

## The Effect of Organizational Support on Organizational Commitment

Yüksel Gündüz

*Artvin Çoruh University, College of Education, Department of Educational Sciences,  
08000, Artvin, Turkey  
Telephone: 90 535553 7910, E-mail: gunduz@artvin.edu.tr*

**KEYWORDS** Teacher. Personal Development. Work Structure. School. Gender

**ABSTRACT** This research examines the effect of organizational support for teachers on their organizational commitment. The data was collected from 819 primary school teachers in seven cities from every geographical regions of Turkey. In the research, the two scales administered are “Perceived Organizational Support Scale (POSS)” and “Teachers’ Organizational Commitment Scale (TOCS)”. The results reveal that teachers perceive organizational support and organizational commitment at a moderate level. While teachers’ organizational commitment perceptions differentiate in terms of gender, experience, reward and education level variables, their organizational support perceptions differentiate in terms of experience and reward variables. It shows that the more teachers’ organizational support perceptions increase, the higher their commitment perceptions are. While organizational support perceptions towards “personal development” have a low influence on the dependent variable, organizational support perceptions towards “work structure” have a negative influence on the dependent variable.

### INTRODUCTION

Human resources are the most important sources to run any organization in the process of reaching its goals and objectives effectively. Having this, they should accept and adapt organizational goals and principles to create commitment and continue it in the long term. However, it is important in the competitive world of work it is difficult to make both the individuals and workers committed for their work. It is a crucial issue to make qualified staff work by using their knowledge for the organization as committed ones. This is related to the word “organizational commitment”.

Here, staff’s success is related to their commitment feelings towards their organizations. It is not an easy fact to create organizational commitment as it has been claimed so. Creating such process for the sake of both the staff and the organization in accordance with organizational goals has many considerations but at this point, organizations should search ways to make the staff committed and to supporting them as well.

There are many critical variables that play roles in creating organizational commitment feeling described as strong will to accept organizational goals, values. According to a view, in order for anyone to stay voluntarily in an organization by working in full capacity as a member, the most important variable is organizational

support. Organizations should support their workers in multiple ways to keep them in their structures and benefit from their performances. It is known that supported employees have tendency to think positively about their organizations. When they keep motivated staff in their organizations and benefit from them effectively, they have a chance to survive and become successful. Organizations that support their staff positively can benefit from their knowledge and skills. By doing so, they may also have a chance to create organizational commitment because committed staff is supposed to have higher feeling of responsibility in terms of performance, task and roles comparing those who are not.

The present study purposes to analyse and examine organizational support and commitment concepts that are considered to have influences on employee’s behaviours in many ways. In this respect, organizational support and commitment concepts are defined, then their effects on them are explained and relevantly concerned literature is analysed.

### Organizational Support

One of the basic elements of organizational commitment is organizational support. It is defined as one’s contribution to one’s organization and its recognition by the organization. It is also considered as one’s perceptions about the

organization (Hellman et al. 2006). Employees want support by their organizations as supported ones might use their knowledge and skills at top level to be beneficial for their organizations. Besides, as long as their expectations are met in their organization, they work more to meet organizational goals (Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002). Meeting staff expectations, benefits and appreciate their efforts may lead them to produce their positive efforts towards the organization. In addition, the value that organization gives to the employees may indicate that they are accepted and wanted there. As a result of this feeling, they work more towards organizational goals (Demircan and Yildiz 2009).

Further, organizational support provides safety for the employees. This is important as this feeling causes them to consider that their organization stands behind them. As a result, high organizational support can lead to effectiveness and productivity for any organization (Eisenberger et al. 1997). Accepting the employees as assets caring about their happiness and hinting it all the time in an organization will affect their emotional relationships with the organizations (Eisenberger et al. 1986). Thus, a strong and positive tie may have been established between the employees and the organization. However, the organization meets the needs of belonging, approval and respect feelings of the staff by understanding their contributions to the organization and by stating being happy with working with them (Armeli et al. 1998). The staffs who perceive this support may be more committed to their work and they are expected to work hard to pay for it (Howes et al. 2000).

There are some factors that play important roles to provide organizational support. Out of these roles, compliance support, financial support and career support are major ones (Kraimer and Wayne 2004). Here, while compliance support shapes adaptation to work and facilities, financial support means financial needs mainly rewards, salary. Finally, career support is related to career needs of the staff. It can be understood from this that staff have expectations in many ways. However, making the work significant and interesting may be added to these expectations (Aube et al. 2007).

It is considered that many things have been done to increase organizational commitment in organizations. One of them is providing organizational support which should be done by pro-

viding supportive practices according to the structure of the work and employees' personal developments. Next, another one is team work which creates a positive feeling on employees' behaviours. Further, perceiving trust in teams and social support by the employees has direct influences on organizational commitment feeling (Greenberg and Baron 2003). A further step is employees' participation in decision making process. It is believed that the employees who participate in decisions have a tendency to establish strong ties with their organizations (Dewettinck et al. 2003). Thus, the employees can consider themselves as important parts of an organization. They also improve and increase feeling of commitment towards their organization.

Organizational support is comprised of three principles (Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002). The first of them is reciprocity. According to reciprocity principle, organizational support that is provided by an organization can lead to emotional necessity of the staff. The second principle is meeting the employees' social needs, leading the staff to close dialogue and providing role status for all the employees fairly. The third principle is strengthening staff beliefs about organizational rewards and promoting performance in a fair way. This way, perceived organizational support can be developed well in time. It is established by creating healthy interactions with their organizations. Thus, it arises as the employees' good organizational perception levels towards their organizations (Demircan Cakar and Yildiz 2009). To meet the purpose, organizations should offer organizational support for their employees considering their happiness and well-beings (Eisenberger et al. 1986). Though, there are studies that indicate that teachers are supported by their organizations (Nartgun-Sezgin and Kalay 2014; Egriboyun 2014) and it's true that such situations have positive reflections on teachers as well.

Many researches were conducted on organizational commitment (Allen, Shore and Griffeth 2003; Aselage and Eisenberger 2003; Egriboyun 2014; Polatci et al. 2014; Iplik et al. 2014; Florence and Vandenberghe 2003; Fuller et al. 2003; Liden and Arad 1996). One of the benefits of organizational support is that it strengthens organizational commitment (Christopher 1994). Another positive result of organizational support is that it strengthens feelings of responsibility (Wayne et al. 1997). According to these

researches, the stronger the perceived organizational support is, the higher the responsibility for reaching organizational goals are (Aselage and Eisenberger 2003). There are many studies producing similar results on organizational support (Makanjee et al. 2006). Thus, as long as the organizational support increases, the level of responsibility for performing work rises (Hutchison 1997). Further, it is claimed that organizational support increases the employees' efforts (Johlke et al. 2002). In some researches, it is shown that those with high organizational support perceptions develop strong psychological commitment state (Van Knippenberg and Sleebos 2006). Taking all these into consideration, when education process is concerned, organizational support increases teachers' performance and productivity over standards.

### **Organizational Commitment**

Northcraft and Neale (1996) investigated that commitment is an attitude reflecting an employee's loyalty to the organization, and an ongoing process through which organization members express their concern for the organization and its continued success and well-being.

It is an individual's desire to remain focused and attached to his work and measured through three tools. These are affective, continuance and normative commitment (Meyer and Allen 1991; Dunham et al. 1994). Northcraft and Neale (1996) further stated that organizational commitment is determined by a number of factors, including personal factors (for example age, tenure in the organization, disposition, internal or external control attributions); organizational factors (job design and the leadership style of one's supervisor); non-organizational factors (availability of alternatives).

A wide variety of definitions and measure of organizational commitment exist. Becker et al. (1995), Batemen and Strasser (1984), Mowday et al. (1982) define the term in three dimensions: a) a strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization; b) a willingness to exert high levels of efforts on behalf of the organization; c) a define belief in and acceptability of the values and goals of the organization.

Dornstein and Matalon (1998) describe eight variables that are relevant to organizational commitment. These are interesting work, co-worker's attitudes towards the organization, organi-

zational dependency, age, education, employment alternatives, attitude of family and friends. Balay (1999) defines organizational commitment as influenced leadership, culture, values and norms subsequently.

Avolio et al. (2004) have suggested a link between transformational leadership and organizational commitment, which involves promoting organizational values related to achieving organizational goals as well as places an emphasis on the commitment of both leaders and followers to accomplishing the organization's mission and vision. Some studies prove that the level of organizational commitment among teachers is moderate (Atik and Ustuner 2014) and some claimed it to be at high level (Aslan and Agiroglu-Bakir 2014).

One of the objectives and the most important one is organizational commitment, because it leads staff to self-devotion at the highest level (Katz and Kahm 1977). Balci (2003) added that it leads the employees' coherence at work, productivity, higher sense of responsibility and less cost for organizations.

It is considered that the more committed the employee is, the higher performance they exert for work. Besides, highly committed employees wish to remain associated with the organization and advance organizational goals, and are therefore, less likely to leave (Armsrtong 1998: Baugh and Roberts 1994; Day et al. 2005; Meyer et al. 1993; Tayyah and Tariq 2001; Nehmeh 2009; Polatci et al. 2014). Further, Guest (1991) concludes that high organizational commitment is associated with lower turnover and absence, but there is no clear link to performance.

According to some researchers, teachers who have a high commitment show high performance and it affects students' achievement and attitudes towards educational facilities and staying at school positively (Day et al. 2005: Troman and Raggl 2008). Numerous studies indicated that teacher commitment is a critical predictor for teachers' work performance and the quality of education (Dee et al. 2006).

Troman and Raggl (2008) indicate five elements that increase organizational commitment. These are; interpersonal relations, service theme, school support that helps them continue to their work, time, convenience and financial benefits. Having good relation with teachers and sustaining it important for them. They also wish organizational and financial support whenever they need.

Results that were obtained from the research conducted in educational field in many different organizations generally reveal that organizational support has positive influence on organizational commitment (Allen et al. 2003; Bishop et al. 2000; Cheung and Law 2008; Jeongkoo and Thye 2002; Kaplan and Ogut 2012; Kose and Gonulluoglu 2010; Ozdevecioglu 2003; Piercy et al. 2006; Turunc and Celik 2010). Having this, it is considered that organizational support for teachers might have positive influence on their organizational commitment as well.

### Problem Statement

Further, the present study purposes to discover if organizational support affects teachers' organizational commitment. Independent variable of this study is "perceived organizational support", and dependent variable is "organizational commitment". Even though there are numerous researches conducted to find out if organizational support affects staff organizational commitment, no study has been conducted on its effects on primary school teachers' commitment feelings. It is also aimed to discover if their views differ regarding their gender, professional experience, education and educational rewards.

### Research Questions

1. What are the general views of primary school teachers about organizational support and commitment?
2. Do their views differ regarding their gender, professional experience, education and educational rewards significantly?
3. What is the level of influence of organizational support for teachers on their organizational commitment?

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

As the purpose of the study is to discover if organizational support affects teachers' organizational commitment, it employs the correlational research method. This method is used to reach a decision on the population which consists many in number. It is possible to get a group or a sample which is considered to represent the general population (Karasar 2009).

### Population and Sampling

The population of this research is 17489 primary school teachers from seven cities in seven geographical regions of Turkey in 2011-2012 school years. They were from Marmara Region (Istanbul, Bagcilar (3172) and Bahcelievler (2100), South East Region (Gaziantep, Nizip (1019) and Sahinbey (4360), Eastern Region (Igdir, City Center (785), Eagean Region (Izmir, Konak (935) and Buca (853), Black Sea Region (Trabzon, City Center (1835), Mediteranean Region (Antalya, Muratpasa (905) and Kepez (1082) and Central Anatolia Region (Konya, Cihanbeyli (333) and Altinekin (120).

The sampling of the study consisted of 819 teachers out of this population. It was determined with a formula based on sampling range theory (Balci 2009). According to this formula, % 5 of the population (382) was determined out of the population of 100.000 people. As the population comprised of 17.489 teachers, 819 participants composed of sampling of this study. In this sampling, the cities and townships from different regions were determined with draw.

### Instrument

In the study, three different instruments were administered. The first one is the questionnaire forms structured by the researcher himself to collect demographic data about teachers. There were four questions regarding the participants' their gender, professional experience, education and educational rewards. The other two instruments were, "Perceived Organizational Support Scale (POSS)" and "Teachers' Organizational Commitment Scale (TOCS)".

### *Perceived Organizational Support Scale (POSS)*

The second instrument of this study is Perceived Organizational Support Scale (POSS) developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986). It was adapted into Turkish by Selcuk (2003). It has 15 items below two factors. The first factor is "Personal Development" which has 9 items (1,2,3,4, 5,6,7,8,11) and it explains 26.77% of it. Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of this subscale was discovered as 0,85.

The second factor is "Work structure" which explains 24.41% of it. It has 6 items (9,10,12,

13,14,15) and Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of this subscale was discovered as 0.82. Some of the items were reversed in this subscale (6,7,9,10,11, 12,13,14 and 15). This two-factor structure explains 51% of total variance. The scale was a 5-point Likert one ranging from "Never" to "Most" with a midpoint of nature 3. Internal consistency of the Perceived Organizational Support Scale" was calculated in two ways and Cronbach Alpha Reliability was found as .80 in total. Cronbach Alpha Reliability was discovered as .69 for Personal Development sub dimension and 0.81 for Work structure sub dimension.

As a result of item analysis made here, it is significant at .001 level for all results statistically. Results reveal that all items of the scale are reliable. These results verify Selcuk's (2003) results partially. The Cronbach Alpha Reliability was found slightly lower than the original scale. However, it produced similar results in the second sub dimension.

#### ***Teachers' Organizational Commitment Scale (TOCS)***

The third instrument of the research is "Teachers' Organizational Commitment Scale (TOCS)" developed by Ustuner (2009). It has 17 items under one dimension. Reliability statistics of the scale were done. Cronbach Alpha Reliability was discovered as .96. The scale was administered on 29 teachers with 2 weeks intervals. Pearson Correlation coefficient was found as " $r=.88$ " as a result of two applications. Analysis reveals that this scale is reliable.

The scale was also a 5-point Likert one ranging from "Never" to "Most" with a midpoint of nature 3. Therefore, the lowest point that can be taken is 17 and the highest is 85. While the highest point shows high organizational commitment, the lowest point reveals low commitment. Internal consistency of the Teachers' Organizational Commitment Scale was calculated in two ways and Cronbach Alpha Reliability was found as .94 in total. Cronbach Alpha Reliability was discovered as .69 for Personal Development sub dimension and 0.81 for Work structure sub dimension. As a result of item remain analysis made here, it is significant at .001 level for all results statistically. Results reveal that all the items of the scale are reliable. This verifies Ustuner's (2009) work. Permissions were taken for both scales.

#### **Data Collection**

Data were gathered with the help of polltakers. During the data collection process, teachers were consented by providing an appropriate place and time. The questionnaires were collected on the same day when they were delivered.

#### **Data Analysis**

In the study, first, the data were analysed with frequency and percentage. In the second phase, complimentary statistical values of sub dimension Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers and Perceived Organizational Support Scale were done and then commented.

T-test and one-way ANOVA analysis were made to discover the differences according to categorical independent variables of both scales and then it was commented afterwards. Finally, multi-regression analysis was done, and then Pearson coefficient moments were determined for independent variables and its effects on it for both scales. All the statistical tests were tested in two ways and significance level was accepted ,5 level. In order to analyse the data, SPSS was used.

### **FINDINGS**

Demographic variables of the sample group of 819 people with whom the research was carried out are shown all together in Table 1.

About 51.2 % of the teachers forming the sample are male and 48.8% are female. When looked at the distribution of teachers, it's seen that the teachers with 11-15 years' seniority take the first place with 25.5%. They're followed by teachers with 6-10 years seniority ranked second with 20.1%. Teachers with 16-20 years' seniority are represented by 16.1 % ones with 1-5 years' seniority are represented by 15.8% and ones with 26 years' and more are represented by 13.9% in this study. As for the seniority variable, teachers with 21-25 years' seniority take the last place (8.5%). 79.4 % of the teachers have four-year bachelor's degree. They're followed by teachers having an associate degree with 12.5%. Teachers having postgraduate and doctoral education are in the last place with 7%. While 53.5% of teachers forming the study group have been awarded in their professions, 46.5% have never been awarded.

**Table 1: Frequency and percentage distribution of teachers according to demographic variables**

| Demographic variables  | Category          | F   | %     |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------|
| Gender                 | Female            | 400 | 48.8  |
|                        | Male              | 419 | 51.2  |
| Professional Seniority | 1-5 years         | 129 | 15.8  |
|                        | 6-10 years        | 165 | 20.1  |
|                        | 11-15 years       | 209 | 25.5  |
|                        | 16-20 years       | 132 | 16.1  |
|                        | 21-25 years       | 70  | 8.5   |
|                        | 26 years and more | 114 | 13.9  |
|                        | Associate degree  | 102 | 12.5  |
| Educational Status     | Bachelor's degree | 650 | 79.4  |
|                        | Master's degree   | 57  | 7.0   |
|                        | Unanswered        | 10  | 1.2   |
| Award Status           | Yes               | 438 | 53.5  |
|                        | No                | 381 | 46.5  |
| Total                  |                   | 819 | 100.0 |

Findings based on descriptive statistics about perceived organizational support and organizational commitment in the study are shown in Table 2.

In the study carried out with sample group, total organizational support mean is  $\bar{x}=3.25$ ; organisational support for personal development mean is  $\bar{x}=3.14$  and organisational support for job structure mean is  $\bar{x}=3.37$ . These values can be accepted as mean value. [(5-1= 4 4/5= .80 1-1.80 range is low 1.81-2.61 range is under average, 2.62-3.42 range is average, 3.43- 4.23 range is above the average, 4.24-5.00 range is high level)].

However teachers' perception of organizational support characteristics for "job structure" is higher than their perception of organizational support for "personal development".

Teachers find the organizational support for "their personal development" lower than organizational support for "job structure".

Organizational commitment of primary education teachers forming the sample is about  $\bar{x}=3.22$ ). In addition, organizational commitment characteristics of primary education teachers are lower than their perceived organizational support. In other words, the levels of organizational support for teachers haven't created an organi-

zational commitment at the same level among teachers. The fact that organizational support is directed more towards the structure of the work rather than towards personal development, may have led to such a perception among teachers. Therefore, teachers want their personal development aspects to be supported along with.

Irrelevant group "t" test and One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) processes were performed and interpreted to determine the differences of averages between "Perceived Organizational Support Scale" and "Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers" according to categorical independent variables collected via survey within the research. The findings are presented in Table 3.

Statistically significant differences weren't found in the irrelevant group "t" test performed for total and sub-dimensions of "Perceived Organizational Support Scale" according to teachers' gender variable. Organizational support characteristics perceived by female ( $\bar{x}=3.28$ ) and male ( $\bar{x}=3.23$ ) teachers were equal.

Yet, when looked at the point average, perception levels of female teachers are higher than males, while perception levels of female and male teachers correspond to each other on "personal development" dimension.

**Table 2: Teachers' "Perceived Organizational Support Scale" and "Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers" descriptive statistic results**

| Scales                                       | Sub-dimension        | n   | $\bar{x}$ | Ss  |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----|-----------|-----|
| Perceived Organizational Support Scale Total | Personal Development | 819 | 3.25      | .59 |
|                                              | Job Structure        | 819 | 3.14      | .57 |
|                                              |                      | 819 | 3.37      | .82 |
| Organizational Commitment Scale Total        |                      | 819 | 3.22      | .81 |

**Table 3: Irrelevant group “t” test results performed for total and sub-dimensions of “Perceived Organizational Support Scale” and “Organizational Commitment Scale for teachers” according to teachers’ gender variable**

| Scales                          | Sub-dimension        | Gender | N   | $\bar{x}$ | ss  | t     | Sd  | P      |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------|-----|-----------|-----|-------|-----|--------|
| Organizational Support Total    | Personal development | Female | 400 | 3.28      | .58 | 1.31  | 817 | .188   |
|                                 |                      | Male   | 419 | 3.23      | .59 |       |     |        |
|                                 |                      | Female | 400 | 3.14      | .56 | .05   | 817 | .955   |
|                                 |                      | Male   | 419 | 3.14      | .57 |       |     |        |
|                                 |                      | Female | 400 | 3.42      | .81 | 1.84  | 817 | .065   |
|                                 |                      | Male   | 419 | 3.32      | .83 |       |     |        |
| Organizational Commitment Total |                      | Female | 400 | 3.14      | .82 | -2.64 | 817 | .008** |
|                                 |                      | Male   | 419 | 3.29      | .79 |       |     |        |

\*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

Statistically significant difference at the .01 level was found in the irrelevant group “t” test performed for “Organizational Commitment Scale” total point averages according to gender variable of the teachers forming the sample. Organizational commitment levels of male teachers ( $\bar{x}$ =3.29) are higher than female teachers ( $\bar{x}$ =3.14) at a significant degree. This may be interpreted as the result of women having more work outside the organization such as house chores and childcare, and thus identifying less with the organization than men. Besides, it may be thought that male teachers find at school what they are looking for and this situation creates feelings of identification with the organization.

Statistically significant differences at the .05 level at least were found in ANOVA test performed for total and sub-dimensions of “Perceived Organizational Support Scale” according to professional seniority variable of the teachers. The findings are displayed in Table 4.

As the teachers’ professional seniority features changed, the organizational support characteristics they perceived also showed a change accordingly. But, the situation isn’t same for scale total and sub-dimension variance features.

Significant differences weren’t found in Levene Test performed for “Perceived Organizational Support Scale” total and sub-dimensions point variances.

Teachers’ professional seniority variable shows that total variance of total perceived organizational support is 1.5%; total variance of perceived organizational support for “personal development” is 2.3% and total variance of perceived organizational support for “job structure” is 2.2%.

After obtaining significant difference in “F” test, post-hoc techniques were initiated to determine the differences between double categories.

Scheffe test was performed as a post-hoc technique since significant differences weren’t found in Levene test.

Here, total characteristics of organizational support perceived by teachers with 1-5 years’ seniority ( $\bar{x}$ =3.41) is higher at significant level than the ones with 16-20 years’ seniority ( $\bar{x}$ =3.15).

Once again, total characteristics of organizational support for “job structure” perceived by teachers with 1-5 years’ seniority ( $\bar{x}$ =3.61) is higher at a significant level than the teachers with 16-20 years’ ( $\bar{x}$ =3.22) and 26 years’ and more seniority ( $\bar{x}$ =3.24). Statistically significant differences weren’t found in paired comparison in “personal development” sub-dimension since Scheffe test has a very high sensibility to alpha type error.

Statistically significant difference at the .001 level was found in ANOVA test performed for total points of “Organizational Commitment Scale” according to professional seniority variable of the teachers forming the sample. As the teachers’ professional seniority features changed, the organizational commitment characteristics they perceived also showed a change accordingly.

Teachers’ professional seniority variable shows that total variance of total organizational commitment is 1.5%; total variance of perceived organizational support for “personal development” is 2.3% and total variance of perceived organizational support for “job structure” is 2.2%.

Teachers’ professional seniority variable shows that total variance of total organizational commitment is 3.6%.

Organizational commitment levels of the teachers with 26 years and more seniority ( $\bar{x}$ =3.50) are higher at a significant level than the ones with 6-10 years seniority (p<.001)

**Table 4: The ANOVA Results for total and sub-dimensions of “Perceived Organizational Support Scale” and “Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers” according to professional seniority variable.**

| <i>Scales</i>                          | <i>Sub-dimension</i> | <i>Professional seniority</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>X</i> | <i>sd</i> | <i>Levene</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>Eta square</i> |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|---------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| <i>Organizational Support Total</i>    |                      | 1-5 years                     | 129      | 3.41     | .62       | 2.00          | 3.64     | .003**   | .015              |
|                                        |                      | 6-10 years                    | 165      | 3.18     | .58       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 11-15 years                   | 209      | 3.30     | .63       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 16-20 years                   | 132      | 3.15     | .53       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 21-25 years                   | 70       | 3.30     | .53       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 26 years and more             | 114      | 3.20     | .54       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Total                         | 819      | 3.25     | .59       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        | Personal Development | 1-5 years                     | 129      | 3.21     | .62       | 2.03          | 2.43     | .033*    | .023              |
|                                        |                      | 6-10 years                    | 165      | 3.03     | .55       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 11-15 years                   | 209      | 3.18     | .60       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 16-20 years                   | 132      | 3.07     | .54       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 21-25 years                   | 70       | 3.21     | .55       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 26 years and more             | 114      | 3.16     | .49       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Total                         | 819      | 3.14     | .57       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        | Job structure        | 1-5 years                     | 129      | 3.61     | .85       | 1.35          | 3.78     | .002**   | .022              |
|                                        |                      | 6-10 years                    | 165      | 3.33     | .77       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 11-15 years                   | 209      | 3.41     | .85       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 16-20 years                   | 132      | 3.22     | .77       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 21-25 years                   | 70       | 3.40     | .76       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 26 years and more             | 114      | 3.24     | .87       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Total                         | 819      | 3.37     | .82       |               |          |          |                   |
| <i>Organizational Commitment Total</i> |                      | 1-5 years                     | 129      | 3.15     | .83       | .85           | 6.02     | .000***  | .036              |
|                                        |                      | 6-10 years                    | 165      | 2.99     | .81       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 11-15 years                   | 209      | 3.21     | .82       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 16-20 years                   | 132      | 3.28     | .80       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 21-25 years                   | 70       | 3.33     | .75       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | 26 years and more             | 114      | 3.50     | .73       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Total                         | 819      | 3.22     | .81       |               |          |          |                   |

\*p&lt;.05 \*\*p&lt;.01 \*\*\*p&lt;.001

( $\bar{x}$ =2.99) and the ones with 1-5 years seniority ( $p<.05$ ) ( $\bar{x}$ =3.15). This may be because teachers with higher and lower length of service have different expectations. Teachers with higher length of service may have low expectations while teachers with lower length of service may have high expectations. Besides, factors such as habits of years, high level of organizational adaptation, rasped expectations, bureaucratic socialization, etc. may underlie high commitment.

No statistically significant differences were found in ANOVA test performed for total and sub-dimensions of “Perceived Organizational Support Scale” according to teachers ‘educational status variable. Organizational support characteristics perceived by the teachers with different educational levels are equal. Once again

significant differences weren’t found in Levene test performed for “Perceived Organizational Support Scale” total and sub-dimensions point variances. Findings are presented in Table 5.

Statistically significant difference at the .05 level was found in ANOVA test performed for total points of “Organizational Commitment Scale” according to educational status variable of the teachers forming the sample. As the teachers’ levels of education change, the organizational commitment characteristics they perceived also show a change accordingly. Teachers’ educational status variable shows that total variance of total organizational commitment is eight per thousand. In scheffe test it’s obtained that organizational commitment levels of teachers

**Table 5: ANOVA Results performed for total and sub-dimensions of “Perceived Organizational Support Scale” and “Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers” according to teachers’ educational status variable.**

| <i>Scales</i>                          | <i>Sub-dimension</i> | <i>Professional Seniority</i> | <i>N</i> | $\bar{X}$ | <i>ss</i> | <i>Levene</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>Eta square</i> |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| <i>Organizational Support Total</i>    |                      | Associate degree              | 102      | 3.29      | .51       | 1.91          | .23      | .79      | .001              |
|                                        |                      | Bachelor's degree             | 650      | 3.25      | .60       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Master's degree               | 57       | 3.25      | .56       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Total                         | 809      | 3.26      | .59       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        | Personal development | Associate degree              | 102      | 3.17      | .51       | .82           | .39      | .67      | .001              |
|                                        |                      | Bachelor's degree             | 650      | 3.14      | .58       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Master's degree               | 57       | 3.08      | .51       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Total                         | 809      | 3.14      | .57       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        | Job Structure        | Associate degree              | 102      | 3.42      | .83       | .13           | .24      | .78      | .001              |
|                                        |                      | Bachelor's degree             | 650      | 3.36      | .82       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Master's degree               | 57       | 3.41      | .86       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Total                         | 809      | 3.37      | .82       |               |          |          |                   |
| <i>Organizational Commitment Total</i> |                      | Associate degree              | 102      | 3.41      | .77       | .61           | 3.37     | .035*    | .008              |
|                                        |                      | Bachelor's degree             | 650      | 3.19      | .82       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Master's degree               | 57       | 3.26      | .74       |               |          |          |                   |
|                                        |                      | Total                         | 809      | 3.22      | .81       |               |          |          |                   |

\*p&lt;.05 \*\*p&lt;.01 \*\*\*p&lt;.001

with associate degree ( $\bar{X}$ =3.41), are higher than teachers with bachelor's degree ( $\bar{X}$ =3.19) (p<.05). The fact that teachers who have a bachelor's degree have lower levels of organizational commitment compared to their counterparts with an associate's degree can be explained with the high levels of consciousness and expectation they gained from their education.

Statistically significant differences at .05 level were found just in “personal development” sub-dimension in irrelevant group “t” test performed for total and sub-dimensions of “Perceived Organizational Support Scale” according to teachers’ award status. The findings are presented in Table 6.

Here, organizational support characteristics that awarded teachers perceived for “personal

**Table 6: Irrelevant group “t” test results performed for total and sub-dimensions of “Perceived Organizational Support Scale” and “Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers” according to teachers’ award status variable**

| <i>Scales</i>                          | <i>Sub-dimension</i> | <i>Award status</i> | <i>N</i> | $\bar{X}$ | <i>SS</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>Sd</i> | <i>P</i> |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| <i>Organizational Support Total</i>    | Personal Development | Yes                 | 438      | 3.27      | .59       | .61      | 817       | .539     |
|                                        |                      | No                  | 381      | 3.24      | .58       |          |           |          |
|                                        |                      | Yes                 | 438      | 3.18      | .56       | 2.12     | 817       | .034*    |
|                                        |                      | No                  | 381      | 3.01      | .57       |          |           |          |
|                                        | Job structure        | Yes                 | 438      | 3.35      | .83       | -.58     | 817       | .559     |
|                                        |                      | No                  | 381      | 3.39      | .82       |          |           |          |
| <i>Organizational Commitment Total</i> |                      | Yes                 | 438      | 3.33      | .78       | 4.09     | 817       | .000***  |
|                                        |                      | No                  | 381      | 3.10      | .83       |          |           |          |

\*p&lt;.05 \*\*p&lt;.01 \*\*\*p&lt;.001

development" ( $\bar{x}=3.18$ ) are higher at a significant level than the teachers who weren't awarded ( $\bar{x}=3.01$ ) ( $p<.05$ ). Perceived organisational support characteristics of the teachers awarded and the teachers not awarded in their careers are equal in "job structure" sub-dimension. This may be the result of rewarded teachers' view of the reward as a support to them or as the result of such support.

Statistically significant difference at .001 level was noted in irrelevant group "t" test performed for "Organizational Support" total point averages. Hereunder, organizational commitment levels of the teachers awarded in their careers ( $\bar{x}=3.33$ ), are higher at a significant level than the teachers not awarded ( $\bar{x}=3.10$ ). The perception among the teachers of the reward given to them as the organization appreciating, recognizing, liking, and honouring them may have increased their organizational commitment.

The regression analysis process results and relations between continuous dependent variables of the research are given in Table 7.

**Table 7: Relationship between total and sub-dimensions of "Perceived Organizational Support Scale" and "Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers"**

|                                              | Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers |          |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------|
|                                              | <i>r</i>                                     | <i>p</i> |
| Perceived Organizational Support Scale Total | .26                                          | .000***  |
| POS for Personal Development                 | .52                                          | .000***  |
| POS for Job Structure                        | .01                                          | .582     |

\* $p<.05$  \*\* $p<.01$  \*\*\* $p<.001$

Relationship between total and sub-dimensions of "Perceived Organizational Support Scale" and "Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers" applied to teachers are given in Table 7.

**Table 8: Multiple regression analysis results**

| Independent Variable: Sub-dimensions of Perceived Organizational Support Scale | Dependent Variable: “Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers” Total |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                | $\hat{A}$<br>$T$                                                         |
| POS for Personal Development                                                   | .62<br>19.78***                                                          |
| POS for Job Structure                                                          | -.23<br>-7.41***                                                         |
|                                                                                | $R^2=.324$                                                               |
|                                                                                | $F= 195.90^{***}$                                                        |

n: 809

\* $p<.05$  \*\* $p<.01$  \*\*\* $p<.001$

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient obtained for "Perceived Organizational Support Scale" total points and "Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers" total points is  $r=.26$  and this result is statistically significant at the .001 level. As indicated in the table, when the organizational support characteristics that the teachers perceived increase, their organizational commitment levels also increase accordingly. Teachers felt more responsible to their organization as a result of the support given to them. This feeling increased their organizational commitment.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient obtained for "Perceived Organizational Support Scale", "Personal Development" sub-dimension points and "Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers" total points is .52 and this result is statistically significant at the .001 level. As the organizational support characteristics that the teachers perceived for "personal development" increase, their organizational commitment levels also increase accordingly. However, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient obtained for "Perceived Organizational Support Scale", "Job Structure" sub-dimension points and "Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers" total points is .01 and this result is not statistically significant. Teachers were affected more positively by the work aimed at their personal development and for this reason they increased their organizational commitment.

Lastly, in research, how much of the commitment of the teachers working in primary schools were explained with organizational support was searched with multiple regression analysis. In the present study, the independent variable was sub-dimensions points of "Perceived Organizational Support Scale" applied to teachers and the dependent variable was total points of "Organizational Commitment Scale". Analysis results are indicated in Table 8.

R<sup>2</sup> values of regression model performed with Enter method (certainty or descriptiveness coefficient) are given in Table 8. This coefficient is a measure that shows to what extent the change in dependent variable can be defined by independent variables. Hereunder, different dimensions of perceived organizational support can explain organizational commitment in different levels.

Here, having the R<sup>2</sup> value .324 it's understood that 32.4% of organizational commitment is explained with perceived organizational support for "personal development" and "job structure". That the F value obtained from regression analysis process is statistically significant at the .001 level shows that independent variables predict the dependent variable significantly and variance ratios indicated are sufficient. Perceived organizational support for personal development explains the 27.9% of total variance (the best predictor) of organizational commitment by itself and job structure explains the 4.6% of it (the least predictor).

Beta values in Table 8 lay bare this situation. As beta coefficient of POS (Perceived Organizational Support) for "personal development" is positive, its effect on dependent variable is positive, as beta coefficient of POS for job structure is negative, its effect on independent variable is negative. It seems more meaningful to emphasize supportive work aimed at teachers' self-development rather than supportive work towards the structure of the work in increasing their organizational commitment.

Both "t" values obtained from regression analysis are statistically significant at the .001 level. When considering there could be a great many of variables which can affect organizational commitment, it's obvious that this ratio (32.4%) is remarkable indeed.

As a result, it's concluded that organizational support characteristics are an important variable predicting teachers' organizational commitment. In other words the degree of perceived organizational support lends assistance to us to predict teachers' organizational commitment level. The Formula obtained from regression analysis for predicting organizational commitment can be stated as below.

Commitment  $\bar{x} = 1.205 + .809$  (personal development POS) +  $(-.23)$  (job structure).

## DISCUSSION

In the research, teachers' general perception of organizational support given to them and their organizational commitment; whether teachers' perception of organizational support and organizational commitment show difference according to various variables or not and the effect of organizational support given to teachers on their organizational commitment are analysed and findings are dealt and debated pursuant to sequence of issue of research problems.

Teachers find organizational support given to them at "medium" level. While this result tallies with Ozdemir's (2010) and Egriboyun's (2014) research result directly, it tallies with the result of Ozdevecioglu's (2003) research mediately. According to Nartgun-Sezgin and Kalay's (2014) study, teachers stated that they were supported by their organizations to a high level. On the other hand, it's seen that teachers' organizational commitment characteristics are at "medium" level too. This result is consistent with Atik and Ustuner's (2014) results. When considering that commitment to school level of the administrators' who should support teachers to improve their organizational commitment is low (Bozdemir and Yolcu 2014), this result is not very surprising. In view of Aslan, Agiroglu-Bakir (2014), Topaloglu et al.'s (2008) and Karatas and Gules's (2010) researches, the result was at "high" level. It's observed that different results were obtained from similar studies on different fields concerning the subject. It can be said that calculation ways of the points gained from the measuring instruments used in the research (on sub-scales and total point basis) have caused this diversity. It is expected in this study that a perception of support and commitment above "medium" level is created among teachers.

Thus, it's required to enhance the organizational support given to teachers qualitatively and quantitatively, to raise the positive perception levels of teachers for organizational support and accordingly, to level up their organizational commitment. It's known that teachers with high organizational commitment have high performance and productivity.

Teachers' perception of organizational support characteristics for "job structure" is at a higher level than their perception of organizational support for "personal development". Here, it can be thought that it has an effect on it that

teachers find the level of organizational support for “job structure” higher than level of organizational support for “personal development”. In this case, it’s required to enhance the quality and quantity of support given for their “personal development” to raise teachers’ commitment to their organizations. Herein, it can be assumed that the gap on this issue can be bridged by doing a research on what sort of support teachers need for “personal development” and what effect it may exert on their organizational commitment in the case of fulfilling their needs. Besides, it’s seen that teachers’ organizational commitment characteristics are at a lower level on average considering the organizational support they perceived. In other words, levels of organizational support given to teachers haven’t created organizational commitment at the same level. However, generally accepted approach is that organizational support given to employees will enhance their organizational commitment. The result doesn’t back up this approach.

According to gender variable of the teachers, when looked at organizational commitment status it’s seen that organizational commitment levels of male teachers are higher than female teachers. This finding is consistent with Aslan and Agiroglu-Bakir’s (2014) study while it is inconsistent with Angle and Perry (1981), Fresko et al. (1997), and Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) results. In those researches of mentioned scientists, organizational commitment levels of females are found higher than males. In some researches, it’s stated that there is no relationship between organizational commitment and gender variable (Karatas and Gules 2010; Selcuk 2003; Selvitopu and Sahin 2013; Nartgun-Sezgin and Kalay 2014; Atik and Ustuner 2014; Topaloglu et al. 2008).

In the study, it can be anticipated that this high perception among male teachers might be affected by their utilization of items binding them to organization, in other words, by the support given by the organization.

Here, it’s possible to say that women’s expectations can’t be met sufficiently by their organizations. The fact that the great majority of administrative staff of primary schools are male that is of course a kind of obstructer of female teachers’ attempts.

According to teachers’ professional seniority variable, total characteristics of organizational support perceived by teachers with 1-5 years’

seniority is higher at a significant level than the ones with 16-20 years’ seniority.

This result tallies with Selcuk’s (2003) research results indirectly. In this study, perception levels of teachers with less seniority are higher than the ones with more seniority, too. Here, the support level that the teachers with more seniority want to gain from their organization is high and this can’t be met by their organizations. On the other hand, organizational commitment levels of teachers with 26 years’ and more seniority are higher than the ones with 1-5 years’ seniority and the ones with 6-10 years’ seniority. As teachers’ professional seniority features change, their organizational commitment features also change accordingly. This result shows conformity to Aslan and Agiroglu-Bakir (2014), Selvitopu and Sahin (2013) and Topaloglu and others’ (2008) research results.

In studies done by several researchers on the same subject, it’s stated that there is no relationship between organizational commitment and seniority variable (Karatas and Gules 2010; Kursunoglu et al. 2010; Nartgun-Sezgin and Kalay 2014). When a literature review is done on similar studies in general, it’s seen that organizational commitment levels of new teachers are high and over the years significant falls in their commitment levels are experienced and in last years of their careers, there is an increase in their commitment levels even if just a hint.

According to teachers’ educational status variable, perceived organizational support characteristics of teachers with different educational levels are equal. This result is backed up by Selcuk’s (2003) research result.

Yet, organizational commitment levels of teachers with associate degree are higher at a significant level than the teachers with bachelor’s degree. This result doesn’t tally with Dee and others’ (2006) research result but it does tally with Aslan and Agiroglu-Bakir’s (2014) research. While analysing the study’s seniority variable, there, it was seen that organizational commitment levels of teachers with more seniority were higher than the ones with less seniority. Tendency of teachers with associate degree is towards this way. Today, graduates of associate degree are a part of teachers with high seniority, because teachers have been graduated as bachelors from faculties for a long time. Here, the organizational commitments of teachers with more seniority and with an associate degree are

high. So, educational status variable has checked the study in this sense.

According to award status variable, organizational support and organizational commitment characteristics that awarded teachers perceived are higher at a significant level than the teachers who weren't awarded. While Oliver (1990) states that organizational awards have a more powerful effect to create organizational commitment; Chen et al. (2009) express that organizations' rewarding approaches enhance the employees' performance individually. As per previous researches, employees form their work performance according to moral and material awards they expect from the organization (Eisenberger and others 1986; Stamper and Johlke 2003). Hereunder, the fact that employee makes a great effort for organization's goals and values raises the expectations that s/he will be awarded by the organization. While enhancement of commitment creates high performance for the organizations, it also creates high spirits and job satisfaction for employees (Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002). It's a requirement for an organization to give importance to practices as supplying social aids, giving career opportunities and providing promotion chances to employees as these will be perceived as a reward by the employees. Besides, organizations should value their employees, generate a peaceful and comfortable working environment, improve working conditions, respect to their thoughts, take their complaints into account, care, dealing with their problems, and pride themselves on their success and reward. Organizational commitment is also a fact based upon mutual advantages between employee and the organization. Here, the point in question is to preserve the mutual advantages rationally.

In the research, it's seen that as the teachers' perceived organizational support characteristics increase; their organizational commitment levels increase too. This result is also backed up by other researchers (Allen et al. 2003; Aselage and Eisenberger 2003; Bishop et al. 2000; Christopher 1994; Egriboyun 2014; Polatci, Ardic and Koc 2014; Iplik et al. 2014; Florence and Vandenberghe 2003; Fuller et al. 2003; Jeongkoo and Thye 2002; Liden and Arad 1996). Eisenberger et al. (1990) propose that employees develop general beliefs according to the quantum of support they get from the. Employees who realize that they are supported by their organizations

have possibility to feel gratitude for their organization and to respond by being committed. Further, perceived organizational support has become a determiner of organizational commitment considerably (Bishop et al. 2000; Jeongkoo and Thye 2002). In supportive organizations employees have expectations of being repaid for their efforts and they combine their organizational identities with their own identities to that end. Besides, employees who always feel the support of the origination just beside will put their shoulders to the wheel.

Though it can be thought that there are quite a lot variables effecting organizational commitment, it's understood that 32.4% of organizational commitment is explained by perceived organizational support for "personal development" and "job structure" in this study. This result is higher than the result that Selcuk (2003) and Ozdevecioglu (2003) found in a similar subject in different job organizations. Here, it's revealed that organizational support characteristics are an important variable predicting Teachers' organisational commitment.

Further, degree of the perceived organizational support helps us also estimate the teachers' levels of organizational commitment. Hence, it's obvious that organizations must give weight to supportive practices especially for "personal development" and "job structure" to enhance teachers' organizational commitment.

In the research, it's seen that "personal development", one of the component of organizational support, has a positive effect on organizational commitment variable. This result is also backed up by several researchers (Allen et al. 2003; Bishop et al. 2000; Jeongkoo and Thye 2002; Kaplan and Ogut 2012; Kose and Gonulluoglu 2010; Piercy et al. 2006; Turunc and Celik 2010). Here, the importance of supportive practices of the organization for "personal development" of employees comes out. An employee, whose personal development needs are supported feels more dependent to his/her work and organization. A conscientious employee has a stronger desire to belong to the organization by identifying with organizations' goals and values and is disposed to do more organizational behaviours (Nehmeh 2009). Forming organizational commitment is one of the most important practices for protecting organizations' beings. Because individuals with organizational commitment work more harmoniously, more productive-

ly, with a high sense of responsibility and cause less cost to organizations (Balci 2003). The fact that organization supports employee's personal development and employee devotes him/herself to his/her work and identifies with the work will enhance the organizational commitment. Organizational commitment of teachers, whose personal development is supported are expected to enhance. To enhance the organizational commitment among teachers, it's important for the organization to perform several activities such as to provide them educational facilities, to give them the chance to be involved in decision-making processes concerning themselves, to support social assistance, to value contributions to the originations, to care and notice his/her efforts, to provide feedback for his/her works and to show interest.

One of the component of organizational support, "Job structure", has a negative effect on organizational commitment variable. Namely, a supportive practice for job structure has a negative effect on employees' organizational commitment. This result is backed up by Selcuk (2003), Kose and Gonulluoglu's (2010) study indirectly. Here, it's required for organizations to follow a more attentive strategy on job security, necessity and openness of the job, supply of the job equipment's, workload and having a policy on employees.

Individuals qualify their work as meaningful when they perceive their works improving, useful and rewarding.

Here, it's important that the job structure has an appropriate quality to be developed and to be enriched because these kinds of works, direct employees to find more physical, mental and emotional resources and enhances their creative abilities (Brown and Leigh 1996). Thus, while the work becomes meaningful for the employee, positive changes in his/her perceptions about this are expected to occur.

## CONCLUSION

In the study conducted to find out whether teachers' general perceptions of organizational support they receive and organizational commitment differ with regard to certain variables, teachers rated the level of organizational support they received as "medium" while they indicated their organizational commitment features as "medium", too. Organizational support to-

wards the "structure of the job" perceived by the teachers was higher than perceived organizational support towards "self-development".

In terms of the gender variable, female and male teachers' perceived organizational support features were equal whereas in terms of organizational commitment, male teachers' levels of organizational commitment were higher than those of female teachers. In terms of length of occupation variable, level of organizational support perceived by lower length of occupation teachers was significantly higher than that of higher length of occupation teachers while organizational commitment level among higher length of occupation teachers was significantly higher than that of lower length of occupation teachers. Levels of perceived organizational support were equal among all teachers with different levels of education while organizational commitment of teachers with an associate's degree was found to be significantly higher than that of teachers with a bachelor's degree. Organizational support and organizational commitment features of the teachers who have received rewards were significantly higher than those who have not received any rewards.

As the level of teachers' perceived organizational support increased, their level of organizational commitment also increased accordingly. Although there are thought to be several variables that may influence organizational commitment, it is understood in this study that 32.4% of organizational commitment is explained by perceived organizational support towards "self-development" and "structure of the job". Again in the study, "self-development" of compounds of organizational support has a positive directional effect on the variable of organizational commitment whereas "structure of the job" has a negative directional effect on organizational commitment.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

To increase teachers' levels of organizational commitment even more, organizational support towards them should be increased both in quality and quantity and teachers should be supported in several aspects. Special emphasis should be placed upon supportive work that helps teachers' self-development. In addition, teachers' creative ideas, suggestions, and criticism should be taken into consideration; an ef-

fective communication and rewarding system should be established; and a participative understanding should be adopted. On the other hand, female teachers should be supported to increase their organizational commitment in the most convenient way for their needs.

## REFERENCES

- Allen DG, Shore ML, Griffeth RW 2003. The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29(1): 99-118.
- Armstrong M 1998. *A Handbook of Personnel Management Practice*. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. London: Kogan Page.
- Armeli S, Eisenberger R, Fasola P, Lynech P 1998. Perceived organizational support and police performance: The moderating influence of socioemotional needs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2): 288-297.
- Angle HL, Perry JL 1981. An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1): 1-14.
- Aselage J, Eisenberger R 2003. Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5): 491-509.
- Aslan M, Agiroglu-Bakir A 2014. Teachers' Opinions About Organizational Commitment In Their Schools. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies International Journal of Social Science*, 25(1): 189-206.
- Atik S, Ustuner M 2014. İlkogretim Okullarının Orgut Tipi Ile Ogretmenlerin Orgutsel Baglilikleri Arasindaki Iliski. *Ahi Evran Universitesi Kirsehir Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 15(2): 133-154.
- Aube C, Rousseau V, Morin EM 2007. Perceived organizational support and organizational commitment: The moderating effect of locus of control and work autonomy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(5): 479-495.
- Avolio BJ, Zhu W, Koh W, Bhatia P 2004. Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(8): 951-968.
- Balay R 1999. Organisational commitment factors of employees and results. *Ankara University Educational Sciences Faculty Journal*, 32(1): 237-246.
- Balci A 2003. *Organisational Socialisation Theory, Strategy and Tactics*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Balci A 2009. *Research, Method, Technic and Principles in Social Sciences*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Bishop JW, Scott DK, Burroughs SM 2000. Support commitment and employee outcomes in a team environment. *Journal of Management*, 26(6): 1113-1132.
- Bateman TS, Strasser S 1984. A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1): 95-112.
- Baugh SG, Roberts RM 1994. Professional and organizational commitment among engineers: conflicting or complementing? *Ieee Transactions on Engineering Management*, 41(2): 108-114.
- Becker TE, Randal DM, Riegel CD 1995. The multidimensional view of commitment and theory of reasoned action: A comparative evaluation. *Journal of Management*, 21(4): 617-638.
- Bozdemir Y, Yolcu H 2014. Okul Yoneticilerinin Orgutsel Adanmislik Duzeyleri Ile Problem Cozme Becerileri Arasindaki Iliski. *Egitim Bilimleri Arastirmalari Dergisi, Uluslararası E-Dergi*, 4(2): 287-311.
- Demircan Cakar N, Yildiz S 2009. Effects of organisational justice on job satisfaction. Is perceived organisational support an intervening variable? *Electronic Social Sciences Journal*, 8(28): 68-90.
- Brown SP, Leigh TW 1996. A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4): 358-368.
- Chen Z, Eisenberger R, Johnson KM, Sucharski IL, Aselage J 2009. Perceived organizational support and extra-role performance: which leads to which? *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 149(1): 119-124.
- Cheung MFY, Law MCC 2008. Relationships of organizational justice and organizational identification: the mediating effects of perceived organizational support in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 14(2): 213-231.
- Christopher O 1994. The effects of exchange ideology on the relationship between perceived organizational support and job performance. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 134(3): 407-408.
- Day C, Eliot B, Kington A 2005. Reform standards and teacher identity: Challenges of sustaining commitment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21: 563-577.
- Dee JR, Henkin AB, Singleton CA 2006. Organizational commitment of teachers in urban schools examining the effects of team structures. *Urban Education*, 41(6): 603-627.
- Demircan CN, Yildiz S 2009. Effect of organisational justice on job satisfaction. *Electronic Social Sciences Journal*, 8(28): 68-90.
- Dewettinck K, Singh J, Buyens D 2003. Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Reviewing the empowerment effects on critical work outcomes. *Vlerick Leuven Gent Working Paper Series*, 29: 1-26.
- Dornstein M, Matalon Y, 1998. A comparative analysis of predictors of organizational commitment. A study of voluntary army personnel in Israel. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 34(2): 192-203.
- Dunham RB, Grube JA, Castenada MB 1994. Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(3): 370-380.
- Egriboyun E 2014. Ortaogretim Okullarında Gorev Yapan Yoneticiler ve Ogretmenlerin Orgutsel Destek ve Orgutsel Baglilikleri Arasindaki Iliski. *Gumushane Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Elektronik Dergisi*, 9: 24-52.
- Eisenberger R, Cummings J, Armeli S, Lynch P 1997. Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(5): 812-820.
- Eisenberger R, Huntington R, Hutchison S, Sowa D 1986. Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Management Reviews*, 71(3): 500-507.

- Eisenberger R, Fasolo P, Davis-LaMastro V 1990. Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1): 51-59.
- Florence S, Vandenberghe C 2003. Organizations and supervisors as sources of support and targets of commitment: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(3): 251-270.
- Fresko B, Kfir D, Nasser F 1997. Predicting teacher commitment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(4): 429-438.
- Fuller JB, Barnett T, Hester K, Relyea C 2003. A social identity perspective on the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational commitment. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 143(6): 789-791.
- Greenberg J, Baron RA 2003. *Behavior in Organizations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Guest EA 1991. *Human Resource Management*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hellman CM, Fuqua DR, Worley J 2006. A reliability generalization study on the survey of perceived organizational support: the effects of mean age and number of items on score reliability. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4): 631-642.
- Howes CJ, Cropanzano R, Grandey AA, Mohler CJ 2000. Who is supporting whom? Quality team effectiveness and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Quality Management*, 5(2): 207-223.
- Hutchison S 1997. A path model of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 12(1): 159-174.
- İplik E, İplik FN, Efeoglu IE 2014. Calisanlarin Orgutsel Destek Algilarinin Orgutsel Vatandaslik Davranisi Uzerindeki Etkisinde Orgutsel Ozdeslesmenin Rolu. *International Journal of Economic and Administrative Studies*, 6(12): 109-122.
- Jeongkoo Y, Thye SR 2002. A dual process model of organizational commitment. *Work and Occupations*, 29(1): 97-124.
- Johlke MC, Stamper CL, Shoemaker ME 2002. Antecedents to boundary-spanner perceived organizational support. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(2): 116-128.
- Kaplan M, Ogut A 2012. Analysis of the relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational commitment. A practice in hotel businesses. *Suleyman Demirel University. Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 17(1): 387-401.
- Karasar N 2009. *Scientific Research Method*. 20<sup>th</sup> Edition. Ankara: Nobel.
- Karatas S, Gules H 2010. Relationship between primary school teachers' job satisfaction and organisational commitment. *Usak University Social Sciences Journal*, 3(2): 74-89.
- Katz D, Kahn RL, 1977. *Organisations' Social Psychology*. Ankara: TODAIE Publishing.
- Kose S, Gonulluoglu S 2010. A research for determining the effect of organisational support on organisational commitment. *Dumlupinar University Social Sciences Journal*, 27: 85-94.
- Kraimer ML, Wayne SJ 2004. An examination of perceived organizational support as a multidimensional construct in the context of an expatriate assignment. *Journal of Management*, 30(2): 209-237.
- Kursunoglu A, Bakay E, Tanriogen A 2010. Organisational commitment level of primary school teachers. *Pamukkale University Education Faculty Journal*, 28(2): 101-115.
- Liden RC, Arad S 1996. A power perspective of empowerment and work groups: Implications for human resources management research. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 14: 205-251.
- Makanjee CR, Hartzer YF, Uys IL 2006. The effect of perceived organizational support on organizational commitment of diagnostic imaging radiographers. *Radiography*, 12(2): 118-126.
- Mathieu JE, Zajac DM 1990. A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2): 171-194.
- Meyer JP, Allen NJ 1991. A Tree-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1: 61-89.
- Meyer JP, Allen NJ, Smith CA 1993. Commitment to organizations and occupations: extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4): 538-551.
- Mowday RT, Porter LW, Steers RM 1982. *Employee-organization linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Nartgun-Sezgin S, Kalay M 2014. Ogretmenlerin Orgutsel Destek, Orgutsel Ozdeslesme ile Orgutsel Sinizm Duzeylerine Iliskin Gorusleri. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 9(2): 1361-1376.
- Nehmeh R 2009. *SMC working paper. Swiss Management Center*, 5: 1-11.
- Northcraft T, Neale H 1996. *Organisation Behaviour*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Oliver N 1990. Work rewards, work values and organizational commitment in employee-owned firm: Evidence from the U.K. *Human Relations*, 43(6): 513-526.
- Ozdemir A 2010. Researching the relationship of perceived organisational support with the teachers' interpersonal self-sufficiency beliefs. *GU, Gazi Education Faculty Journal*, 30(1): 127-146.
- Ozdevecioglu M 2003. A research for determining relationships between perceived organisational support and organisational commitment. *D.E.U. Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal*, 18(2): 113 -130.
- Piercy NF, Cravens DW, Lane N, Vorhies DW 2006. Driving organizational citizenship behaviors and salesperson in-role behavior performance: The role of management control and perceived organizational support. *Journal of The Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(2): 244-262.
- Polatci S, Ardic K, Koc M 2014. Farkli Bir Bakis Acisindan Is Ve Yasam Doyumu Algilanan Orgutsel Destek Ve Orgutsel Bagliligin Etkileri. *C.U. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi*, 23(1): 267-287.
- Rhoades L, Eisenberger R 2002. Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4): 698-714.

- Selcuk G 2003. *Effect of Organisational Support on Employees' Behaviours Concerning Work*. Master's Thesis, Unpublished. Izmir: Dokuz Eylul University Social Sciences Institute.
- Selvitopu A, Sahin H 2013. Ortaogretim Ogretmenlerinin Orgutsel Adalet Algilari ile Orgutsel Bagliliklari Arasindaki Iliski. *Ahi Evran Universitesi Kirsehir Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 14(2): 171-189.
- Stamper CL, Johlke MC 2003. The impact of perceived organizational support on the relationship between boundary spanner role stress and work outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 29(4): 569-588.
- Tayyah S, Tariq N 2001. Development of an indigenous organizational commitment questionnaire. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, ProQuest Psychology Journals*, 16: 31-44.
- Topaloglu M, Koc H, Yavuz E 2008. Analysis of teachers' organisational commitment in terms of some basic factors. *Kamu-Is*, 9: 1-19.
- Troman G, Raggl A 2008. Primary teacher commitment and the attractions of teaching. *Pedagogy Culture & Society*, 16(1): 85-99.
- Turunc O, Celik M 2010. Effect of the employees' perception of organisational support and work stress on organisational identification and job performance. *Management and Economics*, 17(2): 183-206.
- Ustuner M 2009. Organisational commitment scale for teachers: Validity and reliability. *Inonu University Education Faculty Journal*, 10(1): 1-17.
- Van Knippenberg D, Sleebos E 2006. Organizational identification versus organizational commitment: self-definition, social exchange, and job attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(5): 571-584.
- Wayne SC, Shore LM, Liden RC 1997. Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1): 82-111.