

The Effect of School Culture on Teachers' Organizational Commitment

Abstract

The aim of this research is to reveal the relations between the school culture and the teachers' organizational commitment in terms of some demographic variables. Correlational survey and descriptive models were used in the study. The population of the research consists of teachers working in the central districts of Antalya in the 2020-2021 academic year. Its sampling consists of 198 teachers determined with purposive sampling methods. In the study, the "Organizational Commitment Scale" developed by Meyer and Allen (1996) and the "Organizational Culture Scale" developed by Terzi (2005) were used as data collection tools. The data collection tool used to determine the level of organizational commitment is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 18 items in 3 sub-dimensions [Affective (6 items), Continuance (6 items) and Normative (6 items)]. The data collection tool used to determine school culture is a 5-point Likert scale consisting of 29 items in 4 sub-dimensions [Support (8 items), Success (6 items), Bureaucratic (9 items) and Duty (6 items)]. In this study, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for the whole organizational commitment scale was calculated as .84; The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for the whole school culture scale was calculated as .89. For the analysis of data, frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, unpaired t test, ANOVA, Pearson correlation and hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis were applied.

As a result of the research, it has been observed that the average of women of the school culture in all dimensions is higher than that of men. It has been concluded that male teachers show higher commitment than female teachers in normative commitment, which is one of the dimensions of organizational commitment. It has been concluded that teachers with more than 11 working years have higher commitment than teachers with 0-5 working years in the affective commitment dimension, which is one of the organizational commitment dimensions. It has also been concluded that the dimensions of success, duty and bureaucracy culture are important predictors of affective commitment, bureaucratic culture dimension is an important predictor of continuance and success culture dimension is an important predictor of normative commitment.

Keywords: School Culture, Organizational Commitment, Belonging to School, School Management, Teacher

Corresponding Author

Ebru Burcu Cimili Gök, Teacher, Ministry of Education
Mustafa Asım Cula Secondary School-07100/Antalya-Turkey
e-mail: ebruburcu@gmail.com Phone: (+90) 5052719351

Co-Author

Serdar Özçetin, Assistant Professor, Akdeniz University
Sport Science Faculty-07100/Antalya-Turkey
e-mail: serdarozcetin@akdeniz.edu.tr Phone: (+90) 5065074777

Introduction

To have qualified employees nowadays is essential for organizations to realize their goals. It is necessary to ensure a low employee turnover rate so that the investments made in them does not become wasted resources. Researches show that committed employees with sense of belongings are the most beneficial and highly productive employees. Besides, at the organizations where organizational commitment is observed, employees feel little or no intimidation or alienation. According to researches, employees easily identify themselves with the organization and become committed to it in the presence of strong organization culture.

Organizational commitment is defined by Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization, as the relationship between employee and organization that prevent them from leaving the organization voluntarily, and by Luthans (2012) as the commitment that make employees continue their existence in the organization and exert more effort for organizational goals. Eren (2017), on the other hand, explained the definition in more detail as feelings and attitudes that commit employees to the organization and contribute to their own values and to the realization of their individual goals while serving the organization loyally and selflessly.

Among the definitions of organizational commitment, Porter and others (1974) definition “the strong belief in, and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, a strong desire to remain in the organization, and a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization” could be the most accepted one. Based on this definition, it can be said that there are three factors that make up the commitment. These are (Vandenberg & Scarpello, 1994; Allen & Meyer, 1990):

1. Having a strong belief by accepting organizational goals and values
2. Making extra efforts to achieve organizational goals,
3. Having a strong desire to continue membership of the organization.

When the literature was reviewed, it was seen that organizational commitment was classified as attitudinal, behavioral and multiple commitment approaches as in Table 1 (Çimili Gök, 2018).

Table 1. Organizational Commitment Approaches

| | |
|--|--|
| Attitudinal Commitment Approaches | Kanter's Approach Etzioni's Approach O'Reilly ve Chatman's Approach Penley ve Gould's Approach Allen ve Meyer's Approach |
| Behavioral Commitment Approaches | Becker'in Side Bets (Partisanship) Approach Salancik's Approach |
| Multiple Commitment Approaches | People working in an organizational environment may develop multiple commitments to different groups with which they interact. In the multiple commitment model, organizational commitment emerges as the sum of the multiple commitments of various internal and external elements that make up the organization. |

Source: Çimili Gök, 2018

As seen in Table 1, there are many approaches regarding organizational commitment. The organizational commitment classification by Allen and Meyer (1990) was taken as the basis in this study, because it is the most accepted and the most studied approach. Their suggestion is that they intend to explain the meaning of “psychological states” in effort to design organizational commitment concept and development of a model that covers all these psychological states, additively, the scale they developed; being three-dimensional in a way that eliminates the need for a multi-dimensional scale against the inadequacy of scales that handle the subject in one dimension and presenting deduction for reducing the probability of employees leaving the organization were effective in the high acceptance (Aslan, 2017; R. Aydın, 2016; Eğriboyun, 2013; Ertürk, 2011).

Three types of commitment are mentioned in the organizational commitment scale developed by Allen and Meyer. These are affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p.3).

Affective Commitment: employee's adoption of organizational goals, rules, values, employee's identification with them, support to the organization wholeheartedly, and thinking themselves as a whole with the organization, constitutes affective commitment. Continuance commitment expresses that the employees continue their existence in the organization because they think that they cannot bear these costs by considering the costs of leaving an organization. Normative commitment is a loyalty arising from the tendency of employees to fulfill their duties and responsibilities properly due to business and professional ethics, or ethical values (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Eren, 2017; McShane & Von Glinow, 2016; Sabuncuoğlu 2007).

One of the most important organizational behavior issues associated with organizational commitment might be the intention for cease of employment. It is suggested that individuals with low organizational commitment have higher intention to leave the organization (Çimili Gök, 2018). As seen in the results of the studies carried out by Sabuncuoğlu (2007) on the biggest 500 companies of the country, by Garcia Cabrera and Garcia Soto (2012) on senior company executives who own multi-national partnership in Spain, by Jung and Kim (2012) on workers of 10 newspapers in South Korea, Karsh, Booske and Saintfort (2005) on 6584 nurses working in 76 nursing homes and many others, the most important consequence of organizational commitment is reduced intention for cease of employment. For organizations, it is important to lower the experienced employees -who are trained by spending time and capital- turnover rate. Therefore, emphasis should be placed upon increasing the organizational commitment of the employees.

Since the argument of this study is to present the effects of organizational culture on organizational commitment, a quick review of the literature of organizational culture will be appropriate. Schein (1992) defined organizational culture as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.” Eren

(2017) has approached the definitions of organizational culture in a holistic manner and emphasized that phenomenon that is repeated by employees regularly in behavioral pattern; placed as belief and value in their consciousness and minds can be learned and transferred.

While Şahin Fırat (2010) asserts that in cases where formal rules are insufficient, a strong organizational culture is necessary for employees to distinguish between right and wrong, McShane and Von Glinow (2016, p.252) compare organizational culture to companies' DNA. Accordingly, although organizational culture is not a tactual and visible tangible entity, it is the template that shapes and directs many things in the organization. Çiftçioğlu and Sabuncuoğlu (2013: 91) also support this argument and interpret the organizational culture as the basic feature, that distinguishes an organization from others, just like DNA. Organizational culture is a framework that determines the internal rules of the organization that employees know and carry into effect.

According to Schein (1992), three points draw attention about the organizational culture. Firstly, culture is a phenomenon with depth of culture, and may be unsuccessful if it is attempted to be guided by thinking superficially. Secondly, the organizational culture is broad enough to include all the values in the organization and their results in the daily flow of the organization. Thirdly, culture must be stable in a way that makes the future predictable, therefore it is difficult for organizations to change the culture.

In this study, school culture, which can be considered of as being placed on a structure that varies from bureaucratic culture to collaborative culture, is based on the cultural classification stated in Table 2 (Terzi, 2005).

Table 2. School Culture Dimensions

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>Support Culture: Mutual relationship and commitment exist among the members of the organization. Human relations are based on trust, honesty and open communication.</p> | <p>Bureaucratic Culture: There are rational and legal structures that are free from personal relationships.</p> | <p>Success Culture: While individual responsibility is attached importance, completion of work and realization of goals are prioritized.</p> | <p>Duty Culture: Organizations with this culture and focused on organizational goals are business centered.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

Source: Terzi, 2005

According to Robbins (1996), organizational culture, give the members of the organization a privileged personality and ensure their integration with the organization by creating an identity for them. In this way, employees can be more connected to the organization and sacrifice for the organization (cited in Özkalp, 2004). The determinant of the school culture is the interaction that occurs as a result of the communication between teachers, administrators,

students and auxiliary staff, and ensures that all employees in the school can gather around the same belief (Cafoglu, 1995).

Although school culture is related to teachers' job attitudes, it also affects their relationships with parents, students, each other and administrators. Defining the relations between the school culture and the teachers' organizational commitment is important to find out and predict which aspects of the school culture are related to which aspects of organizational commitment. One can say that a teacher, who knows the school culture and has a deep commitment to the organization, will work harder for the success of the students and will be in compliance with the aims of the school. When considering this situation, it is believed that the longer a teacher works at the organization the more he/she will get to know the school culture and therefore will be more committed to the organization. The purpose of this research is to determine the effect of school culture on teachers' organizational commitment levels.

In accordance with the purpose of this study, the following sub-problems are formed.

Sub-Problems:

1. Is there a significant difference based on gender regarding school culture and organizational commitment?
2. Is there a significant difference regarding school culture and organizational commitment in terms of years worked?
3. Is there a relationship between school culture and organizational commitment?
4. Do teachers' perceptions of school culture predict organizational commitment significantly?

Method

Research Model

In the research, since the past or current situations are described as they are (Karasar, 2005), the survey model has been adopted out of the quantitative research approaches. In the research, correlational survey and descriptive models (Balci, 2009) were used because the views on the effect of school culture on teachers' organizational commitment in educational institutions are mistaken for each other and the relationship between some identity variables was aimed to be determined (Balci, 2009).

Population-Sample

The population of the research consists of teachers working in the central districts of Antalya in the 2020-2021 academic year. Its sampling consists of 198 teachers determined with purposive sampling methods. Information about the general characteristics of the study group of the study is given in Table 3.

Table 3. General Characteristics of the Study Group

| Variable | Variable Parameter | n | % |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----|------|
| Gender | Woman | 133 | 67,2 |
| | Man | 65 | 32,8 |
| Working Year(s) | 0-5 Year(s) | 85 | 42,9 |
| | 6-10 Years | 78 | 39,4 |
| | 11 Years and More | 35 | 17,7 |

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that 133 (67.2%) of the teacher candidates participating in the study are women and 65 (32.8%) are men and 85 (42.9%) of the participants have a seniority of 0-5 years, 78 of them (39.4%) have 6-10 years of seniority, 35 of them (17.7%) have 11 years and more.

Data Collection Tool

In the study, the "Organizational Commitment Scale" developed by Meyer and Allen (1996) and the "Organizational Culture Scale" developed by Terzi (2005) were used as data collection tools. The applied scale consists of three parts, the first part, which includes preliminary information and variables (gender and years of study), the second part, which aims to determine the organizational commitment levels of teachers, and the third part, which aims to determine the levels of organizational culture. In this study, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for the whole organizational commitment scale was calculated as .84, for factor 1 as .37, for factor 2 as .12 and for factor 3 .60 for the sub-factors; the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for the whole school culture scale was calculated as .89, for factor 1 as .66, for factor 2 as .75 and for factor 3 .16 and for factor 4 .63 for the sub-factors

Analysis of Data

In the research, the demographic information and characteristics of the teachers were examined by frequency and percentage analysis. Descriptive statistics (arithmetic averages and standard deviations) were calculated to reveal teachers' perception levels of organizational commitment and the dimensions of school culture, and the items that constitute the dimensions of organizational commitment and school culture.

To determine the effect of demographic variables on school culture and organizational commitment, it was evaluated with independent samples t-test (Büyüköztürk, 2006, p.39), one-way analysis of variance (One Way ANOVA) (Büyüköztürk, 2006, p.47; Duncan, 2003, pp. 158-159) for samples independent from parametric tests, and with Pearson correlation analysis to determine the level and direction of the relationship between the scales. $\alpha = 0.05$ level was sought in significance tests. Finally, in the research, a hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis was applied to determine the effect of school culture on organizational commitment in

line with teachers' opinions. Besides, although R^2 is low in some models, the model is interpreted because it is meaningful and most importantly the aim in hierarchical regression analysis models is explanatoriness rather than prediction.

Regarding the assumptions of the parametric tests, the following criteria were taken as a basis and the analyzes were carried out in this direction. The equality of the variances regarding the distribution of measurements in both groups was examined with Levene's test. As a matter of fact, it is stated meeting the assumption that the subgroups display a normal distribution in the universes to which they belong is difficult in the measurements of the dependent variable in education and behavioral sciences; for this reason, when each of the subgroups formed according to the group variable consists of 15 or more numbers, neglecting this assumption will not have a significant effect on the results (Büyüköztürk, 2006, s.39; Muijs, 2004, s.134; Leech, Barrett & Morgan, 2005, s.139; Field, 2009, s.134). SPSS 20.0 statistical package programs were benefited to analyze the data.

Findings

In this section, findings and comments obtained in line with the objectives and sub-objectives of the research are mentioned. Descriptive statistics regarding the dimensions of school culture in Table 4 and the dimensions of organizational commitment are given in Table 5.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics regarding school culture

| Dimension | \bar{X} | S |
|----------------------|-----------|-----|
| Support Culture | 3,51 | ,79 |
| Success Culture | 3,62 | ,80 |
| Bureaucratic Culture | 3,34 | ,61 |
| Duty Culture | 4,15 | ,63 |

As seen in Table 4, teachers participating in the research showed the highest participation in duty culture ($\bar{X}=4,15$, $S=0.63$). This dimension was followed respectively by success culture ($\bar{X}= 3.62$, $S = 0.80$), support culture ($\bar{X}= 3.51$, $S = 0.79$) and bureaucratic culture ($\bar{X}= 3.34$, $S = 0.61$)

Table 5. Descriptive statistics regarding organizational commitment

| Dimension | \bar{X} | S |
|------------------------|-----------|-----|
| Affective Commitment | 3,50 | ,92 |
| Continuance Commitment | 3,25 | ,87 |
| Normative Commitment | 2,99 | ,90 |

As seen in Table 5, teachers who participated in the study showed the highest participation in emotional commitment ($\bar{X}= 3.50$, $S = 0.92$). This dimension was followed respectively by continuance commitment ($\bar{X}= 3.25$, $S = 0.87$) and normative commitment ($\bar{X}= 2.99$, $S = 0.90$).

Table 6 includes the results of the t-test analysis carried out for the purpose of comparing the dimensions of school culture based on gender.

Table 6. Comparison of the dimensions of school culture based on gender

| Dimension | Gender | n | \bar{X} | S | Sd | t | p |
|----------------------|--------|-----|-----------|-----|-----|------|-----|
| Support Culture | Woman | 133 | 3,53 | ,73 | 196 | ,539 | .59 |
| | Man | 65 | 3,46 | ,91 | | | |
| Success Culture | Woman | 133 | 3,63 | ,76 | 196 | ,208 | .84 |
| | Man | 65 | 3,60 | ,88 | | | |
| Bureaucratic Culture | Woman | 133 | 3,36 | ,62 | 196 | ,709 | .48 |
| | Man | 65 | 3,29 | ,58 | | | |
| Duty Culture | Woman | 133 | 4,16 | ,65 | 196 | ,500 | .62 |
| | Man | 65 | 4,12 | ,58 | | | |

As seen in Table 6, the views of the teachers participating in the research on support culture [$t_{(196)}=.539$, $p>.05$]; success culture [$t_{(196)}=.208$, $p>.05$]; bureaucratic culture [$t_{(196)}=.709$, $p>.05$] and duty culture [$t_{(196)}=.500$, $p>.05$] dimensions do not differ based on gender. However, it is seen that the averages of women are higher than men in all dimensions.

In Table 7, results of the t-test analysis carried out for the purpose of comparing organizational commitment dimensions based on gender are given.

Table 7. Comparison of organizational commitment dimensions based on gender

| Dimension | Gender | n | \bar{X} | S | Sd | t | p |
|------------------------|--------|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-------|------|
| Affective Commitment | Woman | 133 | 3,44 | ,90 | 196 | -1,16 | .25 |
| | Man | 65 | 3,60 | ,97 | | | |
| Continuance Commitment | Woman | 133 | 3,24 | ,86 | 196 | -,247 | .80 |
| | Man | 65 | 3,28 | ,90 | | | |
| Normative Commitment | Woman | 133 | 2,90 | ,89 | 196 | -2,14 | .03* |
| | Man | 65 | 3,19 | ,88 | | | |

As seen in Table 7, the views of teachers participating in the research on affective commitment [$t_{(196)}=-1.16$, $p>.05$] and continuance dependence [$t_{(196)}=-.247$, $p>.05$] out of organizational commitment dimensions do not differ based on gender. However, the views of the participants on the dimension of normative commitment differ based on gender [$t_{(196)}=-2.14$, $p<.05$]. For this dimension, male teachers ($\bar{X}=3.19$, $S=0.88$) show higher commitment than female teachers ($\bar{X}=2.90$, $S=0.89$)

In Table 8, the results of the ANOVA analysis carried out for the purpose of comparing the dimensions of school culture based on the years the teachers have worked in their school are given.

Table 8. Comparison of school culture dimension based on the years the teachers have worked in their schools

| Dimension | Working Years | n | \bar{X} | S | sd | F | p | Significant Difference (LSD) |
|----------------------|-------------------|----|-----------|------|-------|------|-----|------------------------------|
| Support Culture | 1. 0-5 year(s) | 85 | 3,45 | 0,87 | | | | |
| | 2. 6-10 years | 78 | 3,46 | 0,77 | 2-195 | 2,24 | .11 | - |
| | 3. 11 years and + | 35 | 3,76 | 0,58 | | | | |
| Success Culture | 1. 0-5 year(s) | 85 | 3,59 | 0,85 | | | | |
| | 2. 6-10 years | 78 | 3,56 | 0,80 | 2-195 | 1,80 | .17 | - |
| | 3. 11 years and + | 35 | 3,85 | 0,61 | | | | |
| Bureaucratic Culture | 1. 0-5 year(s) | 85 | 3,37 | 0,71 | | | | |
| | 2. 6-10 years | 78 | 3,35 | 0,54 | 2-195 | 0,93 | .40 | - |
| | 3. 11 years and + | 35 | 3,21 | 0,44 | | | | |
| Duty Culture | 1. 0-5 year(s) | 85 | 4,08 | 0,66 | | | | |
| | 2. 6-10 years | 78 | 4,14 | 0,62 | 2-195 | 2,11 | .12 | - |
| | 3. 11 years and + | 35 | 4,34 | 0,51 | | | | |

As seen in Table 8, the support culture of the participants [$F_{(2-195)}=2.24$; $p > .05$]; success culture [$F_{(2-195)}=1.80$; $p > .05$]; bureaucratic culture [$F_{(2-195)}=0.93$; $p > .05$] and duty culture [$F_{(2-195)}=2.11$; $p > .05$] dimensions do not differ based on the years the teachers worked

In Table 9, the results of the ANOVA analysis carried out with the purpose of comparing the organizational commitment dimensions based on the year the teachers have worked in their school are given.

Table 9. Comparison of the organizational commitment dimensions based on the year the teachers have worked in their school

| Dimension | Years Worked | N | \bar{X} | S | sd | F | p | Significant Difference (LSD) |
|------------------------|-------------------|----|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------------------------------|
| Affective Commitment | 1. 0-5 year(s) | 85 | 3,32 | 0,99 | | | | |
| | 2. 6-10 years | 78 | 3,54 | 0,91 | 2-195 | 3,83 | .02* | 1-3 |
| | 3. 11 years and + | 35 | 3,82 | 0,67 | | | | |
| Continuance Commitment | 1. 0-5 year(s) | 85 | 3,15 | 0,85 | | | | |
| | 2. 6-10 years | 78 | 3,37 | 0,81 | 2-195 | 1,34 | .26 | - |
| | 3. 11 years and + | 35 | 3,24 | 1,01 | | | | |
| Normative Commitment | 1. 0-5 year(s) | 85 | 2,93 | 0,92 | | | | |
| | 2. 6-10 years | 78 | 2,95 | 0,94 | 2-195 | 0,67 | .51 | - |
| | 3. 11 years and + | 35 | 3,15 | 0,73 | | | | |

As seen in Table 9, participant's continuance commitment [$F_{(2-195)}= 2.24$; $p > .05$] and normative commitment [$F_{(2-195)}= 2.11$; $p > .05$] dimensions do not differ based on the years the teachers have worked. However, the views of the participants on the affective commitment dimension differ based on the year the teachers have worked [$F_{(2-195)}= 3.83$; $p < .05$]. In this dimension, teachers with more than 11 working years ($\bar{X} = 3.82$, $S = 0.67$) have higher affective commitment than teachers with working years of 0-5 years ($\bar{X} = 3.32$, $S = 0.99$).

The results of the simple correlation analysis carried out regarding the relationship between school culture and organizational commitment in educational institutions based on the teachers' opinions are given in Table 10.

Table 10. Simple Correlation Analysis Results Regarding School Culture and Organizational Commitment

| | Support | Success | Bureaucratic | Duty | Affective | Continuance | Normative |
|--------------|---------|---------|--------------|--------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| Support | 1 | | | | | | |
| Success | ,811** | 1 | | | | | |
| Bureaucratic | ,040 | ,138 | 1 | | | | |
| Duty | ,542** | ,601** | ,263** | 1 | | | |
| Affective | ,535** | ,556** | -,077 | ,442** | 1 | | |
| Continuance | -,067 | -,078 | ,290** | -,021 | -,024 | 1 | |
| Normative | ,435** | ,506** | ,067 | ,344** | ,592** | ,233** | 1 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0,01 level.

Table 10 shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between support culture, which is one of the dimensions that make up the school culture, and success culture ($r = ,811$; $p < ,01$) and duty culture ($r = ,542$; $p < ,01$), and no significant relationship between bureaucratic culture ($r = ,047$; $p > ,05$); and there is a positive and significant relationship between support culture and two of the dimensions of organizational commitment affective commitment, ($r = ,535$; $p < ,01$) and normative commitment, ($r = ,435$; $p < ,01$), $,067$; $p > ,05$), and no significant relationship continuance commitment ($r = -,067$; $p > ,05$) It was found that there is a positive and significant relationship between success culture and duty culture ($r = ,601$; $p < ,01$), but no significant relationship between bureaucratic culture ($r = ,138$; $p > ,05$); there is a positive and significant relationship between success culture and two organizational commitment dimensions, affective commitment ($r = ,556$; $p < ,01$) and normative commitment ($r = ,506$; $p < ,01$), no significant relationship with continuance commitment ($r = -,078$; $p > ,05$). It can be seen that there is a positive and significant relationship between bureaucratic culture and duty culture ($r = ,263$; $p < ,01$); there is a positive and significant relationship between bureaucratic culture and continuance commitment, one of organizational commitments ($r = ,290$; $p < ,01$), no significant relationship with affective commitment ($r = -,077$; $p > ,05$) and normative commitment ($r = -,067$; $p > ,05$). It can also be seen that there is a positive and significant relationship between duty culture and affective commitment ($r = ,442$; $p < ,01$) and normative commitment ($r = ,344$; $p < ,01$); no significant relationship between duty culture and continuance commitment ($r = -,021$; $p > ,05$).

The results of hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis regarding the prediction of school culture (support, success, bureaucratic and task culture) in educational institutions and affective commitment, one of the organizational commitment dimensions, are given in Table 11.

Table 11. The Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Regarding the Prediction of Affective Commitment

| | Variables | B | Standard Errors | β | T | p | Dual r | Partial r |
|---------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------|-------------|--------|------|--------|-----------|
| Model 1 | Constant | 1,332 | ,254 | | 5,249 | ,000 | | |
| | Support Culture | ,617 | ,071 | ,530 | 8,745 | ,000 | ,530 | ,530 |
| | $\Delta R^2=$,281 | p=,000 | | | | | | |
| | $F_{(1-196)}=$ 76,472 | p=,000 | R=,530 | $R^2=$,281 | | | | |
| Model 2 | Constant | 1,020 | ,261 | | 3,904 | ,000 | | |
| | Support Culture | ,276 | ,117 | ,237 | 2,358 | ,019 | ,530 | ,139 |
| | Success Culture | ,416 | ,116 | ,361 | 3,591 | ,000 | ,553 | ,211 |
| | $\Delta R^2=$,045 | p=,000 | | | | | | |
| | $F_{(2-195)}=$ 47,005 | p=,000 | R=,570 | $R^2=$,325 | | | | |
| Model 3 | Constant | 1,693 | ,376 | | 4,502 | ,000 | | |
| | Support Culture | ,241 | ,116 | ,207 | 2,072 | ,040 | ,530 | ,120 |
| | Success Culture | ,468 | ,116 | ,405 | 4,019 | ,000 | ,553 | ,233 |
| | Bureaucratic Culture | -,221 | ,090 | -,145 | -2,460 | ,015 | -,080 | -,143 |
| | $\Delta R^2=$,020 | p=,000 | | | | | | |
| | $F_{(3-194)}=$ 34,166 | p=,000 | R=,588 | $R^2=$,346 | | | | |
| Model 4 | Constant | 1,172 | ,417 | | 2,814 | ,005 | | |
| | Support Culture | ,194 | ,116 | ,166 | 1,672 | ,096 | ,530 | ,096 |
| | Success Culture | ,372 | ,120 | ,322 | 3,106 | ,002 | ,553 | ,177 |
| | Bureaucratic Culture | -,282 | ,091 | -,186 | -3,095 | ,002 | -,080 | -,177 |
| | Duty Culture | ,299 | ,110 | ,202 | 2,727 | ,007 | ,437 | ,156 |
| | $\Delta R^2=$,024 | p=,000 | | | | | | |
| | $F_{(4-193)}=$ 28,333 | p=,000 | R=,608 | $R^2=$,370 | | | | |

According to Model 1 in Table 11, the support culture dimension of the school culture significantly predicts the affective commitment dimension ($R=,530$; $R^2=,281$; $F_{(1-196)}=76,472$; $p < ,01$). The support dimension of the school culture explains 28.1% of the total variance of the affective commitment

In Model 2, success culture is included in the analysis. It is seen that the established model causes a significant change in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=,045$; $p < ,01$), and the dimensions of support and success culture together significantly predict emotional commitment ($R=,570$; $R^2=,325$; $F_{(2-196)}=47,005$; $p < ,01$). The dimensions of support and success culture together explain 32.5% of the total variance of affective commitment in teachers.

In Model 3, bureaucratic culture is included in the analysis. It is seen that the established model causes a significant change in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=,020$; $p < ,01$), and dimensions of support, achievement and bureaucratic culture together significantly predict emotional commitment ($R=,588$; $R^2=,346$; $F_{(3-196)}=34,166$; $p < ,01$). Support, success and bureaucratic culture dimensions together explain 34.6% of the total variance of emotional commitment in teachers.

In Model 4, the duty culture is included in the analysis. It is seen that the established model causes a significant change in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=,024$; $p < ,01$), support, success, bureaucratic and

duty culture dimensions together significantly predict emotional commitment ($R=.608$; $R^2=.370$; $F_{(4-196)} = 28,333$; $p<.01$). Support, success, bureaucratic and duty dimensions together explain 37% of the total variance of emotional commitment in teachers. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative importance order of predictor variables on emotional commitment is success, duty, bureaucratic and supportive culture dimensions. When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that success, duty and bureaucracy culture dimensions are important predictors of emotional commitment. On the other hand, support culture does not have a significant effect in predicting the emotional commitment of teachers.

The results of hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis related to predicting school culture (support, success, bureaucratic and task culture) in educational institutions and continuance commitment out of organizational commitment dimensions are given in Table 12.

Table 12. The Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Regarding the Prediction of Continuance Commitment

| | Variable | B | Standard Error _B | β | T | p | Dual r | Partial r |
|---------|----------------------|----------|-----------------------------|------------|--------|------|--------|-----------|
| Model 1 | Constant | 3,514 | ,281 | | 12,485 | ,000 | | |
| | Support Culture | -,074 | ,078 | -,067 | -,942 | ,347 | -,067 | -,067 |
| | $\Delta R^2=.005$ | $p=.347$ | | | | | | |
| | $F_{(1-196)}=.887$ | $p=.347$ | $R=.067$ | $R^2=.005$ | | | | |
| Model 2 | Constant | 3,571 | ,299 | | 11,947 | ,000 | | |
| | Support Culture | -,011 | ,134 | -,010 | -,081 | ,936 | -,006 | -,006 |
| | Success Culture | -,077 | ,133 | -,071 | -,579 | ,563 | -,041 | -,041 |
| | $\Delta R^2=.002$ | $p=.563$ | | | | | | |
| | $F_{(2-195)}=.610$ | $p=.545$ | $R=.079$ | $R^2=.006$ | | | | |
| Model 3 | Constant | 2,222 | ,416 | | 5,338 | ,000 | | |
| | Support Culture | ,059 | ,129 | ,054 | ,456 | ,649 | ,033 | ,031 |
| | Success Culture | -,179 | ,129 | -,165 | -1,393 | ,165 | -,099 | -,095 |
| | Bureaucratic Culture | ,442 | ,099 | ,309 | 4,454 | ,000 | ,305 | ,304 |
| | $\Delta R^2=.092$ | $p=.000$ | | | | | | |
| | $F_{(3-194)}=7,057$ | $p=.000$ | $R=.314$ | $R^2=.098$ | | | | |
| Model 4 | Constant | 2,359 | ,469 | | 5,027 | ,000 | | |
| | Support Culture | ,071 | ,131 | ,065 | ,546 | ,586 | ,039 | ,037 |
| | Success Culture | -,154 | ,135 | -,142 | -1,143 | ,254 | -,082 | -,078 |
| | Bureaucratic Culture | ,458 | ,103 | ,320 | 4,467 | ,000 | ,306 | ,305 |
| | Duty Culture | -,078 | ,123 | -,056 | -,636 | ,526 | -,046 | -,043 |
| | $\Delta R^2=.002$ | $p=.526$ | | | | | | |
| | $F_{(4-193)}=5,378$ | $p=.000$ | $R=.317$ | $R^2=.100$ | | | | |

According to Model 1 in Table 12, the support culture dimension of the school culture significantly predicts the continuance commitment dimension ($R=.067$; $R^2=.005$; $F_{(1-196)} = .887$;

$p > .05$). The support dimension of the school culture explains 0.5% of the total variance of the continuance commitment dimension.

In Model 2, the success culture is included in the analysis. It is seen that the established model does not cause a significant change in R^2 ($\Delta R^2 = .002$; $p > .05$), support and success culture dimensions do not significantly predict continuance commitment ($R = .079$; $R^2 = .006$; $F_{(2-196)} = .610$; $p > .05$). The dimensions of support and success culture together explain 0.6% of the total variance of continuance commitment of teachers

In Model 3, bureaucratic culture is included in the analysis. It is seen that the established model causes a significant change in R^2 ($\Delta R^2 = .092$; $p < .011$); support, success and bureaucratic culture dimensions together significantly predict continuance commitment ($R = .314$; $R^2 = .098$; $F_{(3-196)} = 7.057$; $p < .011$). Support, success and bureaucratic culture dimensions together explain 9.8% of the total variance of continuance commitment of teachers.

In Model 4, the duty culture is included in the analysis. It is seen that the model established does not cause a significant change in R^2 ($\Delta R^2 = .002$; $p > .05$); support, success, bureaucratic and task culture dimensions together do not significantly predict continuance commitment ($R = .317$; $R^2 = .100$; $F_{(4-196)} = 5.378$; $p < .01$). Support, success, bureaucratic and duty dimensions together explain 10% of the total variance of continuance commitment of teachers. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the order of relative importance of predictor variables on continuance commitment is bureaucratic, support, duty and success culture dimensions. When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the bureaucratic culture dimension is an important predictor of continuance commitment. Support, duty and success culture do not have a significant effect on predicting continuance commitment of teachers.

The results of hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis related to predicting school culture (support, success, bureaucratic and task culture) in educational institutions and normative commitment out of organizational commitment dimensions are given in Table 13.

Table 13. The Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Regarding the Prediction of Normative Commitment

| | Variable | B | Standard Error _B | β | T | p | Dual r | Partial r |
|---------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-------|------|--------|--------------|
| Model 1 | Constant | 1,310 | ,263 | | 4,977 | ,000 | | |
| | Support Culture | ,480 | ,073 | ,424 | 6,559 | ,000 | ,424 | ,424 |
| | $\Delta R^2 = .180$ | | | | | | | |
| | $p = .000$ $F_{(1-196)} = 43,023$ | | | | | | | |
| | | $R = .424$ | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | $R^2 = .180$ |
| Model 2 | Constant | ,932 | ,268 | | 3,481 | ,001 | | |
| | Support Culture | ,067 | ,120 | ,059 | ,556 | ,579 | ,040 | ,035 |
| | Success Culture | ,505 | ,119 | ,450 | 4,249 | ,000 | ,291 | ,264 |
| | $\Delta R^2 = .069$ | | | | | | | |
| | | $p = .000$ $F_{(2-195)} = 32,408$ | | | | | | |
| | | $p = .000$ | | | | | | |
| | | $R = .499$ | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | $R^2 = .249$ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|------|--------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|
| Model 3 | Constant | ,960 | ,391 | | 2,453 | ,015 | | |
| | Support Culture | ,065 | ,121 | ,058 | ,539 | ,591 | ,039 | ,034 |
| | Success Culture | ,507 | ,121 | ,452 | 4,187 | ,000 | ,288 | ,260 |
| | Bureaucratic Culture | -,009 | ,093 | -,006 | -,099 | ,921 | -,007 | -,006 |
| | $\Delta R^2=$,000 | p=,921 | | | | | | |
| $F_{(3-194)}=$ 21,499 | | p=,000 | | R=,500 | R ² =,250 | | | |
| Model 4 | Constant | ,822 | ,441 | | 1,864 | ,064 | | |
| | Support Culture | ,053 | ,123 | ,047 | ,430 | ,668 | ,031 | ,027 |
| | Success Culture | ,482 | ,127 | ,430 | 3,799 | ,000 | ,264 | ,237 |
| | Bureaucratic Culture | -,025 | ,096 | -,017 | -,263 | ,793 | -,019 | -,016 |
| | Duty Culture | ,079 | ,116 | ,055 | ,679 | ,498 | ,049 | ,042 |
| $\Delta R^2=$,002 | | p=,498 | | | | | | |
| $F_{(4-193)}=$ 16,195 | | p=,000 | | R=,501 | R ² =,251 | | | |

According to Model 1 in Table 13, the support culture dimension of the school culture significantly predicts the normative commitment dimension $R=,424$; $R^2=,180$; $F_{(1-196)} = 43,023$; $p<,01$). The support dimension of the school culture explains 18% of the total variance of the normative commitment dimension.

In Model 2, the success culture is included in the analysis. It is seen that the established model causes a significant change in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=,069$; $p<,01$), and the support and achievement culture dimensions together significantly predict normative commitment ($R=,499$; $R^2=,249$; $F_{(2-196)} = 32,408$; $p<,01$). The support and success culture dimensions together explain 24.9% of the total variance of normative commitment of teachers.

In Model 3, bureaucratic culture is included in the analysis. It is seen that the established model does not cause a significant change in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=,000$; $p>,05$), support, success and bureaucratic culture dimensions together significantly predict normative commitment ($R=,500$; $R^2=,250$; $F_{(3-196)} = 21,499$; $p<,01$). Support, success and bureaucratic culture dimensions together explain 25% of the total variance of normative commitment in teachers.

In Model 4, the duty culture is included in the analysis. It is seen that the established model does not cause a significant change in R^2 ($\Delta R^2=,002$; $p>,05$), support, success, bureaucratic and duty culture dimensions together significantly predict normative commitment ($R=,501$; $R^2=,251$; $F_{(4-196)} = 16,195$; $p<,011$). Support, success, bureaucratic and task culture dimensions together explain 25.1% of the total variance of normative commitment of teachers. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the order of relative importance of predictor variables on normative commitment is success, duty, support and bureaucratic culture dimensions. When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the success culture dimension is an important predictor of normative commitment. Duty, support and bureaucratic culture do not have an important effect on predicting normative commitment of teachers.

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

According to the results of the study, it was found that teachers' school culture and organizational commitment levels are high. According to teachers' opinions, duty culture, one of the school culture dimensions, is at a higher level than other dimensions, followed respectively by success culture, support and bureaucratic culture dimensions. In the studies of Balay (2000), Sezgin (2010), Pelit, Boylu and Güçer (2007) and Yüceler (2009), the duty culture dimension was determined as the highest perceived dimension. The fact that the bureaucratic culture dimension is the least perceived dimension shares similarity to the results of the studies of Terzi (2005), Koşar (2008) and Sezgin (2010). Terzi (2005) states that bureaucratic culture being a less perceived dimension is a positive thing because schools are value-based organization and it reveals that administrators do not approach teachers with a repressive and prescriptive approach. In the dimensions of organizational commitment, it is found that affective commitment is higher than other dimensions, followed respectively by continuance and normative commitment. This situation shows similarity to the studies of Balay (2000), Sezgin (2010), Pelit et al. (2007) and Yüceler (2009).

As a result of the comparison made based on gender, although there is no significant difference in school culture dimensions, it is seen that the averages of women are higher than men in all dimensions. Thus, it was concluded that female teachers' level of school culture is higher than that of men. Similar results were obtained in the studies of Terzi (2005) studies in which he examined the school culture in primary schools, Meriç (2018) in which he examined the relationship between organizational culture and organizational creativity, Tuncer (2020) in which he examined the relationship between leadership styles and school culture, and Şahin (2020) in which he examined the relationship between organizational culture and job satisfaction. In the comparison of organizational commitment levels based on gender, it was concluded that male teachers showed higher commitment than female teachers in the normative commitment dimension. In the studies conducted by Güllüoğlu (2011) and Işık (2020) in the public sector, it has been revealed that men show higher organizational commitment than female employees. Fuller, Hester, Barnett, Fry and Relyea (2006); Angle and Perry, (1981); Porter and others (1974) found that women show higher organizational commitment than men in the studies they conducted.

Although there was no significant difference in the school culture dimensions when comparison made based on the working years of teachers, it was observed that the level of school culture increased as the working year increased. Tuncer (2020) and Şahin (2020) reached the same significant difference in their studies. In the affective commitment dimension, it was concluded that teachers with more than 11 working years have higher commitment than teachers with 0-5 working year(s). Similar findings can be seen in the study conducted by Pelit et al. (2007) with academicians. As seniority increases, commitment to school decreases. The reason for this may be that the service scores of the teachers increases as their seniority increases

and thus their possibility to be appointed to another school whenever they want in case of a problem they may experience.

When the relationship levels between the school culture dimension and organizational commitment are examined; It has been found that there is a high relationship between support, achievement and duty culture, out of the school culture dimensions, and affective commitment of organizational commitment dimensions, but not a meaningful relationship with bureaucratic culture. Sezgin (2010), who reached similar results in his study, interpreted that the affective commitment of teachers increased in a supportive, success-oriented and task-oriented school culture. While there was no significant relationship between support, success, duty culture and continuance commitment, a significant relationship was found between bureaucratic culture and continuance commitment. It has been found that there is a high relationship between support, success and duty culture, and normative commitment, but not a significant relationship with bureaucratic culture.

It is concluded that the success, duty and bureaucracy culture dimensions are important predictors of emotional commitment; support culture does not have a significant effect on the prediction of affective commitment of teachers. It is concluded that the bureaucratic culture dimension is an important predictor of continuance commitment; support, duty and success culture did not have a significant effect on the prediction of the continuance commitment of teachers. It is concluded that the success culture dimension is an important predictor of normative commitment; duty, support and bureaucratic culture do not have a significant effect on the prediction of the normative commitment of teachers. Teachers behave in accordance with the rules in a school culture that they perceive as bureaucratic, but these behaviors may not be internalized. However, due to the high cost of leaving the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Weiner, 1982), the employee's commitment to the organization (continuance commitment) may continue. It can be stated that the hierarchical structure, which is a part of the bureaucratic culture reduces the commitment of employees by causing the communication channels to increase and therefore not to work well.

Recommendations in the context of the findings and results of this research are as follows:

- In order to increase teachers' commitment to school, bureaucratic culture can be avoided in schools. In order to move away from the bureaucratic culture, a supportive school culture can be adopted by moving away from the authoritarian administration approach that requires strict rules.
- School culture can be developed by increasing affective commitment dimensions, one of the organizational commitment dimensions. For this, plans that allow teachers to realize themselves can be made;
- It should be considered that school administrators need to gain competencies that will help them comprehend that organizational culture and sense of belonging to the institution are a feature that can be changed and managed in order to achieve school

goals in addition to its importance in education and training.

- Organizations such as ceremonies, special days, sports activities, cultural trips can be organized that will help to perceive the school as a value in order to systematically acquire school culture, which increases depending on seniority.

References

- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33 (4), 847-858.
- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: an examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 49, 252-276.
- Angle, H. L. & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, (1) S: 1-14.
- Aslan, İ. (2017). *Öğretmenlerin pozitif psikolojik sermaye alguları ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis), Siirt University, Siirt.
- Aydın, R. (2016). *Otel işletmelerinde psikolojik sözleşmeler ve işgörenlerin işe yönelik tutumları üzerindeki etkisi: Antalya 5 yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma*, Adnan Menderes University, Social Sciences Institute, Aydın.
- Balay, R. (2000). *Özel ve resmi liselerde yönetici ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı: Ankara ili örneği*. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), Ankara University, Ankara.
- Balcı, A. (2009). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma*. Ankara: PegemA Publishing.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2006). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı, istatistik, araştırma deseni SPSS uygulamaları ve yorumu*, Ankara: PegemA Publishing.
- Cafoğlu, Z. (1995). Okulların güçlendirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 1 (4), 549-557
- Çiftçioğlu, A. & Sabuncuoğlu, Z. (2013). "Etik karar almada örgütsel faktörler" *İş etiği Ed. Tokgöz, N.* Eskişehir:
- Çimili Gök, E. B. (2018). *Organizational results of formal and informal group relations of teachers at school*. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Educational Science Institute, Akdeniz University. Antalya.
- Duncan, C. (2003). *Advanced quantitative data analysis*. İngiltere: McGraw-Hill Education.

- Eğriboyun, D. (2013). *Ortaöğretim okullarında görev yapan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel güven, örgütsel destek ve örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki (Bolu ili örneği)* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.
- Eren, E. (2017). *Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi* (16. Baskı). İstanbul: Beta Yayın Dağıtım AŞ.
- Ertürk, S. (2011). *Kuruma aidiyet bağlamında adanmışlık algısı ile kişilik, iş doyumu ve stres ilişkisi* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Kara Harp Okulu, Ankara.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (Third Edition). London: Sage.
- Fuller, J. B., Hester, K., Barnett, T., Frey, L. & Relyea, C. (2006). Perceived organizational support and perceived external prestige: predicting organizational attachment for university faculty, staff, and administrators. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(3), 327-347
- Garcia Cabrera, A. & Garcia Soto, M. (2012). Organizational commitment in MNC subsidiary top manager: Antecedents and Consequences. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23 (15), 3151-3177.
- Güllüoğlu, Ö. (2011). *Kurumsal bağlılık ve iletişim doyumu arasındaki ilişkinin değerlendirilmesi ve bir uygulama örneği*. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), Social Sciences Institute, Selçuk University, Konya.
- Işık, T. (2020). *Kurum içi halkla ilişkiler ve örgütsel bağlılık: Uygulamalı bir çalışma*. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), Social Sciences Institute, Selçuk University, Konya.
- Jung, J. & Kim, Y. (2012). Causes of newspaper firm employee burnout in korea and its impact on organizational commitment and turnover intention. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23 (17), 3636-3651.
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Karsh, B., Booske, B. C. & Saintfort, F. (2005). Job and organizational determinants of nursing home employee commitment, job satisfaction and intent to turnover. *Ergonomics*, 48 (10), 1260-1281.
- Koşar, S. (2008). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişki*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Gazi University, Ankara.
- Leech, N.L., Barrett, K.C. & Morgan, G.A. (2005). *SPSS for intermediate statistics: Use and interpretation (Second Edition)*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Luthans, F. (2012). Psychological capital: Implications for HRD, retrospective analysis, and future directions. *Human resource development quarterly*, 23 (1), 1-8.

- McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2016). Örgütsel davranış. *Translation Editors: Günsel, A. & Bozkurt, S*, Nobel Akademik, Ankara.
- Meriç, Ç. (2018). *İlkokullarda örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel yaratıcılık ilişkisinin yönetici ve öğretmen görüşlerine dayalı olarak değerlendirilmesi: Balıkesir ili örneği*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Social Sciences Institute, Balıkesir University. Balıkesir.
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. London: Sage Publications.
- 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.
- Özkalp, E. (2004). Örgütsel davranış (Ed: Enver Özkalp), *Örgütsel Davranışa giriş ve yöntem*. 2. Baskı, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.
- Pelit, E., Boylu, Y., & Güçer, E. (2007). Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi akademisyenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (1), 86-114.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). *Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603-609.
- Robbins; S. (1996). *Organizational behaviour: concepts controversies and applications*. Prentice Hall Inc., USA.
- Sabuncuoğlu, E. T. (2007). Eğitim, örgütsel bağlılık ve isten ayrılma niyeti arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi. *Ege Academic Review*, 7(2), 613-628.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership (2nd ed.)*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sezgin, F. (2010). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığının bir yordayıcısı olarak okul kültürü. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 35(156).
- Şahin, A.R. (2020). Eğitim kurumlarında örgüt kültürü ve iş doyumunu arasındaki ilişki. (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Uşak University, Uşak.
- Şahin-Fırat, N. (2010). Okul müdürü ve öğretmenlerin okul kültürü ile değer sistemlerine ilişkin algıları. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 35(156).
- Terzi, A. R. (2005). İlköğretim okullarında okul kültürü. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 11, 423-442.

- Tuncer, T. (2020), *Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik tarzlarının örgüt kültürüne etkisi: Isparta İli Örneği*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara.
- Vandenberg, R. J. & Scarpello, V. (1994). A longitudinal assessment of the determinant relationship between employee commitments to the occupation and the organization, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15 (6), 535-547.
- Weiner, Y. (1982) Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-425.
- Yüceler, A. (2009). Örgütsel bağlılık ve örgüt iklimi ilişkisi: Teorik ve uygulamalı bir çalışma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 22, 445-458.