlköğretim okullarında Liderlik kapasitesinin belirlenmesi" [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.

Keçecioğlu, T. (2001). *Bir Değişimin Anatomisi, Ya da Değişimin Bir Parçası Olmak*. Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul.

Lambert, L. (1998a). How to build leadership capacity. *Educational Leadership, 55*(7), 17-19.

Lambert, L. (1998b). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lambert, L. (2009). *Reconceptualizing the road toward leadership capacity*. In A. M. Blankstein, P. D. Houston, R. W. Cole (Eds.), *Building sustainable leadership capacity* (pp. 7-28). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.

McDonald, D.,& Makin, P. J. (2000). The psychological contract, organizational commitment and job satisfaction of temporary staff. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 21*(2), 84-91.

Meyer, J. P.,& Allen, N. J. (2002). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Fundomentals of Organiztional Behavior, 3,* 345-346.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages:* The *psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.

Oliver, N. (1990). Work rewards, work values and organizational commitment in an employee-owned firm: evidence from the U.K.. *Human Relations, 43*(6), 513-526.

O'Reilly, C. & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: the effect of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 492-499.

Ölçüm-Çetin, M. (2004). *Örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel bağlılık.* Ankara: Nobel.

Özkalp, E. & Kırel, Ç. (2001). *Örgütsel davranış.* Eskişehir, Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Özsoy, S. A., Ergül, Ş. & Bayık, A. (2004). Bir Yüksekokul Çalışanlarının Kuruma Bağlılık Durumlarının İncelenmesi, Ege Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Dergisi, 17(3), 1-16.

Porter, L. W. Steers, R. M. Mowday, R. T. & Boulian, P. U. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatrictechnicians, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 15,* 603-609.

Rollinson, D.(2002). *OrganizationalBehaviourand Analysis*. Second Edition. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Sarıkaya, E. (2011). *İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılıkları ve performansları arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Maltepe Üniversitesi.

Şahin, S., & Balkar, B. (2008). İlköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin okul ortamında kullandıkları sosyalizasyon mekanizmaları ve örgütsel bağlılıkları ile ilişkisi.

In *Proceedings of International Conference on Educational Science ICES* (Vol. 8, pp. 1810-1819).

Tahaoğlu, F. (2007). *İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin liderlik rollerinin örgüt kültürü üzerine etkisi (Gaziantep ili örneği)* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gaziantep Üniversitesi.

Ulusoy, T. (2014). *Okullarda sergilenen dağıtımcı liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin iş doyumu ve örgütsel adanmışlıkları arasındaki ilişki.* Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Tokat.

Varoğlu, D. (1993*). Kamu sektörü çalışanlarının işlerine ve kuruluşlarına karşı tutumları, bağlılıkları ve değerleri* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Ankara Üniversitesi.

Wasti, A.S. (2000). *Liderlik ve insan kaynakları uygulamaları.* Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.

Yeşilyurt, E.,& Karakuş, M. (2011). The problems teachers encountered during the candidacy process. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *3*(1), 261-293.

Yılmaz, K. ve Tepebaş, F. (2011). İlköğretim düzeyinde sosyal bilgiler eğitiminde karşılaşılan sorunlar: Mesleğine yeni başlayan sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin görüşleri. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *2*(1),157- 177.

Yörük S.- Sağban Ş., Okul Müdürlerinin Kültürel liderlik rollerinin, öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyine etkisi. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic Volume 7/3, Summer 2012, p. 2795-2813.*

Zeyrek, A. O. (2008). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı 2005 öğretmenlik kariyer basamakları yükselme sınavında öğretmenlerin başarı durumları ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (İstanbul ili örneği)* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Yeditepe Üniversitesi.

Zöğ, H. (2007). *İstanbul ili kağıthane ilçesinde görev yapan ilköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adanmışlık ile iş doyumları arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi.