

**T.R.**  
**ISTANBUL SABAHATTIN ZAIM UNIVERSITY**  
**GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION**

**AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP  
BETWEEN TEACHER EMPOWERMENT AND  
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT OF  
INSTRUCTORS AT ENGLISH PREPARATORY  
SCHOOLS**

**MA THESIS**

**Cihan KAYA**

**Istanbul**

**April-2024**

**T.R.**  
**ISTANBUL SABAHATTIN ZAIM UNIVERSITY**  
**GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION**

**AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN  
TEACHER EMPOWERMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL  
COMMITMENT OF INSTRUCTORS AT ENGLISH  
PREPARATORY SCHOOLS**

**MA THESIS**

**Cihan KAYA**

**Supervisor**

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emrah GÖRGÜLÜ**

**Istanbul**

**April-2024**

## THESIS APPROVAL

This study has been approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for MA Degree in English Language Teaching.

Supervisor of jury Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emrah GÖRGÜLÜ

Member of jury Assist. Prof. Dr. Abdül Kasım VARLI

Member of jury Assist. Prof. Dr. Eyyüp Yaşar KÜRÜM

Prof. Dr. Erhan İÇENER  
Director, Graduate Education Institute

## **DECLARATION OF SCIENTIFIC ETHICS AND ORIGINALITY**

This is to certify that this MA thesis titled “AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHER EMPOWERMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT OF INSTRUCTORS AT ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOLS” is my own work and I have acted according to scientific ethics and academic rules while producing it. I have collected and used all information and data according to scientific ethics and guidelines on thesis writing of İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University. I have fully referenced, in both the text and bibliography, all direct and indirect quotations and all sources I have used in this work.

**Cihan KAYA**

Istanbul, April 2024

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to praise Allah the Almighty, the Most Gracious, and the Most Merciful for His blessing given to me during my study and in completing this thesis.

I would like to acknowledge and express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emrah GÖRGÜLÜ, who provided me with his guidance, insightful feedback, and valuable suggestions and I wholeheartedly appreciate his unending patience and willing to help me in all stages of this research.

Since the beginning of the program, my wife Sema KAFKASLI KAYA has been at my side, and she has always shown her unwavering support and encouragement whenever I fell behind. I'm really grateful to her.

My little daughter Eslem Ravza, your presence is always a source of joy and the reminder of the beauty in our family, filling our home with love and warmth.

My new-born son Ali Yasir, I am very lucky and feel blessed to have you and your arrival will be our strength and make every day brighter and full of love.

**Cihan KAYA**

Istanbul, April 2024

## ABSTRACT

# AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHER EMPOWERMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT OF INSTRUCTORS AT ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

**Cihan KAYA**

M.A., Department of English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emrah GÖRGÜLÜ

April, 2024 - 96 pages

This study, involving 182 instructors at English Preparatory Schools from the foundation and state universities, aimed to explore the relationship between organizational commitment and empowerment. The data were collected through the School Participant Empowerment Scale and TCM Employee Commitment Survey-Revised. The study is descriptive in nature and the data were collected and analysed using some statistical tests. The findings showed that the middle-aged instructors exhibited higher continuance commitment than older counterparts while the younger ones felt significantly more empowered in self-efficacy than all age groups. The medium-tenured instructors were found to be the most committed and significantly differing from the short-tenured instructors, while the short-tenured ones felt significantly more empowered than their long-tenured counterparts. Also, the instructors with fewer teaching hours exhibited higher affective commitment and felt more empowered than those with longer teaching hours. The state university instructors showed significantly higher continuance commitment, and the foundation university instructors exhibited significantly more empowered across all factors than those at the state universities. Moderate positive correlation was found between empowerment and commitment. These findings help us to understand empowerment and organizational commitment of English instructors in terms of some variables.

**Keywords** : Teacher Empowerment, Organizational Commitment

## ÖZET

# İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK OKULLARINDA GÖREV YAPAN ÖĞRETİM GÖREVLİLERİNİN ÖĞRETMEN GÜÇLENDİRME VE ÖRGÜTSEL BAĞLILIKLARI ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİNİN İNCELENMESİ

**Cihan KAYA**

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Emrah GÖRGÜLÜ

Nisan, 2024 - 96 sayfa

Bu çalışma, vakıf ve devlet üniversitelerine bağlı İngilizce Hazırlık Okullarında görev yapmakta olan 182 öğretim görevlisinin örgütsel bağlılıkları ile güçlendirme dereceleri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Veriler, Okul Katılımcısını Güçlendirme Ölçeği ve Revize Edilmiş TCM Çalışan Bağlılığı Ölçeği ile toplanmıştır. Bu çalışma, yapı itibarıyla betimseldir ve toplanan verilerden bazı istatistik testler kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Bulgulara göre, orta yaşlı öğretim görevlileri ileri yaş grubundakilere göre yüksek seviyede zorunlu bağlılık gösterirken, genç öğretim görevlileri ileri yaştaki meslektaşlarına göre öz yeterlilik maddesinde daha fazla güçlendirildikleri tespit edilmiştir. Kurumunda orta süre zarfında bulunan öğretim görevlileri en yüksek bağlılık derecesi göstermiş ve kısa süre zarfında bulunanlardan anlamlı şekilde farklılaşmıştır. Ayrıca, kurumunda kısa süre zarfında bulunan öğretim görevlilerinin, uzun süre kurumunda bulunanlara göre daha güçlendirilmiş oldukları saptanmıştır. Haftalık ders yükü az olan öğretim görevlilerinin, haftalık ders yükü daha fazla olanlara göre daha çok duygusal bağlılık sergiledikleri ve güçlendirilme hissettikleri tespit edilmiştir. Devlet üniversitesinde çalışanlar anlamlı derecede daha fazla zorunlu bağlılık sergilerken, vakıf üniversitelerinde görev yapanların tüm faktörlerde daha fazla güçlendirildikleri saptanmıştır. Güçlendirme ve örgütsel bağlılık arasında ılımlı pozitif ilişki belirlenmiştir. Bu bulgular, bazı değişkenler açısından İngilizce öğretim görevlilerinin güçlendirme ve örgütsel bağlılıklarını anlamamıza yardımcı olmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler :** Öğretmen Güçlendirme, Örgütsel Bağlılık

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>THESIS APPROVAL .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>DECLARATION OF SCIENTIFIC ETHICS AND ORIGINALITY .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ÖZET .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>x</b>
 <b>CHAPTER I</b>	
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1. Introduction.....	2
1.2. Background to the Study .....	2
1.3. Statement of the Problem .....	2
1.4. Sifnificance and Purpose of the Study.....	2
1.5.Research Questions .....	3
1.6 The Limitations of the Study .....	4
1.7 Definition of Key Terms.....	4
1.8 Conclusion .....	4
 <b>CHAPTER II</b>	
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	6
2.2 Teaching Profession .....	7
2.3 The Philosophy of Teacher Empowerment .....	11

2.4. Theoretical Framework of Teacher Empowerment.....	12
2.5 Organizational Commitment .....	19
2.6 Conclusion .....	24
 <b>CHAPTER III</b>	
<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	26
3.2 Research Design.....	26
3.3. Data Collection.....	26
3.4. Data Analysis .. ..	27
 <b>CHAPTER IV</b>	
<b>FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>30</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	30
4.2 Findings .....	31
 <b>CHAPTER V</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION &amp; CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>54</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	55
5.2 Discussion .....	54
5.3. Suggestions for Further Studies .....	66
5.4. Conclusion .....	67
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>CURRICULUM VITAE .....</b>	<b>85</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Demographic Variables and Frequencies of the Participant .....	33
Table 4.2: T-test Results of Commitment Survey by Age .....	34
Table 4.3: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of Commitment Survey by Age .....	35
Table 4.4: T-test Results of Commitment Survey by Gender .....	35
Table 4.5: One-Way ANOVA Results of Commitment Survey by Tenure .....	36
Table 4.6: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of Commitment Survey by Tenure .....	36
Table 4.7: One-Way ANOVA of Commitment Survey by Teaching Hours.....	38
Table 4.8: Post Hoc Tukey HSD of Commitment Survey by Teaching Hours .....	38
Table 4.9: T-test Results of Commitment Survey by Type of University.....	39
Table 4.10: Descriptive Statistics of Commitment Survey by Type of University...	40
Table 4.11: T-test Results of SPES by Age .....	41
Table 4.12: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of SPES by Age .....	41
Table 4.13: T-test Results of SPES by Gender .....	42
Table 4.14: One-Way ANOVA Results of SPES by Tenure .....	43
Table 4.15: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of SPES by Tenure .....	43
Table 4.16: One-Way ANOVA Results of SPES by Teaching Hours .....	44
Table 4.17: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of SPES by Teaching Hours .....	46
Table 4.18: T-test Results of SPES by Type of University .....	47
Table 4.19: Descriptive Statistics of SPES by Type of University .....	48
Table 4.20: The Correlation Results between TCM Employee Commitment Survey- Revised and SPES .....	49

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>SPES</b>	: School Participant Empowerment Scale
<b>TCM</b>	: Three Component Model
<b>SPSS</b>	: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
<b>ANOVA</b>	: Analysis of Variance



# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Introduction

This chapter introduces the study to the reader. It starts with the background the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study and research questions. Then, the chapter attempts to explain the importance of the research and present the content of the study.

### 1.2 Background to the Study

The conditions of teachers at school have a significant impact on their happiness and well-being. The worsening atmosphere at school deteriorates and damages the bonds that bind instructors to their institution, which causes alienation and exclusion of teachers from affairs pertaining to their institution. As is known, instructors have a significant role in determining a student's academic progress, yet unfavorable conditions arranged for the use at school will undoubtedly lead to unwanted teacher attitudes. Therefore, in order to boost teachers' enthusiasm and dedication, it is necessary to give them some rights and space so that they are prone to feel themselves more contributive and sharing. Thus, teacher empowerment gains so much importance that it directly bears a significant impact for the wellbeing of teachers and the healthy environment at school. Empowerment is defined by Short (1994) as a process of development and problem-solving by the participants of the environment. Empowerment is delegating some authority to the participants of the workplace so that a collaborative environment is established. Page and Czuba (1990) states that empowerment opposes to basic assumptions towards power authority, achieving and helping. Distributing responsibility at a workplace opens space for everyone at work to take initiatives and be a part of ongoing process. Sharing the responsibility at school and empowering teachers with some governance roles enable them to be a part of the decision-making process and it can be assumed to increase the dedication or commitment of teachers to their institution.

Organizational commitment is another topic of this research and its relationship with teacher empowerment at school was investigated. Meyer and Allen (1991) defined

organizational commitment as a psychological condition characterized by a person's relationship and motivation to preserve engagement in an organization. It is believed that committed teachers are more positive and contributive to the development of school as a whole, while less committed teachers are claimed to show irresponsible behavior and procrastination while carrying out school duties. Thus, it bears a significant role to investigate and unearth the present conditions at schools and come up with an understandable and productive outcome pointing out this relationship.

### **1.3. Statement of the Problem**

It is predicted that teachers with heavy weekly workloads and with additional duties and their weekly teaching schedule may have issues at school. According to thoughts of the author of this current study, particularly teachers with heavy weekly workloads are more likely to feel underappreciated and unsupported by the administration of the school. They are willing to devote their time and energy to students and school goals, yet they may not be able to handle the increasing pressure on them. Additionally, they could become disheartened and lose their feeling of commitment if they feel excluded from the decision-making process and from the management of the school. Thereby, empowerment of teachers bears a significant role in the well-being of them and the healthy school environment. Short (1998) stated that empowerment emphasizes enhancing one's confidence and providing opportunities for workers to exhibit their ability in the management. Thus, instructors who are given space to make them involved in the management of the school are encouraged and fostered.

Commitment of employees is assumed to make a difference in emotions and approach of them toward their institutions and also their attitudes at work have a big impact on how well they perform at job. Employee commitment levels may differ at a workplace, and this variation is assumed to result from the current conditions made available to employees. According to reports, those who are highly committed to their organizations were found to feel more motivated at work (Davis & Wilson, 2000). Thus, higher level of commitment to organization can be identified with more productive and positive behaviors to workplace and a remarkable positive difference in overcoming stress and negative approach. Instructors who are loaded with lots of responsibilities at school strive to keep up with the program and the expectations. They

feel obliged to meet the objectives of the program and school, making them experience too much stress and burnout as they start to feel ineffective and demotivated and run out of supportive resources. Committed teachers can be thought of being at risk as they give more to be able to meet the demands of the school. However, when they are put under too much stress of work, this will undoubtedly result in with demotivation and less commitment. Both the lack of empowerment and less committed teachers pose a serious problem both for the school environment and for the wellbeing of them.

#### **1.4. Significance and Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine the conditions of preparatory school teachers at both foundation and state universities in terms of teacher empowerment and organizational commitment. Understanding the relationship between teacher empowerment and organizational commitment will shed light on the problems arising from the institutional reasons. The study will also delve into existing conditions with regards to teachers' empowerment and their level of commitment between state and foundation universities.

Examining the effects and relationship between organizational commitment and teacher empowerment at prep schools, this study may provide some significant contributions to promote an understanding of empowerment and commitment at preparatory schools and to aim to enhance them. Firstly, the findings of this study can facilitate explaining how the current conditions provided for teachers affect their attitudes and make a change in their perception of commitment. As student performance is directly associated with teacher commitment, it is expected that findings of this study will help understand the grounds leading to a decrease in teacher commitment. Besides, the study may open more perspectives in language learning environment and management of school.

#### **1.5. Research Questions**

This study focuses on the empowerment and commitment of instructors at English preparatory schools of state and foundation universities. Based on these aims, the study will seek answers to the following 11 questions:

- Is there any significant difference in the organizational commitment of the instructors in terms of age?
- Is there any significant difference in the organizational commitment of the instructors in terms of gender?
- Is there any significant difference in the organizational commitment of the instructors in terms of tenure?
- Is there any significant difference in the organizational commitment the instructors in terms of weekly teaching hours?
- Is there any significant difference in the organizational commitment of the instructors in terms of type of university?
- Is there any significant difference in empowerment of the instructors in terms of age?
- Is there any significant difference in empowerment of the instructors in terms of gender?
- Is there any significant difference in empowerment of the instructors in terms of tenure?
- Is there any significant difference in empowerment of the instructors in terms of weekly teaching hours?
- Is there any significant difference in empowerment of the instructors in terms of type of university?
- Is there a significant relationship between instructors' organizational commitment and their empowerment?

### **1.6. Limitations of the Study**

Findings of the study cannot be generalized to the entire population since there may have distinct measurements for responses to the questions.

As the data was gathered through self-report, their ideas and perceptions may have changed over time and may no longer correctly reflect the situation.

### **1.7. Definition of Terms**

**Teacher Empowerment:** Empowerment is a process where school employees are in charge of their development and problem-solving (Short, 1994).

**Organizational Commitment:** Organizational commitment is a psychological condition characterized by a person's relationship and motivation to preserve engagement in an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

### **1.8. Conclusion**

In this chapter, the conditions of teaching occupation in a broad sense were provided. It is aimed that critical aspects of empowerment and commitment have become more conceivable and new ways are proposed to promote a better environment for teachers and learners. Incessant pressure and imposed programs pose a serious threat to well-being of teachers and intensify their workload with absence of decision-making at school. Teachers become devoid of any supportive placements at school and are considered as the holder only responsible for transmitting knowledge to students. However, lack of empowerment, displacing teachers from any administrative duties and removing their indispensable role in decision-making mechanism at school undoubtedly lead other grave problems to rise and deepen deterioration. In this chapter, the emphasis was placed specifically on teachers' asset in society and their worsening position and prestige. Also, it aims to highlight gradually reducing commitment or dedication of teachers so that the purpose of the study has become more understandable for the reader.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1. Introduction**

This part reviews the literature relating to teacher empowerment and organizational commitment. The theoretical framework and methodology of each phenomenon are investigated and supported through background information in the field. With the advent of 21<sup>st</sup> century, educational reforms started to appear quite rapidly and such changes unavoidably have led to drastic improvements in all areas including schools. Schools have become a common ground for sharing and interacting knowledge and the new role adopted has made every unit of school highly significant. In light of this, teaching area has gained importance and the new ways to enhance teaching quality has become a matter of debate for long years. From designing new programs to rearranging class environment, so many innovative ideas have been proposed to be able to trigger a change and develop the quality of education. On the other hand, teaching as a profession has been investigated on a wide scale to understand the dynamics and relationship with other elements of teaching. Thus, teacher motivation, stress, burnout, job satisfaction has been broadly studied in the field. As known, teaching profession is considered as the most stressful occupation (Dunham, 2002). Teachers struggle with a lot of problems at school while striving for increasing student achievement and also these problems can vary from school administration to students' behaviors. Thus, teachers are negatively affected and start to feel less satisfied with their position at school and leads to a decrease in job satisfaction (Mehta, S., 2012; Bota, O. A., 2013). Besides, a noteworthy increase is evident in the study of teacher stress as an occupation as of 1980, as it is associated with other problems at school (Guglielme and Tatrow, 1998). Later, so much research to unearth the atmosphere of teaching and its pertaining factors was carried out and followed the suit in this field (Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1977; Fimian, M. J., & Blanton, L. P., 1987). Teachers are an indispensable part of the teaching environment and they have to be supported by creating a viable teaching and school environment for them. However, teachers tend to leave their profession due to unwanted and long-awaiting unresolved problems. Thus, teachers drop-out or retention rate has increased

tremendously in time as these problems remain unresolved and teachers feel themselves burned-out or exhausted under these problems (Fisher, M. H., 2011). Unhappy and unmotivated teachers undoubtedly are less willing to continue their career and this will lead to a decline in enthusiasm towards teaching profession. Thus, it is understood that schools must be established in consideration with teachers' needs and teachers must not be left behind while making a change or designing a program. Otherwise, as reported by Geiger, T. and Pivovarova, M. (2018) teacher retention is going to be a driving contributing factor for the shortage of qualified teachers all over the world. In light of all school and teaching profession-related problems in the field, another distressing issue teachers suffer most is lack of empowerment and commitment depriving teachers of adopting their role and accomplishing their goals. In the following parts, apart from mentioned teacher-related issues in the field, two areas of teaching profession, teacher empowerment and teachers' organizational commitment will be investigated thoroughly. However, it will be reasonable first to pay attention to school and shed light on the current school atmosphere and system for a better understanding of teachers.

## **2.2. Teaching Profession**

In this fast-changing world and what it brings at the disposal of humanity, all professions face a difficulty in adapting and making drastic and radical change to be able to fit themselves to the standards and expectations of the era. Among all, teaching profession comes first to adopt the changes of the time so that workers of this profession can meet the demands and convey the future individuals what is expected from them. Thus, it brings the difficulty as well that teachers feel unsupported and left abandoned under this burden and accordingly this creates some other problems in the field and they are forced to leave the profession. In the study of Perryman and Calvert (2019), it was found that 40-50 % of respondents leave or think of leaving the job in ten years' time as they no longer consider teaching a long-term career due to the conditions provided to the teachers unlike their previous thoughts before entering the field. Also, Heffernan et al. (2022) studied reasons for teacher retention in Australia and reported that 41% of the respondents were found intended to remain in the profession. Thus, teachers are always in struggle with too many distractors at school.

It is best to deepen our understanding of the existing conditions at school to be able make a way out for teachers at risk.

### **2.2.1. School Environment**

To be able to understand how much teacher empowerment is critical for teacher development and well-being, it is of utmost important to diagnose the problems encountered by teachers in a school environment. The current conditions are deteriorating at school and occurrences of conflicts posing threats to well-being of teachers are getting more common and widespread. Factors leaving no space and removing the comfort area of teachers are intensifying the present conditions, and also teachers are dragged into a desperate condition financially, physically and mentally. In a school atmosphere where teachers are left in the second place and ignored, it is irrational to anticipate an enhancement. Thus, from teachers and students to principals, the degradation in all units of school may become inevitable and the existing conditions at school are on the way to this end. The school-related conflicts arise from some major reasons. Göksoy and Argon (2016) pointed out that conflicts affecting teachers negatively commonly arise from psychological, social and organizational reasons. According to them, lack of trust, indifference to school-related issues and feelings of insignificance are some serious emotions attributed to these conflicts. Over the past years, empowerment in education has received a great deal of attention and considerable body of literature has covered empowerment as a matter of education in a detailed way. Empowerment at schools means giving teachers more freedom to make judgments away from the constraints of conventional power structures (Lintner, J. D., 2008). It is believed that schools are not places where teachers feel confined and left abandoned. However, the existing conditions and power authorities putting a lot of stress on teachers by alienating them from being involved in the decisions. According to Sprague (1992) there are serious factors affecting a transformation of work in education and this is building a narrow path for teachers to share organizational power at school. It is claimed that the work of teachers has deskilled, feminized and technologized, making it necessary for teachers to be involved in the decision-making process. On the other hand, it is well recognized that teachers face an excessive amount of pressure and workload. According to Karasek (1979), when more demands are made with little possibility to choose the work, a significant deal of issues

is going to arise and become unavoidable. As a result, the atmosphere at school is getting worse, putting instructors under too much stress, and providing no room for relief. Thus, teacher empowerment gains too much importance considering the role adopted by teachers at school because there appear too many distractors in teaching profession in the given conditions. Adding to all, teachers also lack the necessary support from their school principals and their presence is overlooked. School environment unlike 1990 has changed dramatically and the new era with the state of art technology has brought new expectations from teachers. Thus, teachers are known to be in a constant struggle to keep up with the changes of the time. While some manage to meet the needs of it, some have a hard time coping with the pressure imposed on them. As a consequence of pressure, teachers are highly likely to suffer from emotional exhaustion. To be able to respond to too much strain on teachers, they have to seek some social support from outside resources. As reported by Maas et al. (2021), received social support taken from school principals has a facilitative role in alleviating strain arising from time pressure and leads to a fall in emotional exhaustion. A school principal is a leading factor corresponded with the creation of school image for teachers, a place increasing well-being or a place for depletion. In a study by Burkhauser (2017), it was understood that teachers' perceived school and their working conditions are in line with the attitudes of principal in charge without taking average school standards of the district into consideration. It shows that teachers' well-being at school are quite associated with principals' stance and their approach to teachers and the climate at school, thus, determines whether teachers are going to be empowered and supported or abandoned under the debris of demands and changes.

### **2.2.2. School Principals and Empowerment**

Teacher empowerment has long been debated and associated mainly with the school administration and extent of collaboration shared by teachers. The new era has brought a lot of changes leading to increasing expectations from school principals in addition to teachers. Duties performed at school continue to grow in number and responsibilities taken on by school principals are expanding, too. Systematically occurring changes proposed by those in power naturally open doors to adopting a new mindset to enhance student achievement. However, with this mindset solely prioritizing and intensifying the role of school principal and ignoring the merit of

teachers, it is hard to realize the intended purpose, boosted student achievement. Some studies also show that the impact of school principals is evident on student achievement and it is reported that high ability principals lead to an increase in student achievement as they maintain the proper implementation of the curriculum, ensure teacher quality and other school-related factors (Dhuey& Smith, 2014). It shows that school principals are a prominent component for the realization of student achievement and the coordination of all school units. Also, Knoeppel and Rinehart (2008) reported that school principals with more training of recent educational leadership successfully managed their schools and increase student achievement and outperformed their counterparts. The importance of having high- ability for school principals is undoubtedly indispensable, yet growing expectations and redimensionion of schools in line with the demands of policy makers are also clear and leave slight chance of success for school principals considering the role they are to embrace. Increased accountability of school principals is too much focused-on school achievement, yet variables influencing the dynamics of school progress are substantial and sometimes uncontrollable, giving rise to too much struggle to apply mandated reforms. Thus, embracing a new mindset and giving some initiatives to teachers and making them an active component of implementation of policies would make the school environment more efficient for increased student performance. What has to happen for leadership and management of school to improve student performance is to empower teachers and teacher-leaders to adopt the challenge of meeting higher and more difficult expectations.

### **2.2.3. Workload and Role**

Teachers at school are always in a rush to meet the duties of the day and conduct teaching and take short breaks and end the day in great tiredness and burnout. Some also cannot finish work at school and take it home to be able to feel a little bit more comfortable at school as there are some others waiting at school. Such an unendingly occurring rush undoubtedly leaves them exhausted before the week finishes. According to Travers (2001), there is no available time remaining for teachers to rest and ease their negative perceptions throughout the school day on account of the constant interaction they have with students and their colleagues. Apart from their paperwork and responsibilities, they have to maintain healthy communication with

students and their colleagues and respond to them in a proper manner. Teachers are assumed to perform under their capacity when they are burdened with so many responsibilities and giving no space for autonomy to decide at school. Though there are some studies like that of Johari et al. (2018) showing workload has no effect on the performance of teachers in contrast to comprehensive literature pointing out that workload not only leads to a fall in the job performance but also gives way to teacher turnover (Heffernan et al., 2022; Torres, 2016).

The role adopted by teachers at school is another dilemma leading to discomfort. Alongside with teaching practices, teachers are requested to carry out so many responsibilities outside the class. From club activities to administrative duties, rather than considering how to increase students' performance and internalizing the job of teaching, teachers find themselves dealing with so many office duties and sparing themselves little time for lesson planning. At school there are issues of role conflict and ambiguity which is a predictor of teacher burnout according to Dick & Wagner (2001). Teachers are left abandoned to complete their duties without being informed enough and this creates role ambiguity for them. Teachers puzzled with uncertainty struggle too much to find out how to cope with their conditions, leaving relatively disturbing outcomes for teachers as they need to be mentally strong to be able to assist students. It is certain that teachers suffer from the insufficient time to accomplish submitted task as they are not well-informed regarding the way it is to be handled. Not knowing exactly what role teachers bear at school together with improperly detailed tasks, they feel demotivated and develop negative approach and thought towards the profession and themselves so that the self-esteem and the possibility of personal achievement diminishes or disappears. According to Kokkinos (2011), personal achievement keeps teachers stronger and prevents them from facing burnout in the profession. Thereby, the role adopted by teachers in the institution is very critical and tasks must be away from confusion and conflicts, be neatly detailed when submitted so that teachers get over any clash with the role ambiguity and personal achievement can be gained.

Role conflict is another problem encountered at institutions and gives a hard tackle for teachers to overcome as they are unable to control. Sutton (1984) classifies conflict into two as structural and inter-role conflict. Structural conflict refers to teachers' absence of authority on the submitted tasks so that they do not play a role in decision-

making. This is quite associated with the main content of this research as the lack of empowerment on the tasks that teachers are held accountable creates a heavy burden and arousal of unintended feelings. Unavoidably, this ends up with the negative approach to grow in the institution. Sutton (1984) takes the attention on the inter-role conflict as this makes teachers to spend less time with family members as they take their tasks home. According to Kaya (2019), the second most favored and applied coping strategy was social support. when teachers confronted with a stress-creating task at work. Thus, home and the shareholders of it contribute to relieving of unhealthy thoughts, but when an inter-role conflict emerges, this surely intensifies the burden and strain on teachers as they will be stripped of social support gained through a healthy interaction. Thus, empowerment gains great importance in the health of teachers and how much of work they are held accountable and what role they adopt at school.

### **2.3. The Philosophy of Teacher Empowerment**

The study of teacher empowerment will provide the needed data to unearth the understanding between the degree of teacher empowerment and the occurrence or absence of organizational commitment. In the first place, it can be thought that giving some force or authority to teachers at school will restore the degraded value of teachers in the eyes of public. However, the otherwise is also likely and giving some force and authority may create some other problems. In this sense, Short (1992) pointed out that organizations where participants are entitled to more authority are likely to end up with some organizational problems. Conflicts at school are thought to increase since the constant change in line with the developing programs is demanded and imposed on both administrators and teachers. Bogler and Somech (2004) stated that the notion of teacher empowerment is built on the anticipation that teachers contribute to school climate and make a change. The roles teachers now adopt at school are different than the past and this causes teachers to find themselves in an ongoing struggle with the reforms and changes proposed by lawmakers. Teachers are placed in a tough position and they are known as the real game changer in students' lives. With all these expectations bringing about too much stress, teachers are expected to perform their best. Thus, teacher empowerment is understood as a great facilitator comforting teachers, and it is considered to create a space in a positive way. Dampson (2019)

stated teacher empowerment enhances the effectiveness of teachers in the educational system if ensured that teachers are equipped with information and skills necessary to address issues that arise at school. Surely the professional growth and competence of teachers are another scope of teacher empowerment considering that teachers are given another role as the decision makers and they are considered to positively influence and contribute to the implementation of curriculum.

## **2.4. Theoretical Framework of Teacher Empowerment**

In the core of the study, it is aimed to base the research on the six dimensions proposed by Short and Rinehart (1992) and the dimension of the framework is determined in consideration that the six dimensions are the reflections of teacher experience at work. The proposed six dimensions are decision-making, impact, status, autonomy, professional growth and self-efficacy.

### **2.4.1. Decision-making**

Running the whole school according to the mandated programs and maintaining peace and wellbeing of every unit at school is a very arduous and far-reaching goal. With rapidly changing programs proposed and submitted to principals to implement, the expectation and hard work on principals is growing seriously. Workload regarding the achievement of administration duties is also added on this and principals at schools where no vice-principals are assigned, the workload is dramatically leaving no space and comfort for principals. It is also possible that principals may have to work alone in fulfilling their administrative duties without being helped by an assistant as officials find the assigning of a vice principal ineligible for no reason. Thus, principals or school administrators may find themselves in a great turmoil not to fall behind the program and demands. Hatcher (2005) signaled that the existing conditions and complexity of programs were intensifying and this made school principals be in close interaction with their colleagues and in collaboration in the decision-making process so that expectation on the imposed programs could be actualized. Thus, teacher involvement in the administration of school emerges and makes teachers bear a key and a new role in the school which aims at a sustainable and goal-oriented implementation of school program.

From Karasek's Job Demand Control (1979) it is known that when high demands are imposed on teachers and when they are not involved in decision-making process, allowing them very little personal area to control, their psychological strain emerges and becomes unresolved if it lasts longer. Thus, whether teachers are made a part of decision makes a difference in the possible occurrence of problems at school. Short (1992) stated that teachers had a very little say and involvement in the decision-making process while they are expected to take part in evaluation and decision of content and teaching practice and he complained about the centralization of decision-making at districts rather than local school level. Involvement of teachers into decision-making process has improved significantly since that time though there are some exceptions. In the study of Ngussa & Gabriel (2017) it was found that teachers were given less opportunity to get involved in decision making process in public schools than private ones. Some other studies also support the same fact that absence of participation in decision making leads to discomfort and stress at school (Alghaswyneh, 2011; Bakircı, 2012). Empowerment of teachers and fostering a shared decision-making participation positively influences school environment and performance of teachers. The expectation of all teachers is to find a comfortable teaching environment where they are asked for their opinion and feel themselves a valuable asset and part of school. According to Ahrari et al. (2020) empowered teachers showed reduced psychological strain and increased job satisfaction. As Rosenholtz (1985) indicated when teachers were empowered their sense of ownership and attachment to the process increased. Compared to instructors who are not involved in decision-making, empowered teachers are more eager to accept responsibility for issues and propose solutions. Such a collective decision-making in the long run has a positive effect on school performance, overall quality of instructional programs and teachers' relationship with their colleagues, principal and students.

#### **2.4.2. Professional Growth**

Being a teacher does not mean that learning ends and no new things will be proposed in the field to foster better learning opportunities. Instead, methodology of teaching has changed drastically over time to create a more viable learning environment for students. It is highly likely that teachers maintaining a career development and adopting a lifelong learning perception feel themselves more equipped and prepared

for newly proposed teaching strategies and programs submitted to schools for implementation by policymakers. However, teachers with absence of professional development and growth may find these proposed programs hard to keep up and meet the demands. Therefore, professional growth should not be ignored and placed at the core of school. In this dimension of empowerment, Short (1992) described it as the characteristics of school that enables teachers to grow professionally, learn continuously and expand their teaching skills by means of work life at school. Absence of opportunities for professional growth threatens teachers' self-esteem and hinders their learning, so in an encounter with a challenging issue that they are supposed to cope with, they may show failure and incompetency to combat with the problem. As Fimian (1982) described, teachers were stuck in isolation and helplessness and had to continue their life-long professional learning to feel more equipped and stronger. Freeman (1999) and Cox et al. (1999) reported that teachers tended to label themselves incompetent when they failed to get over their problems at school. Thereby, this perception undoubtedly will bring unwillingness to participate shared decision-making and disbelief in their teaching and management abilities. Additionally, teachers may start to feel isolated and helpless ending with the perception that they are not for this profession. It is not hard to predict that this will increase the likelihood of teacher retention. To be able to create a change at a school, teachers must be stronger in power and open to professional development so that positive reflections of both on students and climate can be reaped in return. Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) stated that without learning and professional development activities, a change cannot be mentioned at school as they are the natural component of the change. Also, Hickey & Harris (2005) underlined the importance of professional growth for more committed teachers. When teachers are empowered and supported, they will show more eagerness to participate professional development activities and become more committed to their school. Through this, they gain admiration and respect both from their colleagues and in the community.

### **2.4.3. Status**

Status as a dimension of empowerment refers to “teacher perceptions that they have professional respect and admiration from colleagues” (Short, 1992, p.10) Teachers are burdened with lots of responsibilities at and outside school, yet the rapidly diminishing

status of teachers worry them about losing appreciation and respect in the community. Litt and Turk (1985) indicated that low status and followingly too much paperwork are main stress leading elements for teachers. In one study, reasons for low status were reported as low salary and less sense of belonging (Osunde & Izevbigie, 2006). The role and the duty teachers bear play a key role in shaping and moulding children as our future. However, the recognition of teaching profession as less paid job creates a negative image and prestige and lowers the status of teachers in the community. As a source of dissatisfaction and stress-creating factor, low salary was reported as one of the primary factors of many studies (Ozdayı, 1990; Bolin, 2014). Also, higher salary was associated with less teacher attrition (Guarino et al., 2006). Thus, giving a satisfying and deserving salary to teachers would make them gain more sense of belonging and satisfaction, creating a more positive perception of teachers in the community. Finally, empowering teachers with some administrative duties and showing the value of them for the institution by assigning them in critical decision will alter their negative thought and feeling of being left out at school. Empowering teachers will bring growing confidence, increased sense of belonging, creation of positive image of teachers as a decision maker.

#### **2.4.4. Autonomy**

Autonomy of teachers encompasses their control over their work life from selection of textbooks to instructional planning (Short, 1992). Currently changing programs are imposed by lawmakers without considering opinions of teachers and submitted to school principals for implementation. Demands of policymakers conflicting with the realities of school environment pose not more than a source of discomfort for both teachers and principals. Each school has their own dynamic and school population, which can also show variance in demographic characteristics among districts. Accepting all schools as one and fitting them all to a standard determined by the policy makers do not give benefit but harm only. According to the study of Pearson and Moomaw (2005), which involved 300 Florida instructors, teacher stress dropped noticeably as autonomy of teachers rose. Moreover, teachers are restricted even in the classroom activities and are not given enough space to incorporate their own teaching blended with experience. The absence of empowerment dictated through programs and the practices of principals alienate them from school environment and even let them

consider leaving the profession. Also, changing policies are found hard to follow as teachers feel inadequately informed and this exacerbate their feeling of left out of process. Kyriacou and Chien (2009) reported that educational reforms pose a stress causing problem as they lack degree of control and have to meet the demands. However, a supportive environment and increased empowerment proposed with the directions of policymakers and fostered by principals provide teachers with sufficient classroom space and this will surely lead to teachers bearing responsibility of their teaching practices, gaining a sense of belonging, feeling commitment. Briley (2004) stated that increased autonomy promotes cooperation and sharing of teachers with their colleagues and create a positive impact on school climate. When taking responsibility of curriculum design and teaching activities, teachers depict more collaborative and responsive attitudes. Thus, lawmakers must not ignore the role and participation of teachers in the instructional planning and provide some space for empowerment so that teachers gain a more positive self-image, earned admiration, more confidence and responsibility.

#### **2.4.5. Self-efficacy**

As a dimension of empowerment self-efficacy is described as “teachers' perceptions that they have the skills and ability to help students learn, are competent in building effective programs for students, and can effect changes in student learning” (Short, 1992, p.11). According to Bandura, self-efficacy refers to “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p.3). Teachers’ own perceptions regarding what they can do make a great difference when they attempt to take a role at school. Rather than being a passive and isolated participant of their institutions, all teachers prefer to be involved in and informed about all planned and ongoing activities so that they feel a valued and component’ of their organization. However, the attitude adopted by teachers align with their perception of competency as well. Alongside with being isolated from shared-decision-making, teachers with lack of confidence in their teaching and management skills are high likely to feel incompetent while managing their work duties. All of them to some extent contribute and exacerbate the growth of negative feelings and perceptions both to school and themselves. Skaalvik &Skaalvik (2007) indicated that teachers with high degree of self-efficacy are more persevered in managing difficult

students and are better in their instructional implementations. Also, high degree of self-efficacy influences teachers' success in the implementation of teaching practice, accordingly contributing to learners' success and motivation (Alibakhshi et al., 2020). Teachers are the source of a possible change at school though they are ignored and the road to success of implementation of instructional programs and student achievement grow out of the hands of teachers. Thereby, self-efficacy of teachers plays a key role in determining the consequences and expectations. Other findings also support that teachers' self-efficacy affect both evaluated teaching performances and student achievement (Caprara et al., 2006; Eells, 2011; Klassen & Tze, 2014; Shahzad & Naureen, 2017). When schools turn out a place where teachers' self-efficacy is underestimated and understood as a dispensable consideration of teaching mechanism, serious problems emerge with regards to teachers' well-being. Emotional exhaustion and burnout of teachers change the climate of school and make it a source of problem rather than a source of success. Teachers with lower self-efficacy were reported to feel greater degree of burnout (Gholami, 2015; Motallebzadeh & Ashraf, 201; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). Thus, this gives rise to the matter of teacher retention and recruitment of qualified teachers in the field and brings some problems in consideration of policymakers. However, teachers should be considered a significant element of every school matter so that they attain the deserved value and admiration. To be able to do place them as the key determinant of achievements and decisions, they have to be empowered and given involvement in activities. Empowerment was reported to have significant positive correlation with teacher self-efficacy (Azizifar et al., 2020; Veisi et al., 2015). Also, teachers with high degree of self-efficacy showed more commitment behaviors to school administration and teaching (Stein & Wang 1988). Azizifar et al. (2020) stated self-efficacy and empowerment have reciprocal relationship, indicating that both affect one another positively in a school environment. All in all, only collaborative decision making and shared participation of activities can contribute to the attainment of higher degree of self-efficacy and this highlights the importance of empowerment in the relations of all school dynamics.

#### **2.4.6. Impact**

Impact is described by Short (1992, p.12) as "teachers' perceptions that they have an effect and influence on school life". Personal opinion of teachers regarding their

existence at school determines whether they develop a positive thought and how contributory they are at school. Those who see themselves as a part of the institution adopt a dimensionive attitude and recognize their values and asset for the institution and they consider that they can be a part of the change in a positive way. With the recognition of their place and earned respect efficacy of teachers enhances and their productivity and impact on wider scale is reflected upon every unit of school specifically student achievement. In a study it was found that teacher efficacy was positively associated with student achievement in maths and reading score (Goddard et al., 200) Likewise, Moran & Barr (2010) found a significant relationship between collective teacher efficacy and student achievement in math, writing and English tests. The impact teachers provide in a school is not restricted to student achievement. When a positive self-image and perception of being as a teacher is created and the extent of contributions surpasses beyond students' achievement to communities and school climate. Empowered teachers and those trained as teacher leaders at the same time certainly take more initiatives and provide a wide spectrum impact touching and contributing to every outside classroom activity. It is for sure that empowering behaviors of principals to teachers and making them a part of running school will arouse a more powerful and increased sense of belonging feelings among teachers and they prefer to be held accountable in achievement of duties. Thus, their impact at school will expand remarkably and they will be more eager to take part in work-related tasks including administrative duties. Davis and Wilson (2000) reported that the more empowering behaviors were shown by the principals, the greater impact teachers show and feel to complete their tasks. Also, it was reported in the same study that teachers felt less strain and more motivated when they were given a space for taking responsibility and being involved in decisions of the school. Thus, the impact of teachers can only be enlarged by empowering them and given more initiatives and selections to choose to be able to reach a positive outcome for the benefit of all school units. Teacher leaders empowered by their principals are more likely to develop positive thought and commitment in return for their hard work in contrast to feeling isolated and abandoned in ambiguity and role conflict.

## 2.5 Organizational Commitment

The world has witnessed an amazing progress in almost every field over more than twenty years and in such rapidly growing and changing conditions, employees are affected significantly and their expectations from their workplace have been subject to change. There has been a growing body of literature examining the performance, satisfaction, well-being, burnout and commitment of workers to come up with an outcome and serve them better conditions at work. Their perception and critic of their workplace form an understanding and a viewpoint about how they regard their workplace in their mind. The workplace can become a stress source or a pleasure to be at for workers based on the conditions of environment. Also, interaction they establish with their colleagues and principals matters the most. Thus, organizational commitment of workers embodies a great importance and determinant factor in workers' perception of work environment and climate and this has been the subject of many studies since 1960 starting with Becker (1960). Becker (1960) described organizational commitment as a rise in voluntary contributions of members to the organizations and proposed his side bet theory to explain organizational commitment of workers.

This method was one of the first used to examine a thorough conceptual framework of organizational commitment from the standpoint of the interaction between the individual and the organization. Definition of commitment is as it follows “tendency to engage in “consistent lines of activity” by Becker (1960, p.33, as cited in Powel & Meyer, 2004). The involvement of workers within the organization enables them to make investment or side bets. Weibo et al. (2004) defined side bets as “the accumulation of investments valued by the individual”. Individuals have their hidden investments and continue to make the new ones, making them have to remain in the organization to be able to claim the side bets, and this increases their commitment and lower the turnover intention. The interaction established between a worker and the workplace lies within the expectations and investments outside workplace and this interaction determines the likelihood of a possible job leaving or strengthened bonds with the workplace. The positive attitude adopted by workers at workplace and the existence of claims and investments makes them feel a part of the organization and sustain their participation and membership. Otherwise, the job leaving or turnover of workers are imminent and a more secure way of protecting claims and investments is

aimed. Becker (1960) signaled the organizational commitment as the main predictor of job turnover and this has made the subsequent studies to be conceptualized in line with Becker's approach and concentrate on commitment behaviors and turnover. Becker's side bet theory has been adopted and incorporated into many multi-dimensional models of commitment theories since then. This was first tested by Ritzer and Trice (1969) measuring organizational commitment of workers by asking questions related to job leaving in return for some incentives.

The dimension of organizational commitment approached to psychological attachment to organization later years and it kept being associated with workers' turnover. It was defined with three distinct qualities by Porter et al. (1974) as powerful dedication to maintaining the organization's values and purposes, eagerness to engage in a lot of work for organization, and an immense desire to be continue to be the member of it. On their definitions of organizational commitment, Mowday et al. (1979) developed a 15-item scale to measure psychological attachment of workers and commitment was thought as the main predictor of turnover intention or job leaving. Rather than associating commitment with the claims and its pertaining perceived cost, Mowday et al. (1982) approached and considered commitment as emotional or affective attachment.

Moreover, O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) viewed organizational commitment as psychological attachment of workers to their organization. Every organization has their own dynamics and establishment. The way workers perceive their work environment depends on how they feel and approach to norms and activities of organization. Increased participation in the activities helps workers be more involved in the organization and this promotes internalization of policies at workplace. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) drew attention on how much workers internalized or adopts the traits and viewpoints of organization.

### **2.5.1. Attitudinal and Behavioral Approaches**

Kanter (1968) established the notion of attitudinal commitment by hypothesizing that participation with an organization had an influence on an individual's commitment to that organization. Meyer and Allen (1990) named this kind of commitment as affective commitment. The discussion about the difference between the attitudinal and

behavioral commitment has a long history in the literature and it started with the interpretation of Becker's side-bet theory tying the commitment of workers to outside investments (1960). In addition, Salancik (1977) also viewed commitment as binding to certain behavioral acts due to potential loss of valued assets. Thus, as stated by Mottaz (1989) investments leave no options for employees since the loss of investment has a cost and pressure and he referred to commitment as the degree individual perceives locked in the organization due to potential loss of investments. From this, workers feel attached to their organization due to their perceived cost and potential loss of it rather than a personal attachment or consideration of goals and values of the organization. Outside conditions or investments claimed pose implications in the behaviors of workers and tie the workers to remaining in the organization. Also, Weibo et al. (2010) viewed Becker's side-bet theory consistent with behavioral commitment rather than attitudinal as commitment was referred to as a consistent line of actions to be able to maintain membership in the organization in fear of losing investments. Meyer and Allen (1990) associated attitudinal commitment with the organization and workers, specifically their relationships. It is also concerning to what extent values and goals of workers are congruent with the organization while in the behavioral approach, attitudes as a consequence of behaviors determines the psychological state of workers and signals whether the behavior will occur again or not. Specifically, Mowday et al. (1982) considered the attitudinal approach as the psychological state of workers in line with the goals and values congruent with that of organization. Moreover, Mowday et al. (1982) supported that these approaches are reciprocally related. It indicates that commitment attitudes result in commitment behaviors strengthening commitment attitude. Likewise, commitment behaviors result in commitment attitudes reinforcing commitment behaviors. In addition, Meyer and Allen (1990) tried to incorporate both approaches and extend the psychological state from goals and values to desire and obligation to be able to explain a larger composition of commitment as a psychological state. Rather than considering these as types of commitment, they were proposed as components of commitment with a complementary relationship covering desire, need and obligation which explains not only job turnover but also other work behaviors.

### **2.5.2. Meyer and Allen's Three-component Model**

Among the arduous struggle to conceptualize and scale the organizational commitment, the three-component model proposed by Meyer and Allen (1990) distinctively affected the subsequent studies. Meyer and Allen defined commitment as three unique psychological states, each of which determines whether or not a person would stay in the organization. In this new interpretation of commitment, a new framework was proposed and added to these varied definitions of commitment. Meyer and Allen (1990) signaled that the measurement of commitment reflected upon at least three distinct states and based the new incorporation on affective attachment of workers to their organization, perceived cost of leaving, and obligation to continue membership. This framework and new concept of commitment was expanded upon affective, continuance and normative commitment by Meyer and Allen (1990) and each was reported as exclusive and might be felt by employees to different degrees and considered to have varying implications for job behavior.

#### **2.5.1.1. Affective Commitment**

Affective commitment constitutes emotional attachment, feelings of employees toward their organization, identification with and their involvement in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1990). According to Meyer and Herscovitch (2001), affective commitment is mostly derived from an individual's participation and identification with the organization. Individuals become self-driven or a part of a course of action as a result of this identity association and affiliation with the aims of the organization. Strong connections and positive feelings of teachers toward school makes a great difference in their perception of their work. The rise of tensions and problems at school are generally thought to stem from negative thought of teachers toward their profession as they see their environment as a source of problem. Powell and Meyer (2004) pointed out that affective commitment was considered to have the strongest positive impact on the occurrence of desirable and positive work behaviors such as attendance and performance before normative and continuance commitment. Thus, affective commitment demonstrates how individuals' attitudes toward their organization influence their contributions and investment.

### **2.5.1.2. Continuance Commitment**

Meyer and Allen (1990) presented the continuance dimension of this framework as a more accurate portrayal of Becker's side-bet theory, pointing out that commitment emerges and increases when employees have investments outside the organization. It was created to determine how committed employees are to their organizations based on the cost they perceive in case of job leaving. The possibility of losing assets or investments would be too much to tolerate for employees specifically when they are burdened economically and sustain a family. The fear of losing investments can be combined with the individual's lack of other career options additionally and this creates pressure and an obligation to remain in the organization. However, it was indicated by Allen and Meyer (1996) that continuance commitment was anticipated to have little or negative effect on desirable work behaviors as attendance and performance.

### **2.5.1.3. Normative Commitment**

In this dimension of the framework, Meyer and Allen (1990) proposed that employees develop a feeling of obligation to stay with the company and normative commitment reflects this obligation to continue employment. It was indicated that this psychological state may result from certain norms that the individual has adopted. Employees want to stay with the organization because of not the cost they are likely to lose in the event of a job leaving, but the internalized feelings toward the organization and this obligation makes them remain in the organization. The development of internalized norms of obligation to organization rise out of certain advantages from organization as well. Therefore, Meyer and Allen (1990) signaled that organization might provide some rewards in advance like paying college fee or providing job training and employees also develop normative commitment and feel in debt toward the organization and want to do something to pay this. Normative commitment was also shown to be significant and positively correlated with positive job behaviors after affective commitment.

## **2.6. Conclusion**

In this chapter, to be able to understand the dynamics of the administrative tasks of school and interaction of teachers with the other components of school environment, the other shareholders such as principals, colleagues and students were placed in the discussion. Teachers are displayed in the middle of constant struggle while being pressurized with lots of school duties. Teachers face numerous challenges at school while working to raise student accomplishment, and these challenges range from school administration to student behavior. As a result, teachers are severely impacted and begin to feel dissatisfied with their position at school, resulting in a decline in job satisfaction. As a result, the drop-out or retention rate of teachers has increased dramatically over time as these issues stay unaddressed and authorities turn ignorant of whether teachers feel burned-out or weary as a result of these issues. Besides, it is less likely that unsatisfied and discouraged instructors continue their professional life, resulting in a drop-in passion for the teaching profession and it is unreasonable to expect an improvement and increased willingness in a school environment where instructors are placed second and neglected. In this chapter, to reverse the stated negative conditions into positive and to place teachers at the center of decision-making mechanism, empowerment and commitment of teaches were investigated. Basing the investigation on the six aspects described by Short and Rinehart (1992) is the primary objective of this investigation. Impact, decision-making, status, autonomy, professional progress, and self-efficacy are the six proposed aspects and instructors at undergraduate English preparatory schools will participate in the study to unearth their empowerment level. To test organizational commitment of instructors, the three-component model proposed by Meyer and Allen (1990) will be applied. Meyer and Allen (1990) indicated that measuring commitment showed at least three separate stages and based the new incorporation on workers' affective attachment to their organization, perceived cost of leaving, and obligation to remain membership.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

This chapter introduces the reader the methods and procedures used to collect and process the data. It starts with the description of the research design, nature of the research, sampling of the study, data collection, tools, procedures and analysis.

#### **3.2. Research Design**

The following parts will define the research design of the study in detail.

##### **3.2.1. Nature of the Research**

This study is descriptive in nature. Descriptive studies seek to identify what occurs in the surveyed environment according to Trochim & Donnelly (2001). Thus, it depicts the situation at preparatory schools in terms of instructors' level of empowerment and commitment to their organizations. This study is quantitative study. The quantitative method examines the relationship between variables when there are large number of participants and the study consist of numerical data to answer the research questions (Yin, 2009). This study is also qualitative one. Qualitative research is a type of research design that aims to investigate and offer more profound understanding of real-world issues (Moser, A., & Korstjens, 2017). In the current study, the numerical data collected through the quantitative way were analyzed and interpreted and a profound understanding regarding empowerment and commitment of instructors was aimed to establish. A study that is both qualitative and quantitative is said to be a mixed-method research. According to Creswell (2003) mixed-method research designs are the integration of qualitative and quantitative designs in the collection and interpretation of data. This study also has the characteristics of a survey research. Pinsonneault and Kraemer (1993) described survey as a tool to collect wide range of information such as demographics, responses and opinions from a large group of participants. In the current study, the participants were sent e-mails and their demographic information and responses regarding their level of empowerment and commitment were collected.

### **3.2.2. Sampling of the Study**

The participants of this study were 182 undergraduate English preparatory school instructors employed in four state and five foundation universities. The participants were selected using the convenience sampling method. According to Saumure and Given (2008) convenience sampling is referred to the choosing participants of the study that are accessible to the researcher. 47 male and 135 female instructors from four state and five foundation universities participated in the study. 99 participants from the state universities and 83 from the foundation universities constituted 182 participants in total.

### **3.3. Data Collection**

The following parts will define data collection of the study in detail and it starts with data collection tools, data collection procedures and data analysis.

#### **3.3.1. Data Collection Tools**

The first scale was the School Participant Empowerment Scale developed by Short and Rinehart (1992) as a measure of teacher empowerment and it contained two parts. The first part elicited demographic information of the participants. The demographic information is considered as the antecedents of organizational commitment and teacher empowerment, and it bears a significant importance in the majority of studies in the field as there were found significant differences among participants in the aspects of demographics. The participants wrote their age, gender, tenure, teaching hours per week. Also, participants were asked to specify their university as foundation or state.

After submitting their demographic information, participants were later requested to fill in the second part with a five-point likert scale containing 38 statements. Instructors were asked to select their responses on a five-point Likert scale as “strongly disagree”, “disagree”, “neutral”, “agree”, “strongly agree”. It was aimed to measure the overall perception of teacher empowerment. The scale contained six dimensions that measure teacher empowerment. The first sub-scale is about decision-making which refers to participation of the teachers in decision-making process at school. The second sub-scale is elicited information about professional growth. Short (1992) described it as the characteristics of school that enables teachers to grow

professionally, learn continuously and expand their teaching skills by means of work life at school. Status was the third dimension of empowerment and it refers to “teacher perceptions that they have of professional respect and admiration from colleagues” (Short, 1992, p.10). Autonomy as the fourth dimension of the scale encompasses teachers’ control over their work life from selection of textbooks to instructional planning (Short, 1992). The fifth dimension of the scale is self-efficacy which refers to teachers’ perceptions about their abilities required in assisting students to promote learning and developing effectual programs (Short, 1992). The final dimension of the scale is identified as impact and it refers to personal opinions of teachers about their membership and influence at school.

The items measuring each dimension in the instrument are as follows.

Decision-making : 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 30, 33, 35, 37, 38

Professional growth : 2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 31

Status : 3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 34

Self-efficacy : 4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 32

Autonomy : 5, 11, 17, 23

Impact : 6, 12, 18, 24, 29, 36 (Short & Rinehart, 1992)

Internal consistency was tested using the coefficient alpha, and the following values were reported for each dimension:

involvement in decision-making,.89 ; possibilities for professional growth,.83 ; status,.86; self-efficacy,.84; autonomy,.81; impact,.82 (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Short & Rinehart, 1992).

The second scale was Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales - Revised developed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993). It consisted of one part, and it contained 18 statements. The surveyed instructors were asked to fill in their responses on a seven-point Likert scale as “strongly disagree”, “disagree”, “slightly disagree”, “neutral”, “slightly agree”, “agree”, “strongly agree”. The scale aimed to measure the overall perception of organizational commitment. There are three dimensions of the scale to measure commitment and they are reported as affective, continuance and normative. Meyer and Allen (1990) stated that the measurement of commitment would be at least three distinct states. Meyer and Allen (1990) based the new incorporation of commitment on affective attachment of workers to their organization, perceived cost of leaving, and obligation to continue membership.

The items and factors for the commitment instrument are given below.

Affective Commitment : 1, 6, 7 (R) , 11 (R), 12, 15 (R)

Continuance Commitment : 2, 5, 8, 10, 17, 18

Normative Commitment : 3 (R), 4, 9, 13, 14, 16

Reverse-keyed statements are identified by R and scored accordingly in the measurement. Internal consistency was tested using the coefficient alpha and for each dimension the values were reported as follows.

Affective commitment .85; Continuance commitment .79; Normative commitment .73 (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

### **3.3.2. Data Collection Procedures**

Participants were chosen by using convenient sampling method and sent an e-mail containing an introductory letter regarding the study. In the e mail, the following forms were attached : The Informed Consent Agreement, the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992) and Three-Component Model Employee Commitment Survey- Revised by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993). Also, the author of the current study contacted some instructors at other universities to request their colleagues at school to motivate their participation in the study.

### **3.4. Data Analysis**

The data from the surveyed population were gathered through the instruments and later were utilized for performing analysis on Statistical Package for Social Sciences (IBM SPSS 28 version). For the interpretation of the data, T- test, mean, One-way ANOVA), Post- Hoc Tukey HSD, frequency and Pearson correlation were applied.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

#### 4.1 Introduction

The data analysis for the whole study was completed in this chapter, and statistical analysis tables were presented. In the study, 182 English language instructors working at undergraduate English preparatory programs from foundation and state universities were selected to apply the instruments. Furthermore, a percentage analysis of the data was performed and is displayed in tables to represent the distribution of the responses provided by the participants. The descriptive statistical statistics are used to properly clarify each study issue. Aforementioned in the opening chapter, commitment and empowerment of the undergraduate English Language instructors were investigated through research questions according to age, gender, tenure, teaching hours per week and type of university.

#### 4.2 Findings

The tables related to each question were published and shown to highlight whether any significant difference was found in any scale factors and the whole scales.

The table below provides information on the demographic characteristics and professional attributes of instructors participating in the study.

**Table 4.1: Demographic Variables and Frequencies of the Participant**

		Frequency	Percent
Age	22-29	15	8.2
	30-39	88	48.4
	40-49	53	29.1
	50+	26	14.3
	Total	182	100.0

Gender	Male	47	25.8
	Female	135	74.2
	Total	182	100.0
Tenure	1-5 years	56	30.8
	6-10 years	23	12.6
	11-20 years	81	44.5
	20+	22	12.1
	Total	182	100.0
Weekly Teaching Hours	12-15 hours	38	20.9
	16-19 hours	43	23.6
	20-24 hours	89	48.9
	25 ve üzeri	12	6.6
	Total	182	100.0
Type of University	State	99	54.4
	foundation	83	45.6
	Total	182	100.0

The table 4.1. shows the distribution and about half of the total responses, are in the 30- to 39-year-old age range. The distribution points to a fairly even representation of various age groups. As of gender, the distribution indicates a clear majority of female respondents with 74.2%, constituting approximately three-quarters of the total. The tenure distribution illustrates a diverse range of experience levels, suggesting mix of both early-career and more experienced instructors. The majority of responders are educators who work 20–24 hours a week in the classroom and this information is very

critical for understanding the workload within the investigated group. Also, a relatively balanced distribution between state and foundation universities exists.

The table below shows the T-test results for TCM Employee Commitment Survey-Revised Average, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment.

**Table 4.2: T-test Results of Commitment Survey by Age**

		Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig.
Survey Average	Between	3.998	3	1.333	1.326	.267
	Within	178.821	178	1.005		
	Total	182.818	181			
Affective Commitment	Between	9.099	3	3.033	1.615	.188
	Within	334.353	178	1.878		
	Total	343.452	181			
Continuance Commitment	Between	13.697	3	4.566	3.438	.018
	Within	236.424	178	1.328		
	Total	250.122	181			
Normative Commitment	Between	12.837	3	4.279	2.349	.074
	Within	324.309	178	1.822		
	Total	337.146	181			

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The table 4.2. indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the groups for the survey Average, Affective Normative Commitment. according to 0.05 significance level excluding Continuance Commitment dimension in which groups were reported to significantly differ.

Post Hoc Tukey HSD was applied to analyze the differing groups in age.

**Table 4.3: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of Commitment Survey by Age**

Dependent Variable		(I) Age	(J)Age e	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Continuance Commitment Factor	Tukey HSD	22-29	30-39	-.42955	.32193	.542
			40-49	-.71950	.33706	.146
			50+	.07308	.37368	.997
	30-39	22-29	.42955	.32193	.542	
		40-49	-.28995	.20039	.472	
		50+	.50262	.25725	.210	
	40-49	22-29	.71950	.33706	.146	
		30-39	.28995	.20039	.472	
		50+	.79257*	.27595	.023	
	50+	22-29	-.07308	.37368	.997	
		30-39	-.50262	.25725	.210	
		40-49	-.79257*	.27595	.023	

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The table 4.3. indicates that only the instructors aged between 40-49 are significantly different from instructors aged 50 and more at the 0.05 significance level. The mean difference shows that the first has higher scores in continuance commitment dimension than the latter group, explaining that instructors at the age of 40-49 were reported to feel more committed in this dimension than their counterparts at the age of 50 and more.

The table 4.4. reached through Independent Sample Test shows that there is no statistically difference between groups according to the gender at the 0.05 significance level.

**Table 4.4:T-test Results of Commitment Survey by Gender**

		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Affective Commitment	Equal variances assumed	-1.779	180	.077	-.41250	.23192
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.745	77.605	.085	-.41250	.23641
Continuance Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.755	180	.451	.15054	.19933
	Equal variances not assumed	.740	77.483	.461	.15054	.20337
Normative Commitment	Equal variances assumed	-.510	180	.611	-.11802	.23162
	Equal variances not assumed	-.485	73.690	.629	-.11802	.24356
Survey Average	Equal variances assumed	-.742	180	.459	-.12651	.17042
	Equal variances not assumed	-.729	77.743	.468	-.12651	.17354

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The table 4.5. below shows One-Way ANOVA results of groups according to tenure.

**Table 4.5: One-Way ANOVA Results of Commitment Survey by Tenure**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Survey Average	Between Groups	15.664	3	5.221	5.560	.001

	Within Groups	167.154	178	.939		
	Total	182.818	181			
Affective Commitment	Between Groups	29.359	3	9.786	5.546	.001
	Within Groups	314.093	178	1.765		
	Total	343.452	181			
Continuance Commitment	Between Groups	23.213	3	7.738	6.070	<.001
	Within Groups	226.908	178	1.275		
	Total	250.122	181			
Normative Commitment	Between Groups	8.157	3	2.719	1.471	.224
	Within Groups	328.989	178	1.848		
	Total	337.146	181			

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The groups were found significantly differing from one another in survey average, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment excluding the Normative Commitment factor considering the significance level.

The table 4.6. shows the Post hoc Tukey HSD analysis conducted to be able to spot the differing groups in the mentioned factors, in terms of Survey Average and Affective and Continuance Commitment

**Table 4.6: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of Commitment Survey by Tenure**

Dependent Variable		(I) Tenure	(J) Tenure	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Survey Average	Tukey HSD	1-5	6-10	.00578	.24000	1.000

			11-20	-.62170*	.16841	.002
			20+	-.23467	.24383	.771
		6- 10	1-5	-.00578	.24000	1.000
			11-20	-.62748*	.22896	.034
			20+	-.24045	.28899	.839
		11-20	1-5	.62170*	.16841	.002
			6-10	.62748*	.22896	.034
			20+	.38703	.23298	.347
		20+	1-5	.23467	.24383	.771
			6-10	.24045	.28899	.839
			11-20	-.38703	.23298	.347
Affective Commitment	Tukey HSD	1-5	6-10	.53002	.32898	.375
			11-20	-.62081*	.23086	.039
			20+	-.04113	.33424	.999
		6-10	1-5	-.53002	.32898	.375
			11-20	-1.15083*	.31386	.002
			20+	-.57115	.39614	.475
		11-20	1-5	.62081*	.23086	.039
			6-10	1.15083*	.31386	.002
			20+	.57969	.31936	.270
		20+	1-5	.04113	.33424	.999
			6-10	.57115	.39614	.475
			11-20	-.57969	.31936	.270
Continuance Commitment	Tukey HSD	1-5	6-10	-.58566	.27962	.159
			11-20	-.82282*	.19622	<.001

	20+	-.32413	.28409	.665
6-10	1-5	.58566	.27962	.159
	11-20	-.23716	.26676	.811
	20+	.26153	.33670	.865
11-20	1-5	.82282*	.19622	<.001
	6-10	.23716	.26676	.811
	20+	.49869	.27144	.259
20+	1-5	.32413	.28409	.665
	6-10	-.26153	.33670	.865
	11-20	-.49869	.27144	.259

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The table 4.6. presents that instructors with 11-20 years of tenure were significantly differing from their counterparts with 1-5 and 6-10 years in survey average and Affective Commitment factor. In Continuance Commitment factor, the instructors with 11-20 years significantly differed from their counterparts having 1-5 years of tenure. In the total evaluation of the result, short-tenured instructors were found less committed than the medium-tenured instructors and specifically the ones with 11-20 years of tenure (medium-tenured) were found the most committed among all according to the mean scores.

The table 4.7. shows the One-Way ANOVA results of the commitment level of instructors according to their weekly teaching hours.

**Table 4.7: One-Way ANOVA Results of Commitment Survey by Weekly Teaching Hours**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Survey Average	Between Groups	3.673	3	1.224	1.216	.305

	Within Groups	179.145	178	1.006		
	Total	182.818	181			
Affective Commitment	Between Groups	16.642	3	5.547	3.021	.031
	Within Groups	326.811	178	1.836		
	Total	343.452	181			
Continuance Commitment	Between Groups	1.037	3	.346	.247	.863
	Within Groups	249.084	178	1.399		
	Total	250.122	181			
Normative Commitment	Between Groups	6.316	3	2.105	1.133	.337
	Within Groups	330.829	178	1.859		
	Total	337.146	181			

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The only statistically difference was reported in affective commitment dimension at the 0.05 significance level, while no significance difference was found in the other dimensions and the total score of the commitment survey.

The table 4.8. presents Post hoc Tukey HSD analysis performed in order to identify the distinct groups in affective commitment dimension according to weekly teaching hours.

**Table 4.8: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of Commitment Survey by Weekly Teaching Hours**

Dependent Variable	(I) Weekly Teaching Hours	(J) Weekly Teaching Hours	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
	12-15	16-19	.20685	.30169	.902

Affective Commitment	Tukey HSD		20-24	.71565*	.26257	.035
			25+	.56506	.44868	.590
		16-19	12-15	-.20685	.30169	.902
			20-24	.50880	.25165	.184
		20-24	25+	.35820	.44238	.850
			12-15	-.71565*	.26257	.035
		25 +	16-19	-.50880	.25165	.184
			25+	-.15059	.41669	.984
			12-15	-.56506	.44868	.590
			16-19	-.35820	.44238	.850
			20-24	.15059	.41669	.984

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The table 4.8. indicates that the instructors giving 12-15 teaching hours per week were found statistically differing from the ones with 20-24 hours at the 0.05 significance score and were reported more affectively committed to their institutions in terms of mean score difference among all tenure groups.

The table 4.9. presents T-test results of the instructors according to type of their university.

**Table 4.9: T-test Results of Commitment Survey by Type of University**

		t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Affective Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.254	180	.800	.05221	.20554
	Equal variances not assumed	.253	171.062	.801	.05221	.20648
	Equal variances assumed	3.543	180	<.001	.60089	.16962

Continuance Commitment	Equal variances not assumed	3.525	170.780	<.001	.60089	.17045
Normative Commitment	Equal variances assumed	-.062	180	.951	-.01266	.20368
	Equal variances not assumed	-.062	174.517	.951	-.01266	.20367
Survey Average	Equal variances assumed	1.439	180	.152	.21453	.14913
	Equal variances not assumed	1.428	168.753	.155	.21453	.15021

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The table 4.9. shows that continuance commitment factor was reported the only significantly differing one among groups. In the total score of the instrument, there was no reported significant difference.

The table 4.10. presents the descriptive stats and means scores of the instructors' commitment factor according to type of university

**Table 4.10: Descriptive Statistics of Commitment Survey by Type of University**

	Type of University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Affective Commitment	State	99	4.5000	1.34813	.13549
	Foundation	83	4.4478	1.41946	.15581
Continuance Commitment	State	99	4.5808	1.11050	.11161
	Foundation	83	3.9799	1.17373	.12883
Normative Commitment	State	99	3.8428	1.36873	.13756
	Foundation	83	3.8554	1.36838	.15020
Survey Average	State	99	4.3089	.96383	.09687
	Foundation	83	4.0944	1.04591	.11480

The table 4.10 shows that the total mean score of participants in the state universities is higher than that of ones in the foundation universities and it can be interpreted that instructors working at the state schools were found more committed to their institutions

in continuance dimension than their counterparts in the foundation universities. Instructors from both university types were found to have the lowest mean scores in normative commitment factor.

The table 4.11. shows the T-test results for School Participant Empowerment Scale and its dimensions according to age.

**Table 4.11: T-test Results of SPES by Age**

		Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig.
SPES Average	Between Groups	1.971	3	.657	2.163	.094
	Within Groups	54.075	178	.304		
	Total	56.046	181			
Decision making	Between Groups	3.135	3	1.045	1.879	.135
	Within Groups	98.958	178	.556		
	Total	102.093	181			
Professional growth	Between Groups	2.749	3	.916	1.522	.210
	Within Groups	107.177	178	.602		
	Total	109.926	181			
Status	Between Groups	.898	3	.299	1.240	.297
	Within Groups	42.991	178	.242		
	Total	43.889	181			
Self-efficacy	Between Groups	3.349	3	1.116	3.637	.014
	Within Groups	54.633	178	.307		
	Total	57.981	181			
Autonomy	Between Groups	1.207	3	.402	.538	.657
	Within Groups	133.101	178	.748		
	Total	134.308	181			
Impact	Between Groups	3.233	3	1.078	2.477	.063
	Within Groups	77.439	178	.435		
	Total	80.673	181			

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The table 4.11. presents that the only significantly differing dimension was found self-efficacy among groups while no statistically significant difference was reported for SPES Average and the other five dimensions according to age.

The table 4.12. shows the results of Post Hoc Tukey HSD employed to analyze the differing group in self-efficacy dimension according to age.

**Table 4.12: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of SPES by Age**

Dependent Variable		(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Self-efficacy	Tukey HSD	22-29	30-39	.43030*	.1547	.030
			40-49	.44465*	.1620	.034
			50+	.57949*	.1796	.008
		30-39	22-29	-.43030*	.1547	.030
			40-49	.01435	.0963	.999
			50+	.14918	.1236	.624
		40-49	22-29	-.44465*	.1620	.034
			30-39	-.01435	.0963	.999
			50+	.13483	.1326	.740
		50+	22-29	-.57949*	.1796	.008
			30-39	-.14918	.1236	.624
			40-49	-.13483	.1326	.740

The table 4.12. below shows that only the instructors aged between 22-29 are significantly different from the instructors from other age groups at the 0.05 significance level. This explains that the instructors at the age of 22-29 were reported to feel more empowered in self-efficacy factor than their counterparts from the other age groups.

The table 4.13. reached through Independent Sample Test shows that there is no statistically difference between groups according to the gender at the 0.05 significance level.

**Table 4.13: T-test Results of SPES by Gender**

		t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Decision making	Equal variances assumed	-1.039	180	.300	-.13218	.12717
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.001	75.255	.320	-.13218	.13201
Professional growth	Equal variances assumed	-1.258	180	.210	-.16580	.13177
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.116	66.430	.269	-.16580	.14859
Status	Equal variances assumed	-1.379	180	.170	-.11474	.08319
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.241	67.763	.219	-.11474	.09248
Self-efficacy	Equal variances assumed	-1.667	180	.097	-.15904	.09539
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.530	69.717	.131	-.15904	.10398
Autonomy	Equal variances assumed	-1.162	180	.247	-.16935	.14575
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.206	86.020	.231	-.16935	.14045
Impact	Equal variances assumed	-1.378	180	.170	-.15540	.11279
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.309	73.615	.194	-.15540	.11868
SPES Average	Equal variances assumed	-1.548	180	.123	-.14537	.09388
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.433	70.609	.156	-.14537	.10147

The table 4.14. shows One-Way ANOVA results of groups according to tenure.

**Table 4.14: One-Way ANOVA Results of SPES by Tenure**

		Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig.
SPES Average	Between	3.201	3	1.067	3.594	.015
	Within Groups	52.846	178	.297		
	Total	56.046	181			
Decision making	Between	4.349	3	1.450	2.640	.050
	Within Groups	97.744	178	.549		
	Total	102.09	181			
Professional growth	Between	4.161	3	1.387	2.334	.076
	Within Groups	105.76	178	.594		
	Total	109.92	181			
Status	Between	1.269	3	.423	1.766	.155
	Within Groups	42.620	178	.239		
	Total	43.889	181			
Self-efficacy	Between	2.046	3	.682	2.171	.093
	Within Groups	55.935	178	.314		
	Total	57.981	181			
Autonomy	Between	7.154	3	2.385	3.338	.021
	Within Groups	127.15	178	.714		
	Total	134.30	181			
Impact	Between	5.558	3	1.853	4.390	.005
	Within Groups	75.115	178	.422		
	Total	80.673	181			

According to the table 4.14. above, the groups differed significantly in the total score of empowerment scale alongside with decision-making, autonomy and impact factors according to 0.05 significance level.

The table 4.15. shows the results of Post hoc Tukey HSD analysis conducted for SPES Average, autonomy, impact and decision-making factors to reveal the differing groups.

**Table 4.15: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of SPES by Tenure**

Dependent Variable		(I) Tenure (year)	(J) Tenure (year)	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.
SPES Average	Tukey HSD	1-5	6-10	.23122	.13494	.320
			11-20	.03587	.09469	.981
			20+	.39546*	.13710	.023
		6-10	1-5	-.23122	.13494	.320
			11-20	-.19535	.12874	.429
			20+	.16424	.16249	.743
		11-20	1-5	-.03587	.09469	.981
			6-10	.19535	.12874	.429
			20+	.35959*	.13100	.033
		20+	1-5	-.39546*	.13710	.023
			6-10	-.16424	.16249	.743
			11-20	-.35959*	.13100	.033
Decision making	Tukey HSD	1-5	6-10	.14363	.18352	.862
			11-20	.04916	.12878	.981
			20+	.50090*	.18646	.039
		6-10	1-5	-.14363	.18352	.862
			11-20	-.09447	.17508	.949
			20+	.35727	.22099	.372
		11-20	1-5	-.04916	.12878	.981
			6-10	.09447	.17508	.949
			20+	.45174	.17816	.058
		20+	1-5	-.50090*	.18646	.039

			6-10	-.35727	.22099	.372
			11-20	-.45174	.17816	.058
Autonomy	Tukey HSD	1-5	6-10	.30066	.20932	.478
			11-20	.12715	.14689	.823
			20+	.64651*	.21267	.014
		6-10	1-5	-.30066	.20932	.478
			11-20	-.17351	.19969	.821
			20+	.34585	.25205	.518
		11-20	1-5	-.12715	.14689	.823
			6-10	.17351	.19969	.821
			20+	.51936	.20320	.055
		20+	1-5	-.64651*	.21267	.014
			6-10	-.34585	.25205	.518
			11-20	-.51936	.20320	.055
Impact	Tukey HSD	1-5	6-10	.21506	.16088	.541
			11-20	.08150	.11290	.888
			20+	.56981*	.16345	.003
		6-10	1-5	-.21506	.16088	.541
			11-20	-.13357	.15348	.820
			20+	.35474	.19372	.262
		11-20	1-5	-.08150	.11290	.888
			6-10	.13357	.15348	.820
			20+	.48831*	.15618	.011
		20+	1-5	-.56981*	.16345	.003
			6-10	-.35474	.19372	.262

	11-20	-.48831*	.15618	.011
--	-------	----------	--------	------

The table 4.15. above presents that according to SPES Average and impact factor instructors with 1-5 and 11-20 years of tenure were significantly different from their counterparts with 20+ years of tenure. In decision-making and autonomy factors, instructors with 1-5 years were found significantly different from the ones with 20+ years of tenure.

The table 4.16. below shows the One-Way ANOVA results of empowerment according to instructors' weekly teaching hours.

**Table 4.16: One-Way ANOVA Results of SPES by Weekly Teaching Hours**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
SPES Average	Between Groups	8.010	3	2.670	9.894	<.001
	Within Groups	48.036	178	.270		
	Total	56.046	181			
Decision making	Between Groups	15.721	3	5.240	10.800	<.001
	Within Groups	86.372	178	.485		
	Total	102.093	181			
Professional growth	Between Groups	17.039	3	5.680	10.884	<.001
	Within Groups	92.887	178	.522		
	Total	109.926	181			
Status	Between Groups	2.124	3	.708	3.017	.031
	Within Groups	41.765	178	.235		
	Total	43.889	181			
Self-efficacy	Between Groups	1.445	3	.482	1.517	.212
	Within Groups	56.536	178	.318		
	Total	57.981	181			

Autonomy	Between Groups	12.073	3	4.024	5.860	<.001
	Within Groups	122.235	178	.687		
	Total	134.308	181			
Impact	Between Groups	9.247	3	3.082	7.681	<.001
	Within Groups	71.426	178	.401		
	Total	80.673	181			

According to the table 4.16. above, groups differed significantly in total score of the instrument and almost all the factors of the instrument excluding self-efficacy factor at 0.05 significance level.

Post Hoc Tukey HSD analysis was performed in order to identify the distinct groups in SPES Average according to weekly teaching hours.

**Table 4.17: Post Hoc Tukey HSD Results of SPES by Weekly Teaching Hours**

Dependent Variable		(I) Weekly Teaching Hours	(J) Weekly Teaching Hours	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
SPES Average	Tukey HSD	12-15	16-19	.17765	.11566	.418
			20-24	.45498*	.10067	<.001
			25+	.69020*	.17202	<.001
		16-19	12-15	-.17765	.11566	.418
			20-24	.27733*	.09648	.023
			25+	.51255*	.16960	.015
		20-24	12-15	-.45498*	.10067	<.001
			16-19	-.27733*	.09648	.023
			25+	.23522	.15975	.456
		25+	12-15	-.69020*	.17202	<.001
			16-19	-.51255*	.16960	.015

	20-24	-.23522	.15975	.456
--	-------	---------	--------	------

The table 4.17. indicates that the instructors conducting 12-15 and 16-20 teaching hours per week were found statistically differing from their counterparts with 20-24 and 25+ hours according to 0.05 significance level and they were reported to feel more empowered at their current institutions regarding the mean score difference.

The table 4.18. below presents T-test results of the instructors' empowerment levels according to type of their university.

**Table 4.18: T-test Results of SPES by Type of University**

		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Decision making	Equal variances assumed	-6.167	180	<.001	-.62802	.10184
	Equal variances not assumed	-6.008	148.101	<.001	-.62802	.10453
Professional growth	Equal variances assumed	-2.923	180	.004	-.33212	.11364
	Equal variances not assumed	-2.841	145.476	.005	-.33212	.11690
Status	Equal variances assumed	-2.877	180	.005	-.20673	.07186
	Equal variances not assumed	-2.830	159.320	.005	-.20673	.07305
Self-efficacy	Equal variances assumed	-2.532	180	.012	-.21014	.08300
	Equal variances not assumed	-2.507	166.270	.013	-.21014	.08382
Autonomy	Equal variances assumed	-3.981	180	<.001	-.49069	.12324
	Equal variances not assumed	-3.947	167.262	<.001	-.49069	.12433

Impact	Equal variances assumed	-4.906	180	<.001	-.45909	.09357
	Equal variances not assumed	-4.836	161.549	<.001	-.45909	.09493
SPES Average	Equal variances assumed	-5.236	180	<.001	-.40505	.07736
	Equal variances not assumed	-5.112	150.643	<.001	-.40505	.07924

The table 4.18. above indicates that according to the type of university, in all the dimensions and total score of the instrument groups differed statistically different.

To be able to understand the differing group in the aforementioned dimensions and the total empowerment scale, the descriptive stats and means scores of the instructors' empowerment level were investigated and the results presented in the table 4.19.

**Table 4.19: Descriptive Statistics of SPES by Type of University**

<b>Group Statistics</b>					
	Type of University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Decision making	State	99	2.3412	.58219	.05851
	Foundation	83	2.9692	.78918	.08662
Professional growth	State	99	3.5354	.63900	.06422
	Foundation	83	3.8675	.88986	.09767
Status	State	99	4.0724	.43913	.04413
	Foundation	83	4.2791	.53032	.05821
Self-efficacy	State	99	3.8838	.52836	.05310
	Foundation	83	4.0940	.59088	.06486
Autonomy	State	99	2.7955	.78925	.07932
	Foundation	83	3.2861	.87228	.09575
Impact	State	99	3.4024	.57932	.05822

	Foundation	83	3.8614	.68314	.07498
SPES Average	State	99	3.2876	.44920	.04515
	Foundation	83	3.6927	.59330	.06512

The table 4.19. above presents the mean scores of instructors working at both state and foundation universities. It was found that instructors working at the foundation universities felt themselves more empowered in all the factors of the instrument and SPES average.

**Table 4.20: The Correlation Results between TCM Employee Commitment Survey-Revised and SPES**

		SPES Average	Decision making	Professional growth	Status	Self-efficacy	Autonomy	Impact	Commitment Survey Average	Affective commitment	Continuance commitment	Normative commitment
SPES Average	Pearson Correlation	1	.861**	.847**	.731**	.751**	.745**	.900**	.451**	.567**	-.057	.474**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.445	<.001
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
Decision making	Pearson Correlation	.861**	1	.662**	.399**	.430**	.719**	.706**	.374**	.453**	-.012	.381**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.868	<.001
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
Professional growth	Pearson Correlation	.847**	.662**	1	.621**	.600**	.530**	.679**	.502**	.617**	.008	.479**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.913	<.001
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
Status	Pearson Correlation	.731**	.399**	.621**	1	.746**	.380**	.669**	.335**	.396**	-.019	.357**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.801	<.001
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182

Self- efficacy	Pearson Correlation	.751**	.430**	.600**	.746**	1	.347**	.739**	.323**	.400**	-.055	.355**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.463	<.001
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
Autonom y	Pearson Correlation	.745**	.719**	.530**	.380**	.347**	1	.605**	.340**	.452**	-.104	.385**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	.161	<.001
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
Impact	Pearson Correlation	.900**	.706**	.679**	.669**	.739**	.605**	1	.309**	.429**	-.122	.354**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	.102	<.001
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
Commitm ent Survey Average	Pearson Correlation	.451**	.374**	.502**	.335**	.323**	.340**	.309**	1	.822**	.572**	.888**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
Affective commitm ent	Pearson Correlation	.567**	.453**	.617**	.396**	.400**	.452**	.429**	.822**	1	.114	.708**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		.125	<.001
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
Continua nce commitm ent	Pearson Correlation	-.057	-.012	.008	-.019	-.055	-.104	-.122	.572**	.114	1	.288**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.445	.868	.913	.801	.463	.161	.102	<.001	.125		<.001
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
Normativ e commitm ent	Pearson Correlation	.474**	.381**	.479**	.357**	.355**	.385**	.354**	.888**	.708**	.288**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	
	N	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 4.20. indicates the correlation results of the surveyed population. Moderately positive relationship was reported for SPES Average with the Commitment Survey and Affective and Normative Commitment. Also, decision making factor correlated almost strongly with autonomy and impact factors, while status was found positively correlated with self-efficacy. There is a strong positive association between the dimensions of teacher empowerment and the total teacher empowerment instrument.

Except for the continuance commitment factor, teacher empowerment was shown to contribute to the variability in organizational commitment as a whole and across nearly every of its components, and moderately positive relationship was reported. Among the empowerment factors, excluding the continuance commitment, professional growth was the highest positively correlated empowerment factor. Affective commitment factor was found moderately positively correlated with normative commitment unlike continuance commitment.



# CHAPTER V

## DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

### 5.1 Introduction

Organizational commitment and empowerment have been extensively researched in the domains of organizational psychology, human resource management and teaching fields as a vital component in understanding employee or teacher behaviors within an organization. Scholars have studied numerous elements that impact organizational commitment and empowerment, and age, gender, and university type have emerged as relevant variables with considerable variations. Through this thesis, it was aimed to investigate the current literature on organizational commitment and empowerment and see whether there are any notable differences based on demographics of the participants in terms of age, gender, tenure and university type, teaching hours.

### 5.2 Discussion

Age is a commonly reported element in connection to organizational commitment. According to research, various age groups may have varying levels of commitment to their organizations. For example, Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky (2002) revealed that older employees have greater levels of organizational commitment than their younger counterparts. This interpretation is often attributed to factors such as increased job tenure, greater investment in or outside the organization or an obligation to remain in the organization developed over time.

In our study, for the total scale result of organizational commitment, age did not significantly differ, yet two age groups display distinct levels of commitment in terms of continuance commitment within the surveyed population. Instructors aged 40-49 reported more committed to their university than their counterparts aged 50 and more. As continuance commitment refers to the fear of loss of gain such as income, prestige, status, social circle in case of a possible leave, it can be interpreted that the perceived costs of leaving the organization, such as the financial investment made in terms of time and effort are more for the instructors aged 40-49 probably due to some financial reasons, which needs to be further investigated.

In other studies, conducted to reveal relationship between age and organizational commitment, varying results emerged. In some studies, in consistent with this result, age was not found significantly differing among groups concerning organizational commitment (Anari, 2012; Garipağaoğlu, 2013). Also, a study on organizational commitment involving 125 instructors from 33 Pakistani universities revealed that age did not significantly differ and was unrelated to organizational commitment (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006). On the other hand, there are so many abundant studies emphasizing the positive relationship between age and organizational commitment, indicating that older workers or teachers are more committed to their organization. For example, a study was conducted through 860 secondary school teachers and it was aimed to reveal commitment difference of secondary school teachers and the older teachers were found to be more committed than the younger ones. (Shah & Mahmood, 2021). It could be explained that older people, particularly those who have been with a company for a long time, have a higher stake in the company as well as a longer history with it than younger or less experienced employees. In one study concerning organizational commitment of academicians, organizational commitment was found to have a significant relationship with the respondents' age and also the results pointed out that commitment increases in line with age (Khan et al., 2014). Some other studies also signaled the same relationship between age and organizational commitment. The following authors highlighted that the more experienced members of the organization are more committed to their places (Abdulla & Shaw, 1999; Kanchana and Panchanatham, 2012; Gökyer, 2018; Shah & Mahmood, 2021). However, in a study by Yücel and Bektaş (2012), younger teachers at secondary school level were reported to feel emotionally more attached to their school. Also, they identified their organization's problems as their own and express their desire to stay at the current organization for longer years. In the literature, there are very few studies examining this dimension of organizational commitment and its relation with age for undergraduate English language instructors. Our result shows consistency with the literature considering the total score of the instrument, but in terms of continuance commitment, age group differed significantly from the others.

In the result of empowerment with respect to age, the overall perceived empowerment of instructors was found no significantly different according to age of the respondents. However, it was reported that instructors aged 22-29 showed statistically significant

difference from all the other age groups in the self-efficacy factor, exhibiting that younger instructors with less teaching experience feel comparatively more empowered than their more experienced and elder ones. Bogler and Somech (2004) stated that teachers with greater degrees of self-efficacy participate in more organizational behaviors and teachers with high expectations of themselves to work efficiently and successfully in school will perform extracurricular activities and feel more committed to their school and the teaching profession. It is anticipated that teaching experience comes with age and when examining related studies in the field there are very contrasting ones depicting contradictory results in this regard. For example, 221 instructors working at undergraduate English Preparatory Schools in Turkey participated in a study to investigate self-efficacy. It was found that years of experience created a significant difference; however, the novice instructors with 1-5 years of experience scored lower than the experienced instructors; in contrary to this, age did not show a significant difference among groups (Taşçı, 2019). Also, 117 instructors working at undergraduate English Preparatory Schools in Turkey were involved in a study to investigate self-efficacy and it was found that work experience did not show a significant difference (Baş, 2010). Besides, in a study to investigate the relationship between general self-efficacy belief and burnout level among 174 Turkish academicians, it was found that age did not cause any significance difference in the general self-efficacy level (Sevindi, 2013). Leaving self-efficacy dimension of empowerment instrument aside, the insignificance of age in terms of teacher empowerment is supported with some other prior studies. For example, in a study conducted with 408 instructors in Mazandaran University in Iran, age was not found a significant demographic variable in teacher empowerment (Ghaemi & Sabokrouh, 2014). Also, 185 high school teachers from the United States were involved in a study to examine teacher empowerment and it was found that age was not a significant factor for varying teacher empowerment among teachers (Kirgan, 2010). On the other hand, there are other studies pointing out the other aspect of this issue. For example, a study investigated sense of empowerment of teachers at secondary school in Turkey and the research, conducted with 441 teachers revealed that age differed significantly among groups and teachers at 51 years of age and older perceived teacher empowerment more highly than younger teachers do. (Hıdıroğlu & Tanrıöğen, 2021). On the other hand, according to Erdem et al. (2014), younger instructors may feel more empowered since

they are more familiar with current teaching approaches and technology. These findings underline the need of considering the multifaceted character of teacher empowerment. Short and Rinehart (1992) underlined that age is a significant predictor of teacher empowerment. Thus, it is important to note that owing to the scarcity of studies concerning the conditions of instructors at undergraduate English preparatory schools, associated studies reinforcing or contrasting the results of this current study do not exist and some other related studies need to be referred to explain the degree of empowerment according to age.

The impact of gender on organizational commitment has also been a subject of interest and the results of the studies show a very contradictory point of view with regards to role and commitment and empowerment level of teachers in their institutions. In our study, no significant difference was found among undergraduate English instructors according to their gender. In consistent with our result, in the study of Dalgic (2014) with 11.690 teachers, gender was not found a significant predictor of organizational commitment of teachers. Also, according to Lambert et al. (2005) there was no significant relationship between gender and organizational commitment. In a study conducted in a vocational high school in Surabaya, professional commitment did not significantly differ by sex of teachers (İzzati et al., 2022). Besides, Meyer et al. (2002) stated that so many studies were conducted to reveal the relationship between organizational commitment and gender, but for most of them, there was not found any relationship. Varying results were found in the literature in expressing the association between organizational commitment and gender. For example, in one study by Zilli and Zahoor's (2012) study, a larger percentage of female school instructors generally reported a higher level of organizational commitment than their male counterparts in higher education. Also, another study was conducted through 860 secondary school teachers and it was aimed to reveal commitment difference of secondary school teachers and female teachers were found committed more than their male colleagues. Also, Tsui and Cheng (1999) revealed in their study that a strong correlation existed between teacher commitment and gender. Prior studies found that women tend to exhibit more commitment behaviors to their organization than men (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Singh & Billingsley, 1998). Some explanations might be advanced to explain why female instructors were found to be more committed to their organisation, yet the environment and other factors may play a role, and this may stem from their work

satisfaction or view of their profession. All in all, in our study no difference was found and this shows that every undergraduate English language instructor with different demographic characteristics shares the same level of organizational commitment.

In our study examining the empowerment and gender relationship, there is no significant difference, and this is consistent with some studies. For example, according to the study of Azizifar et al. (2020), Iranian English teachers did not significantly differ by gender. Also, Veisi et al. (2015) reported that there was no significant difference in empowerment level among Iranian English teachers with respect to gender. Another study investigated sense of empowerment of teachers at secondary school in Turkey and the research, conducted with 441 teachers revealed that gender was not significantly different. (Hıdıroğlu & Tanrıöğen, 2021). Also, an investigation of teacher empowerment was completed with 312 teachers in Northeast Tennessee and gender was not found statistically significant variable (Gardenhour 2008). Also, in a study conducted with 267 teachers from all type of schools in the United States to research the degree of empowerment, gender of the participant was not associated with perceived level of empowerment (Moran, 2015). In addition, 185 high school teachers from the United States were involved in a study to examine teacher empowerment and it was found that gender was not a significant factor for varying teacher empowerment among teachers (Kirgan, 2010). On the other hand, there are contrasting arguments and results. For example, in a study conducted with 408 instructors in Mazandaran University in Iran, gender was found a significant demographic variable in teacher empowerment and female teachers were found less empowered than their counterparts (Ghaemi & Sabokrouh, 2014). In consistent with this, female teachers working at universities were found less empowered than their male teachers (Rafique & Akhtar, 2020). Thus, although some research points to potential differences in gender in teacher empowerment, the results are not always overwhelming. Gender and teacher empowerment have a complicated relationship that can be impacted by a wide range of personal and environmental factors. However, it is noteworthy to point out that in this current research the lowest mean scores of the instrument were found in the decision-making and autonomy factors. Thus, the critical point of view must be developed to unearth the underlying reasons leading to instructors feeling disempowered and suffering from absence of autonomy at their institutions.

The evaluation of tenure of instructors with their organizational commitment was performed with the current study and it was found that the instructors with 11-20 years of tenure were significantly differing from their counterparts with 1-5 and 6-10 years in the total score of the instrument, affective commitment. This shows that the years the instructors have spent at school make a difference in their commitment level, explaining that medium-tenured instructors are more committed to their organizations than the short-tenured ones. According to Cohen (1993) the relation between organization commitment and tenure was strongest for the oldest tenure subgroups according to meta-analysis of organizational commitment in different time frames of employment. The result of the study is also in consistent with the general interpretation of organizational commitment with respect to long service at the same organization. For example, tenure was found a statistically significant effect on professional commitment for the teachers at vocational high schools, indicating that teachers with longer tenures showed greater levels of professional commitment (İzzati et al., 2022). Also, 120 college teachers in India participated in the study of organizational commitment and it was reported that teachers with more than six years of tenure were more committed to their institution than those with less than six years (Mohan & Kaur, 2014). Additionally, in the study conducted with 1017 high school teachers in Turkey it was found that teachers with long service at the school had more commitment to their organization in affective and continuance commitment factor (Karakus & Aslan 2009).

For the empowerment scale and its association with tenure of the instructors, it was found that the instructors with 1-5 years of tenure were found significantly different from 20+ years of tenure in the total scale of the instrument, decision-making, impact and autonomy. There are some studies reinforcing our result while there are also abundant of them contrasting our current study. For example, in his case study of two school districts Johnson (1992) revealed that according to correlation between years of experience and teacher empowerment as experience increased, positive teacher empowerment opinions tended to diminish. Also, 57 elementary teachers participated in an investigation of teacher empowerment and a negative correlation was found between teachers' years of experience and the empowerment sub-scale of professional growth and autonomy (Conway, 2001). Besides, in a study conducted with 151 high school teachers from Pennsylvania, the perception of teacher empowerment had a

statistically significant negative relationship with years in present position (Snyder, 1995). At the same time, some other studies exist in the field, pointing out insignificance relationship between tenure and empowerment (Kenny, 2002; Kirgan, 2010; Moran, 2015; Veisi et al., 2015). Also, the other studies examining teacher empowerment and tenure display the significance of tenure in empowerment level and highlighting the importance of time spent at school in feeling more empowered. For example, a study investigated sense of empowerment of teachers at secondary school in Turkey and the research, conducted with 441 teachers revealed that teachers with 6 or more years of service at their institutions felt more empowered than teachers with short tenure. (Hıdıroğlu & Tanrıöğen, 2021). Also, Aitken conducted a study of empowerment with 185 elementary teachers in Nevada and it was found that the years of experience was a very strong determinant of teachers' perceived levels of empowerment and when a teacher has more years of teaching experience, the teacher will be more empowered. (Aitken, 2006). According to the name whose contributions to the field are considered a lot, experience was significant predictors of empowerment (Short& Rinehart, 1992). Generally, it is thought that teachers spending more time at their institutions feel more empowered as they know the dynamics of their institutions in compared to younger colleagues. They are assumed to have the authority and confidence to make decisions that impact instruction and learning, as well as the opportunities to advance their careers and to influence student achievement However, our study showed contrasting outcome, leading to a thought that teachers with longer service or years of tenure at the institution may draw back from being a part of the decision-making process. Also, Synder (1995) considered that instructors with more service in their current roles regarded their principals as interfering with their professional judgement, resulting in a perception of reduced empowerment. (Snyder, 1995). This result of the current study might also be due to the perceived stress and discomfort of the instructors arising from the attitudes of their principals.

As for the teaching hours of the instructors and its variation in their level of organizational commitment, the instructors giving 12-15 teaching hours per week were found statistically differing from the ones with 20-24 hours in affective commitment factor. From the mean scores, it is concluded that the instructors teaching fewer hours per week are more affectively committed to their institutions than their counterparts with more workload of teaching hours. It is undeniable that heavy workload arising

from the too many teaching hours create too much responsibility and stress on the instructors. Being in an unending struggle to pace with the demands and needs of too many classes pose too much risk for their well-being and commitment. In a study conducted with 95 teachers from the UK it was found that there was a strong negative relationship between organizational commitment and job stress (Jepson & Forrest, 2006). Excessive workload and being in a rush to finish tasks on time intensify the development of negative thoughts towards the perception of their profession and it leads to reduced attachment and reduced positive feelings. Also, it is known that heavy workload, long working hours and intensive pressure from completing tasks create too much stress on teachers (Travers & Cooper, 1997). This is in line with the findings of Nart and Batur (2014) pointing out that job stress causes a negative effect on organizational commitment of the 266 primary school teachers in Turkey. There are some other studies in an effort to emphasize the significant effect of workload on organizational commitment. For example, 233 academicians took part in a study to investigate the relationship between affective commitment and workload, and the results showed that affective commitment is significantly impacted by workload (Keçeci et al., 2022). Additionally, 64 lecturers from Hang Tuah University in Surabaya participated in a study and it was aimed to reveal the relationship between organizational commitment of lecturers and their workload. It was found workload has significant effect on organizational commitment (Fitriana, 2022). It is anticipated a negative relationship between affective commitment and workload. In particular, the instructors may view an excessive workload as an unfavorable circumstance arising from insufficiency in the number of academic staff or a source of pressure imposed by their principals or their authoritative figure. Low levels of affective commitment are likely to result from these unfavorable principal evaluations. On the other hand, there are some contradictory studies proving the insignificance of teaching hours or the workload for the varying commitment of the instructors. For example, in a study conducted in Malatya with 217 teachers from private schools, organizational commitment scores of teachers did not differ in their weekly teaching hours (Demirtas, 2010). All in all, for overall effectiveness and success of educational institutions, committed teachers make a difference in student achievement. Workload and teaching hours seem to be key determinants in instructors' lives and their approach to their positions, yet higher teaching hours increases workload bringing myriad of

responsibilities, including lesson planning, administrative tasks, grading, and this definitely undermines instructors' enthusiasm and make them tend to develop diminished organizational commitment. It is sure that instructors who are dealing with a heavy workload as a result of longer teaching hours may doubt their loyalty to an organization that appears to prioritize their well-being and work-life balance less.

With regards to empowerment levels of the instructors according to their teaching hours, the instructors conducting 12-15 and 16-20 teaching hours per week were found statistically differing from their counterparts with 20-24 and 25+ hours explaining that teachers delivering less hours feel more empowered at their current institutions. It is known that workload is a serious burden on instructors at schools and the more it worsens, the busier the program of them progresses to. The instructors who are kept aside and held accountable only for delivering lessons start to feel alienated from the decision-making mechanism of the school. In this current study, as seen, the instructors delivering the lowest hours at their institution feel more empowered, autonomy of their decisions and a part of this collaborative work environment. A comprehensive body of literature point out that workload not only leads to a fall in the job performance but also gives way to teacher retention (Heffernan et al., 2022; Torres, 2016). In the situation where instructors are burdened with excessive teaching hours and left outside and disempowered in decisions of teaching, they developed a negative perspective towards the institution and their profession. In this sense, Short and Rinehart (1992) stated that teachers had very little say and involvement in the decision-making process, despite the fact that they were expected to participate in the evaluation and decision-making of content and teaching practice, and he complained about decision-making being centralized at the district level rather than the local school level. In a study 100 academicians from India participated in, it was found that they were unhappy with increased workload in the form of non-teaching activities as administrative tasks in addition to 12 hours of lesson and requested more space allowed (Rasheed, 2010). As understood from the current result of the study, the instructors with less hours feel more a part of the collaborative work at their universities. As Short & Rinehart (1992) stated teachers who have a degree of autonomy in decision-making, curriculum development, and classroom management tend to feel more empowered (Short & Rinehart, 1992). Thus, rather than holding instructors accountable only with workload as a result of excessive teaching hours, they must be involved in decision making

mechanism of their teaching practices to ensure a more dimensionive, collaborative and more empowered teaching environment. It is certain that all instructors will be glad to find a pleasant teaching atmosphere in which they are solicited for their opinions and feel valued as an addition to the school rather than being considered as the conductor of the submitted program.

In the current study, with respect to the relationship between type of university and organizational commitment of the instructors, no varying group emerged in the total score of the instrument, yet for continuance commitment, the instructors at the state universities were found significantly differing and more committed to their organizations than their counterparts in the foundation universities. In consistent with the result of the total scale, 218 academicians from state and foundation universities participated in a study and it was found that there is no significant difference between the variable of university type (Doğan & Aydın, 2012). However, there come some contrasting results from the schools at lower levels. For instance, in an investigation of 150 instructors from private and public schools, it was shown that private school teachers were more committed than public school teachers. (Khan, 2015). Also, EFL teachers in private schools were found more committed and more higher professionalism than the teachers at state schools (Fazlali, 2023). However, these results arise from differing backgrounds and are hard to compare with the results of the current study and there are not found any other studies in the field supporting or contrasting the results of this current study. As far as the result of the continuance commitment dimension is concerned, the instructors at the state universities were found more committed to their organizations than their counterparts in the foundation universities. Allen and Meyer (1990) proposed the continuance commitment as a more appropriate representation of Becker's side-bet theory, arguing that commitment begins and grows when employees have investments outside of the organization. It was designed to assess how committed employees are to their organization based on the perceived cost of quitting the job. The risk of losing investments, along with the individual's lack of alternative professional alternatives, produces pressure and an obligation to remain in their organizations. Also, Meyer et al. (2012) stated that continuance commitment was thought to have the weakest positive influence on the occurrence of desired and good work behaviors such as attendance and performance. From this, it can be interpreted that the instructors at the state universities are

committed to their organizations more because they may fear a possible leaving of their positions will jeopardize their investments outside their organizations. In this regard, opposite but in the same direction to our study, Garipağaoğlu (2013) conducted a study with the teachers at private schools and the teachers scored the lowest on the normative commitment sub-scale and the highest on the continuance commitment sub-scale, the same as the findings of this current study for the state university instructors, showing that their commitment to their school is primarily motivated by the expenses involved with quitting the organisation. According to Garipağaoğlu (2013), if given the opportunity, the instructors may take a more competitive offer from a rival and leave their existing position. A positive side is that affective commitment score of the instructors at the state university is as high as continuance commitment which is interpreted as an advantage for the state universities, signaling that the instructors developed emotional attachment and a sense of commitment at the same time.

As for the empowerment level of the instructors and its relationship with type of university, in both the total evaluation of the instrument and all the factors of the instrument, the instructors at the foundation universities differed from their colleagues at the state universities and they were found more empowered in all the dimensions of the instrument and SPES average. There has been a shortage of research that precisely investigate how school type effects teacher empowerment, but from this result, it can be interpreted that the instructors at the foundation universities are more involved in their decision-making or perceive themselves to have more influence or in decision-making processes. Foundation universities may enable teachers to enjoy greater autonomy in designing and implementing their curriculum and have a more saying to design their teaching practices and it may lead them to have more initiatives to make a change that directly affects their teaching practices. Though it is not clear, it is significantly likely that as a result of the leadership practices in place and the existing organizational culture the absence of autonomy may play a role in the reduced empowerment of the instructors in the state universities. Thus, to reach a more comprehensive and conclusive evaluation of this condition, further studies are in need.

In the current study, the correlation findings between the instruments indicate that empowerment of the instructors correlated moderately positive with their affective commitment and the total commitment survey. Among the empowerment factors,

excluding the continuance commitment, professional growth was the highest positively correlated empowerment factor. Also, there is a strong positive association between the sub-scales of teacher empowerment and the total teacher empowerment instrument. In line with our study, 321 teachers from Virginia participated in the investigation of teacher empowerment and organizational commitment. Teacher empowerment explained the most variation in affective organizational commitment, implying that empowerment promotes and develops teachers' relationship to the school where they work more than the other commitment components. Professional development was identified as an essential dimension that generated the highest variance in all measures of organizational commitment (Keiser, 2007). Aliakbari and Amoli (2016) conducted a study with EFL teachers at university in Iran and reported that the six dimensions of decision making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact played a significant role in teacher commitment. Also, 247 private university academics were involved in a study and it was found that a significant relationship between empowerment and commitment exists (Choong et al., 2012). Besides, 1103 secondary level school teachers in Pakistan participated in a study to examine the relationship between organizational commitment and empowerment and a positive relationship was found according to the results (Muhammad & Chaudhary, 2020). Additionally, among the variables used in a study conducted with 2203 teachers from Indonesia, teacher empowerment was found to be the most significant point affecting teacher commitment and performance, while supervision was noted as the weakest affecting one. (Muttakin et al., 2023). So many other studies also signal the positive effects of empowerment on development of organizational commitment (Boudouaia et al., 2024; Gretkierewicz, 2020; Muttaqin et al., 2023; Oo & Myint, 2020; Opige, 2014). As for the effect of professional growth on the organizational commitment, Bogler and Somech (2004) and Wu and Short (1996) reported that among the six subscales of empowerment, professional growth, was significant predictor of organizational professional commitment. With respect to the relationship among the factors of the teacher empowerment scale, in line with the current study, 415 teachers working at universities in Pakistan participated in a study and revealed that there is a strong positive association between the dimensions of teacher empowerment and total teacher empowerment (Rafique & Akhtar, 2020).

### **5.3. Suggestions for Further Studies**

The study aims to provide an understanding for the instructors employed at undergraduate English Preparatory Schools and their empowerment and organizational commitment level was examined to be able to shed light on their existing conditions. As organizational commitment is the critical for the educational achievements and a positive school climate, it needs to be fostered and promoted. The absence of commitment poses too many risks for every unit of school and leads to development of negative thoughts towards the school and specifically students. The rise of negative approach directly affects teachers' performance and they start to feel themselves as a passive piece of the whole and they prefer to alienate all the school-related work. This undoubtedly creates some other negative thoughts regarding the perception of teachers toward their own competency and profession. Thereby, in this study, it is understood that empowerment and organizational commitment are closely interrelated terms and form a basis for one another. The demographic variables play a major role in the understanding of the variations in degree of empowerment and commitment of the participants and the significance of these variables were aimed to comprehensively be explained to promote this understanding further. As there are very few studies investigating the conditions at undergraduate English Preparatory School in Turkey, for future studies and for a thorough grasp of the variations in the degree of empowerment and commitment there, principal leadership and behaviors, administrative roles and principal perceptions of the instructors must be topic of studies as it would be of great help and value to unearth the dynamic relationship between administrators and the instructors. As clear, empowerment is directly in the hands of the principal in charge and the way the school is administered makes a difference, such topics as principal attitudes, behaviors, support, motivation, performance, management and interpersonal skills would directly make a change in the promoting empowerment; accordingly, affecting the degree of organizational commitment of instructors. Thus, for future studies, principal must be the main unit of studies for a complete understanding of the issue.

#### **5.4. Conclusions**

This study is of a great contribution to enlighten the significance of organizational commitment and empowerment for the instructors at Undergraduate English Preparatory Schools as there are very little research in this field investigating this surveyed population. From this study, it is understood that instructors at the age of 40-49 (medium-aged) were reported to feel more committed in continuance commitment than their counterparts at the age of 50+. While gender does not play a role in variation in organizational commitment, it was reported short-tenured instructors are less committed than the long and medium-tenured instructors and specifically the ones with 11-20 years of tenure (medium-tenured) were found the most committed in the total instrument and affective commitment factor. As for teaching hours, the instructors delivering 12-15 hours of lesson were found significantly different from and more affectively committed than the instructors teaching more hours (20-24 hours). For the type of university, the instructors working at the state schools were found significantly differing and more committed to their institutions in continuance factor than their counterparts in the foundation universities. As for the results of empowerment, the instructors at the age of 22-29 were reported to feel more empowered in self-efficacy factor than their counterparts from the other age groups while for the total instrument no significant difference was found. The instructors showed no difference by gender, but the instructors with 1-5 years of tenure reported difference from the instructors with 20+ years of tenure in the total empowerment instrument, decision-making, impact and autonomy factors. Importantly, the instructors teaching less hours (12-15) per week were found significantly differing from the ones with 20-24 or 25+ hours and they were feeling more empowered at their workplaces. Additionally, it was found that the instructors working at the foundation universities felt themselves more empowered in all the factors of the instrument and SPES average. Finally, empowerment of the instructors correlated moderately positive with their affective commitment and the total commitment survey score. Among the empowerment factors, excluding the continuance commitment, professional growth was the highest positively correlated empowerment factor.

## REFERENCES

- Abdulla, M. H., & Shaw, J. D. (1999). Personal factors and organizational commitment: Main and interactive effects in the United Arab Emirates. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 77-93.
- Ahrari, S., Roslan, S., Zaremohzzabieh, Z., Mohd Rasdi, R., & Abu Samah, A. (2021). Relationship between teacher empowerment and job satisfaction: A Meta-Analytic path analysis. *Cogent Education*, 8(1), 1898737.
- Aitken, F. B. (2006). The effects of perceived teacher empowerment on student achievement.
- Alghaswyneh, S. A. (2012). *Teacher stress among Tawjihi teachers in Jordan and their adopted coping strategies to reduce stress* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Huddersfield).
- Aliakbari, M., & Amoli, F. A. (2016). The effects of teacher empowerment on teacher commitment and student achievement. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(4), 649.
- Alibakhshi, G., Nikdel, F., & Labbafi, A. (2020). Exploring the consequences of teachers' self-efficacy: a case of teachers of English as a foreign language. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1), 1-19.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- Anari, N. N. (2012). Teachers: emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of workplace Learning*, 24(4), 256-269.
- Azizifar, A., Naghipour, S., Mohamadian, F., Veisani, Y., Cheraghi, F., & Aibod, S. (2020). Investigating the relationship between iranian EFL teachers' empowerment and their self-efficacy as a consequence for their educational improvement. *Journal of education and health promotion*, 9.

- Bakırcı, B. (2012). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarında çalışan öğretmenleri etkileyen örgütsel stres kaynakları nelerdir (Edirne İli Örneği)* (Master's thesis, Trakya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*: New York: Freedom and Company.
- Baş, G. (2010). *An examination of the perceived self-efficacy levels of efl teachers at preparatory departments of universities in Turkey* (Master's thesis, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32-40.
- Burkhauser, S. (2017). How much do school principals matter when it comes to teacher working conditions?. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 39(1), 126-145.
- Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and teacher education*, 20(3), 277-289.
- Bolin, F. (2007). A study of teacher job satisfaction and factors that influence it. *Chinese Education & Society*, 40(5), 47-64.
- Bota, O. A. (2013). Job satisfaction of teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 83, 634-638
- Boudouaia, A., Miqdad, K., AL-Qadri, A. H., Saraa, N., Belmamoune, S., Bariu Ntorukiri, T., ... & Mouissi, M. (2024). The effect of empowerment on English language teachers' commitment to schools: the mediation of teachers' attitudes towards curriculum reform. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1-16.
- Briley, B. L. (2004). *Teachers as leaders: A case study of teacher leadership development*. Auburn University.
- Caprara, G. V., & Steca, P. (2006). The contribution of self-regulatory efficacy beliefs in managing affect and family relationships to positive thinking and hedonic balance. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 25(6), 603-627.

- Choong, Y. O., Wong, K. L., & Lau, T. C. (2012). Organizational commitment: An empirical investigation on the academicians of Malaysian private universities. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 3(2), 51-64.
- Chughtai, A. A., & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers. *Applied HRM research*, 11(1), 39.
- Clarke, D., & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and teacher education*, 18(8), 947-967.
- Cohen, A. (1993). Age and tenure in relation to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. *Basic and applied social psychology*, 14(2), 143-159.
- Conway, P. R. (2001). *The relationship among teacher empowerment, teacher beliefs, teacher demographics, and second grade reading achievement*. University of Missouri-Columbia.
- Cox, T., Boot, N., & Cox, S. (1989). Stress in schools: a Problem solving approach. *Stress and Teaching, Milton Keynes: Open University Publications*.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dalgic, G. (2014). A meta-analysis: Exploring the effects of gender on organisational commitment of teachers. *Issues in Educational Research*, 24(2), 133-151.
- Dampson, D. G. (2019). Empowering Teachers in Ghanaian Basic Schools: Prospects and Challenges. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 3(1), 1-11.
- Demirtas, H. (2010). The Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction among Teachers Working at Private Courses. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education (INUJFE)*, 11(2).
- Dogan, S., & Aydin, B. (2012). The relationship between organizational value and organizational commitment in public and private Universities. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(6), 2107.
- Dunham, J. (2002). *Stress in teaching*. Routledge.

- Dhuey, E., & Smith, J. (2014). How important are school principals in the production of student achievement? *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique*, 47(2), 634-663.
- Eells, R. J. (2011). *Meta-analysis of the relationship between collective teacher efficacy and student achievement* (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University Chicago).
- Erdem, M., İlğan, A., & Uçar, H. İ. (2014). Relationship between learning organization and job satisfaction of primary school teachers. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(1), 8-20.
- Fazlali, F. (2023). Examining the Status of Professionalism and Organizational Commitment among English Teachers. *Teacher Professional Development*, 8(1), 65-84.
- Fimian, M. J. (1982). What is teacher stress?. *The Clearing House*, 56(3), 101-105.
- Fisher, M. H. (2011). Factors influencing stress, burnout, and retention of secondary teachers. *Current issues in education*, 14(1).
- Fitriana, R. (2022). The Effect of Workload and Autonomy on Organizational Commitment with Job Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in Permanent Lecturers at Hang Tuah University Surabaya. *Kontigensi: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 10(2), 320-332.
- Freeman, A. (1989). Coping and SEN: Challenging idealism. *Teaching and stress*, 48-68.
- Gardenhour, C. (2008). *Teachers' perceptions of empowerment in their work environments as measured by the Psychological Empowerment Instrument* (Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University).
- Garipağaoğlu, Ç. B., (2013). Examining Organizational Commitment Of Private School Teachers. *Journal of Educational & Instructional Studies in the World*, 3(2).
- Ghaemi, F., & Sabokrouh, F. (2014). Teacher empowerment and its relationship to job satisfaction: A case study in mazandaran university. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 5(2), 287-298.

- Gholami, L. (2015). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 60, 83-86.
- Guarino, C. M., Santibanez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of educational research*, 76(2), 173-208.
- Guglielmi, R. S., & Tatrow, K. (1998). Occupational stress, burnout, and health in teachers: A methodological and theoretical analysis. *Review of educational research*, 68(1), 61-99.
- Geiger, T., & Pivovarova, M. (2018). The effects of working conditions on teacher retention. *Teachers and Teaching*, 24(6), 604-625.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American educational research journal*, 37(2), 479-507.
- Gökyer, N. (2018). Organizational Commitment of High School Teachers. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(n3a), 115-125.
- Gretkierewicz, K. G. (2020). *Relationships of empowerment and experience with organizational commitment in Arizona middle school teachers* (Doctoral dissertation, Grand Canyon University).
- Hatcher, R. (2005). The distribution of leadership and power in schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26(2), 253-267.
- Heffernan, A., Bright, D., Kim, M., Longmuir, F., & Magyar, B. (2022). 'I cannot sustain the workload and the emotional toll': Reasons behind Australian teachers' intentions to leave the profession. *Australian Journal of Education*, 66(2), 196-209.
- Hıdıroğlu, Y. Ö., & Tanrıöğen, A. (2021). Examining teachers' perceptions on empowerment according to various variables. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 11(1), 127-146.
- Hickey, W. D., & Harris, S. (2005). Improved professional development through teacher leadership. *The Rural Educator*, 26(2).

- Izzati, U. A., Nurchayati, N., Lolita, Y., & Mulyana, O. P. (2022). Professional commitment in terms of gender and tenure of vocational high school teachers. *IJORER: International Journal of Recent Educational Research*, 3(2), 135-146.
- Jepson, E., & Forrest, S. (2006). Individual contributory factors in teacher stress: The role of achievement striving and occupational commitment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(1), 183-197.
- Johari, J., Tan, F. Y., & Zulkarnain, Z. I. T. (2018). Autonomy, workload, work-life balance and job performance among teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(1), 107-120.
- Johnson, C. D. (1992). *Teachers' perceptions of teacher empowerment: A case study of two school districts*. Wayne State University.
- Kanchana, P. N., & Panchanatham, N. (2012). The influence of demographic factors on organizational commitment. *International Journal of Exclusive Management Research*, 2(5), 1-13.
- Karakuş, M., & Aslan, B. (2009). Teachers' commitment focuses: a three-dimensioned view. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(5), 425-438.
- Karasek Jr, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative science quarterly*, 285-308.
- Kaya, C. (2019). *An Investigation of Teachers' Stress Sources & Stress Coping Styles* (Master Dissertation, Bursa Uludag University (Turkey)).
- Keçeci, M., Küçükkelçi, D. T., & Allaham, M. V. (2022). The Mediating Role of Affective Commitment and Job Satisfaction Between Workload and Intention to Stay: The Case of a Private University. *Journal of Academic Value Studies*, 8(4).
- Keiser, C. M. (2007). *The relationship between teacher empowerment and organizational commitment*. ProQuest.
- Kenny, E. L. L. (2002). *Special education teachers' attitudes and perceptions regarding teacher empowerment*. University of Northern Colorado.

- Khan, I., Nawaz, A., Khan, S., Khan, F., Khan, S., & Yar, N. B. (2014). The impact of organizational commitment (OC) on the intention to leave (ITL) among the academicians in higher educational institutions (HEIs) in Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 243-254.
- Khan, S. (2015). Organizational commitment among public and private school teachers. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(3), 65-73.
- Kirgan, B. G. (2010). *The correlation between teacher empowerment and principal leadership behaviors in high schools*. Capella University.
- Klassen, R. M., & Tze, V. M. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Educational research review*, 12, 59-76.
- Kokkinos, C. M. (2007). Job stressors, personality and burnout in primary school teachers. *British journal of educational psychology*, 77(1), 229-243.
- Knoepfel, R. C., & Rinehart, J. S. (2008). Student achievement and principal quality: Explaining the relationship. *Journal of School Leadership*, 18(5), 501-527.
- Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1977). Teacher stress: A review. *Educational review*, 29(4), 299-306.
- Kyriacou, C., & Chien, P. Y. (2004). Teacher stress in Taiwanese primary schools. *The Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 5(2).
- Lambert, E., Edwards, C., Camp, S., & Saylor, W. (2005). Here today, gone tomorrow, back again the next day: Absenteeism and its antecedents among federal correctional staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 165-175.
- Lintner, J. D. (2008). *The relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power*. Auburn University.
- Litt, M. D., & Turk, D. C. (1985). Sources of stress and dissatisfaction in experienced high school teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 78(3), 178-185.
- Maas, J., Schoch, S., Scholz, U., Rackow, P., Schüler, J., Wegner, M., & Keller, R. (2021). Teachers' perceived time pressure, emotional exhaustion and the role of social support from the school principal. *Social Psychology of Education*, 24, 441-464.

- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 171.
- Mehta, S. (2012). Job satisfaction among teachers. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(2), 54.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(4), 538.
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human resource management review*, 11(3), 299-326.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 61(1), 20-52.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L. J., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2012). Employee commitment in context: The nature and implication of commitment profiles. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 80(1), 1-16.
- Mohan, V., & Kaur, M. (2014). Effect of work motivation and tenure on organizational commitment of college teachers in India. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 12(2), 17.
- Moran, K. A. (2015). *Teacher empowerment: School administrators leading teachers to lead*. Youngstown State University.
- Moser, A., & Korstjens, I. (2017). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 1: Introduction. *European Journal of General Practice*, 23(1), 271-273.
- Motallebzadeh, K., Ashraf, H., & Yazdi, M. T. (2014). On the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' burnout and self-efficacy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1255-1262.
- Mottaz, C. J. (1989). An analysis of the relationship between attitudinal commitment and behavioral commitment. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 30(1), 143-158.

- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior, 14*(2), 224-247.
- Muhammad, N., & Chaudhary, A. H. (2020). Relationship of Teachers' Empowerment and Organizational Commitment at Secondary School Level in Punjab. *Bulletin of Education and Research, 42*(2), 69-80.
- Muttaqin, I., Tursina, N., Sudrajat, A., Yuliza, U., Novianto, N., Ramadhan, F. F., & Kurnanto, M. E. (2023). The effect of academic supervision, managerial competence, and teacher empowerment on teacher performance: the mediating role of teacher commitment. *F1000Research, 12*.
- Nart, S., & Batur, O. (2014). The relation between work-family conflict, job stress, organizational commitment and job performance: A study on Turkish primary teachers. *European journal of research on Education, 2*(2), 72-81.
- Ngussa, B. M., & Gabriel, L. (2017). Participation in decision making and teachers' commitment: a comparative study between public and private secondary schools in Arusha Municipality, Tanzania. *American Journal of Educational Research, 5*(7), 801-807.
- Oo, M., & Myint, K. T. (2020). *The relationship between teacher empowerment and organizational commitment* (Doctoral dissertation, MERAL Portal).
- Opige, J. O. (2014). *The effect of empowerment on commitment of teachers in private primary schools in Nairobi city county, Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- 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.
- Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Educational research quarterly, 29*(1), 38-54.
- Perryman, J., & Calvert, G. (2020). What motivates people to teach, and why do they leave? Accountability, performativity and teacher retention. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 68*(1), 3-23.

- Powell, D. M., & Meyer, J. P. (2004). Side-bet theory and the three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 65(1), 157-177.
- Rasheed, M. I., Aslam, H. D., & Sarwar, S. (2010). Motivational issues for teachers in higher education: A critical case of IUB. *Journal of management research*, 2(2), 1.
- Rafique, A., & Akhtar, M. M. S. (2020). Effect of demographic variables of university teachers on their perceived teacher empowerment. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 42(3), 241-256.
- Ritzer, G., & Trice, H. M. (1969). An empirical study of Howard Becker's side-bet theory. *Social forces*, 475-478.
- Salancik, G. R. (1977). Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. *New directions in organizational behavior*, 1, 54.
- Saumure, K., & Given, L. M. (2008). Convenience sample. *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*, 2, 124-125.
- Sevindi, T. (2013). The relationship between general self-efficacy belief and burnout level among Turkish academicians. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8(24), 2255.
- Shah, N. H., & Mahmood, A. (2021). Organizational Commitment of Secondary School Teachers: A Comparative analysis of Gender, Age, Rural and Urban Schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 24(1), 54.
- Shahzad, K., & Naureen, S. (2017). Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy on Secondary School Students' Academic Achievement. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 4(1), 48-72.
- Short, P. M. (1992). Teacher empowerment and school climate. (ERIC Document: ED347678)
- Singh, K., & Billingsley, B. S. (1998). Professional support and its effects on teachers' commitment. *The journal of educational research*, 91(4), 229-239.

- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of educational psychology*, 99(3), 611.
- Sprague, J. (1992). Critical perspectives on teacher empowerment. *Communication Education*, 41(2), 181-203.
- Stein, M. K., & Wang, M. C. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. *Teaching and teacher education*, 4(2), 171-187.
- Snyder, P. E. (1995). *Relationships between attributed conflict resolution styles of principals, teacher empowerment, and teacher job satisfaction*. The Pennsylvania State University.
- Taşçı, Ç. (2019). A multivariable examination of the relationships between EFL instructors' self-efficacy beliefs and motivation in higher education.
- Torres, A. C. (2016). Is this work sustainable? Teacher turnover and perceptions of workload in charter management organizations. *Urban Education*, 51(8), 891-914.
- Travers, C. (2001). Stress in teaching: past, present, and future: in J. Dunham. *Stress in the workplace, past, Present, and future*, 130-162.
- Travers, C. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1993). Mental health, job satisfaction and occupational stress among UK teachers. *Work & Stress*, 7(3), 203-219.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Barr, M. (2004). Fostering student learning: The relationship of collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. *Leadership and policy in schools*, 3(3), 189-209.
- Tsui, K. T., & Cheng, Y. C. (1999). School organizational health and teacher commitment: A contingency study with multi-level analysis. *Educational research and evaluation*, 5(3), 249-268.
- Van Dick, R., & Wagner, U. (2001). Stress and strain in teaching: A structural equation approach. *British journal of educational psychology*, 71(2), 243-259.

- Veisi, S., Azizifar, A., Gowhary, H., & Jamalinesari, A. (2015). The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' empowerment and teachers' self-efficacy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 185, 437-445.
- WeiBo, Z., Kaur, S., & Jun, W. (2010). New development of organizational commitment: A critical review (1960-2009). *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(1), 12.
- Wu, V., & Short, P. M. (1996). The relationship of empowerment to teacher job commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 23(1), 85.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (Vol. 5). sage.
- Yucel, I., & Bektas, C. (2012). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and demographic characteristics among teachers in Turkey: Younger is better?. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 1598-1608.
- Zilli, A. S., & Zahoor, Z. (2012). Organizational commitment among male and female higher education teachers. *Indian Journal of Psychology and Education*, 2(1), 55-60.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A

#### *Demographic Information*

*Please select your information by putting "X"*

**Gender :**     Male .....

                  Female .....

**Age :**        22-29 .....

                  30-39 .....

                  40-49 .....

                  50+ .....

#### **How long have you worked in your current school?**

1-5 years .....

6-10 years .....

11-20 years .....

20 and more .....

#### **How many hours per week do you teach?**

12-15 .....

16-19 .....

20-24 .....

25 and more .....

#### **What is the type of your university?**

State .....

Foundation .....

### School Participants Empowerment Scale

The following statements describe the degree to which you are involved in your work environment. Mark the response that best reflects the degree to which the statement applies to you.

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>1. I am given the responsibility to monitor programs.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>2. I function in a professional environment.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>3. I believe that I have earned respect.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>4. I believe that I am helping kids become independent learners.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>5. I have control over daily schedules.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>6. I believe that I have the ability to get things done.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>7. I make decisions about the implementation of new programs in the school.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>8. I am treated as a professional.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>9. I believe that I am very effective.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> | <p>10. I believe that I am empowering students.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>11. I am able to teach as I choose.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>12. I participate in staff development.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>13. I make decisions about the selection of other teachers for my school.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>14. I have the opportunity for professional growth.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>15. I have the respect of my colleagues.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>16. I feel that I am involved in an important program for children.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>17. I have the freedom to make decisions on what is taught.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> <p>18. I believe that I am having an impact.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤</p> |
|--|--|

19. I am involved in school budget decisions.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
20. I work at a school where kids come first.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
21. I have the support and respect of my colleagues.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
22. I see students learn.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
23. I make decisions about curriculum.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
24. I am a decision maker.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
25. I am given the opportunity to teach other teachers.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
26. I am given the opportunity to continue learning.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
27. I have a strong knowledge base in the areas in which I teach.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
28. I believe that I have the opportunity to grow by working daily with students.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
29. I perceive that I have the opportunity to influence others.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
30. I can determine my own schedule.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
31. I have the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers in my school.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
32. I perceive that I make a difference.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
33. Principals, other teachers, and school personnel solicit my advice.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
34. I believe that I am good at what I do.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
35. I can plan my own schedule.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
36. I perceive that I have an impact on other teachers and students.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
37. My advice is solicited by others.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤
38. I have an opportunity to teach other teachers about innovative ideas.  
① ② ③ ④ ⑤

(Short & Rinehart 1992)

## Appendix B

### Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales (Revised)

The following statements describe the degree of attachment and loyalty you feel to the school in which you currently work. Mark the response that best reflects the degree to which the statement applies to you.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Slightly Disagree	4 Neutral	5 Slightly Agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	---------------------------	--------------	------------------------	------------	------------------------

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this school.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>2. It would be very hard for me to leave my school right now, even if I wanted to.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>3. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current school.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>4. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my school now.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>5. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my school right now.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> | <p>10. I believe that I have too few options to consider leaving this school.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>11. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this school.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>12. This school has a great deal of personal meaning to me.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>13. This school deserves my loyalty.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>14. I would not leave my school right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>15. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my school.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> |
| <p>6. I really feel as if this school's problems are my own.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>7. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my school.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>8. Right now, staying with my school is a matter of necessity as much as desire.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>9. I would feel guilty if I left my school now.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p>   | <p>16. I owe a great deal to my school.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>17. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this school is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice; another school may not match the overall benefits I have here.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p> <p>18. If I had not already put so much of myself into this school, I might consider working elsewhere.<br/>① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦</p>   |

(Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993)

## Appendix C



[www.farabicongress.org](http://www.farabicongress.org)

## CURRICULUM VITAE

### PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name: Cihan
Last Name: Kaya
Address: İstanbul
Email Address:

### EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

Göl Anatolian Teacher Training High School	<b>Dates:</b>	September, 2000- June, 2004
BA: Middle East Technical University -Foreign Language Education	<b>Dates:</b>	June, 2008
MA: Uludağ University – Educational Sciences	<b>Dates:</b>	September, 2019
MA: İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University – English Language Teaching	<b>Dates:</b>	April, 2024
Certificate of Attendance: “Leadership and Entrepreneurship (Norway)”	<b>Dates:</b>	March, 2011

Certificate of Attendance: “Creative Teaching English to Adults (Lake School of English / Oxford)	<b>Dates:</b>	July, 2013
--	---------------	------------

### WORK EXPERIENCE

Workplace	Dates Worked		Job Title and Details
	from	to	
Mount Olympus Amusement Park (Wisconsin / USA)	June- 2007	September 2007	Sales Assistant
Middle East Technical University / Faculty of Education	2007	2008	Computer Maintenance Technical Support Assistant
Kıyık İlköğretim Okulu (Muş)	2008	2010	English Language Teacher
Hasip Dinçsoy İlköğretim Okulu (İstanbul)	2010	2011	English Language Teacher
İstanbul Technical University / School of Foreign Languages	2011	ongoing	English Language Instructor