

The Impact of Motivational Language Which School Principals Use on Teachers' Organizational Commitment ^a

Okul Müdürlerinin Kullandığı Motivasyonel Dilin Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılığı Üzerine Etkisi

Sedat YAKUT^b

İlknur MAYA^c

Abstract

In this research, it is aimed to determine the impact of motivational language which school principals use on teachers' organizational commitment. The research was designed in a quantitative research and survey model. The data were collected from 826 teachers who work in 58 public schools at the high school level in Çanakkale, Turkey, using the "Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers" and the "Motivational Language Scale". The data were entered in SPSS program and analyzed by frequency, percentage, Kruskal Wallis-H test, Mann Whitney-U test, correlation and multiple regression. In addition, it has been determined that there is a highly significant relationship between motivational language and organizational commitment according to teachers' perceptions, and that the motivational language used by school principals significantly affects organizational commitment.

Key Words: Motivational language, School principal, Teacher, Organizational commitment

Jel Codes: I20, I21

Başvuru: 09.02.2022

Kabul: 19.07.2022

Özet

Bu araştırmada okul müdürlerinin kullandığı motivasyonel dilin öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları üzerindeki etkisinin belirlenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Araştırma nicel araştırma ve tarama modelinde tasarlanmıştır. Veriler Türkiye'de Çanakkale ilinde yer alan lise düzeyinde 58 devlet okulunda çalışan 826 öğretmene "Öğretmenler İçin Örgütsel Bağlılık Ölçeği" ve "Motivasyonel Dil Ölçeği" kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Veriler SPSS programında incelenmiş olup frekans, yüzde, Kruskal Wallis-H testi, Mann Whitney-U testi, korelasyon ve çoklu regresyon yapılarak analiz edilmiştir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, öğretmenlerin motivasyonel dili ve örgütsel bağlılığı algılamasında çeşitli değişkenlere göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ilişkiler saptanmıştır. Ayrıca, öğretmenlerin algısına göre motivasyonel dil ile örgütsel bağlılık arasında yüksek düzeyde anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu ve okul müdürlerinin kullandığı motivasyonel dilin örgütsel bağlılığı anlamlı bir şekilde etkilediği tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Motivasyonel dil, Okul müdürü, Öğretmen, Örgütsel bağlılık

Jel Kodları: I20, I21

^a This research was derived from the master's thesis conducted by Sedat YAKUT under the supervision of Prof. Dr. İlknur MAYA.

^b Öğretmen, Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı, Çanakkale-Türkiye, yakut.sedat83@gmail.com, 0000-0002-6492-9439.

^c Prof. Dr., Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Education Faculty, mayailknur@gmail.com, 0000-0001-9964-1382.

INTRODUCTION

Effective leaders are very important in successful organizations and are at the center of the organization (Brannon, 2011). In order for a manager to be defined as a leader, he or she must be able to strongly influence the employees in that organization. Effective leaders take into account the cultural and social characteristics of the institution, which are very important as well as the functioning of the organization for success (Özmen, 2019). Thus, the members of the organization will be more motivated and productive.

Human resource is one of the most valuable and important elements in organizations. To be successful, human resources must be used effectively (Mert, 2011). Otherwise, the use of ineffective human resources may lead the organization to failure. Today, interactive management styles are used instead of the classical management style. If the leader manages his organization using a motivational language, the employees will be able to understand him more easily, perceive the messages correctly and will be more willing to work (Latifoğlu, 2015). Leaders can achieve successful results by using motivational language instead of oppressing or coercing members of the organization.

1. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Leaders can employ motivational language to impress their employees. Motivational language is a verbal communication strategy used by the leader, which creates positive outputs such as better job performance, satisfaction and continuity on employees (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2019). In other words, motivating language is a rhetoric that produces positive results on the leader's members.

Sullivan (1988) developed Motivational Language Theory and presented information about the function of language used between leaders and employees. Using the acts of reducing ambiguity, empathizing and creating meaning together in the function of language creates an effective and successful communication between the leader and his employees (Karaaslan, 2010; Mayfield et al., 1995; Özen, 2013; Sullivan, 1988).

It consists of a total of 3 sub-dimensions as motivational language, perlocutionary language, illocutionary language and locutionary language. Perlocutionary language is the motivational language element of the leader that includes clarifying the goals of his employees, reducing organizational ambiguities, describing the assignment of tasks, and explaining how, when and where things are done. Illocutionary language is the motivational language element that the leader uses to talk emotionally with his employees, encourage the employees, deal with the personal problems of the employees and increase their emotional attachment to the work. Locutionary language is explanatory speech and the motivational language element that the leader uses to create a strong bond between his employees and the organization (Demir, 2018a; Karaaslan, 2010; Mayfield et al., 1998; Mayfield & Mayfield, 2017; Mayfield & Mayfield, 2006; Özen, 2015; Sullivan, 1988). The leader's use of motivational language makes his employees feel valuable, supports them emotionally, helps to integrate personal goals with the goals of the organization, and reduces uncertainties (Hanke, 2020). Thus, positive results emerge for both the organization and the employees.

Employees in organizations reflect their emotions not only physically, but also by using their mental and emotional labor (Beytekin et al, 2020). Therefore, the use of motivating language by the leader affects the employees positively and increases the success of the organization. Employee satisfaction, job satisfaction and motivation level get better with the use of motivational language by the leader (Gutierrez-Wirsching et al., 2014). To achieve success, leaders can use motivational language to mobilize their employees. For example, rewarding employees who perform well by the leader motivates them more. When other employees learn or see the award-winning personnel, this creates a positive motivation for them (Uludağ, 2019). Thus, eagerness to stay in the organization and to work better can occur in all members.

The leader's use of motivational language provides many benefits to the organization. Some of these benefits are; motivational language increases the performance of the employees and the turnover of the organization (William & Susan, 2006), increases the quality of the decisions of the employees (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2016), improves the work life of the employees (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2017), increases the work efficiency and provides more attachment to the organization (Latifoğlu, 2015), predicts teachers' self-efficacy positively (Demir, 2018a), increases teacher motivation (Demir, 2018b).

For motivational language to be effective, discourse and action must be consistent. If what the leader says and what he does are not compatible, the effect of motivational language decreases (Hargie et al, 2002; Lüscher & Lewis, 2008). For this reason, effective and responsible school principals should be able to bring their leadership characteristics to the fore while managing the school, bring the innovations of the age to the school, motivate their teachers and provide effective learning environments to students (Akyol et al., 2017). In addition, school principals should be aware of the risks that may occur in the school, take precautions against the crises that may arise, and raise the awareness of all school members about risks and crises (Maya, 2014). Today, it seems difficult for classical school principals to be successful, it is necessary to be an effective

education leader in order to be successful. Because the raw material in schools is human and it is necessary to motivate students and teachers and be prepared for crises for success.

Organizational commitment can be defined as the psychological state that makes a person committed to his organization (Taş, 2017). In other words, it can be said as the feelings of the employees towards the organization or the desire to continue to be in the organization. Human resource is the most effective element in the continuity or termination of organizations. For this reason, organizations want and need their employees to be committed to the organization (Aslan & Bakır, 2014). It is thought that members with high organizational commitment will increase the success of the organization.

When the factors affecting organizational commitment and related studies are examined, there are many factors affecting organizational commitment. Recent studies on these factors affecting organizational commitment are listed as follows; work environment, job stress, job satisfaction, burnout (Griffin et al., 2010), organizational silence (Kahveci, 2010), emotional intelligence (Emrahimi et al, 2013), organizational justice (Buluç & Güneş, 2014), leadership of school administrators (Devos et al, 2014) motivational language (Latifoğlu, 2015), trust in the principal (Abston, 2015), organizational trust (Lashari et al, 2016), organizational cynicism (Mousa, 2017), teachers' resilience levels, job satisfaction, professional burnout, job satisfaction (Culibrk et al, 2018; Kim & Ryu, 2017), emotional labor behaviors (Deliveli, 2018) anti-productive work behaviors (Doğruöz & Özdemir, 2018).

1. RELATED RESEARCH

When the literature on motivational language is examined; It is seen that research on motivational language in Turkey have increased in recent years. These research are about relationships with motivational language between the variables; organizational dedication and leader-member exchange (Sivik, 2018), school climate (Sönmez, 2018), teachers' over-role behavior (Yavuz, 2018), teachers' self-efficacy (Demir, 2018a), teachers' motivation level (Demir, 2018c), employees' organizational commitment (Latifoğlu, 2015), adaptive leadership characteristics of school principals (Özen, 2015), organizational citizenship (Özen, 2014), organizational commitment, job satisfaction, manager satisfaction (Mert et al, 2011), performance (Mert, 2011) and organizational citizenship (Karaaslan, 2010). In the research conducted outside of Turkey, they are about relationships with motivational language between the variables; job satisfaction, emotional commitment and job performance (Harroon, 2018), intrinsic motivation (Sun et al, 2016), employee self-esteem (Banks, 2014), employee job satisfaction, managerial effectiveness and communication skills (Simmons & Sharbrough III, 2013), teachers' job satisfaction and job performance (Holmes, 2012), job satisfaction and employee performance (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2010), employee absenteeism (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2009b), creative performance of team members (Wang et al, 2009), employee intention to stay in the organization (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2007), worker performance and job satisfaction (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2006), employees' innovation (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2004) and employee commitment (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2002).

When the literature review about organizational commitment is done; the research on organizational commitment in Turkey have been identified. These research are related to organizational commitment; teacher identity (Kavrayıcı, 2019), authentic leadership behaviors (Koçak, 2019), variables such as seniority, gender and marital status (Mert, 2019), emotional labor behaviors (Deliveli, 2018), anti-productive work behaviors (Doğruöz & Özdemir, 2018), psychological well-being (Köylü, 2018), burnout (Kaya, 2017; Yanar, 2011), psychological empowerment (Şan, 2017). In other countries apart from Turkey, the research are related to organizational commitment; organizational success (Werang & Pure, 2018), trust in the principal (Abston, 2015), teaching quality and student satisfaction (Xiao & Wilkins, 2015), leadership of school administrators (Devos et al, 2014), emotional intelligence (Emrahimi et al, 2013), distributed leadership (Hulpia et al, 2010), professional commitment and organizational citizenship (Bogler & Somech, 2004).

When the literature is examined, it is understood that there are few research on the use of motivational language in educational institutions. A study on the effect of motivation language on organizational commitment was carried out in ÇAYKUR, And a positive and significant relationship was found between the motivational language used by the managers of the institution and the organizational commitment of the employees (Latifoğlu, 2015).

This study differs from previous studies in that it investigates the relationship between school principals' motivational language use and teachers' organizational commitment in educational organizations. Considering the results of this research, many school principals will be able to benefit from the use of motivational language in order to improve teachers' organizational commitment level. In addition, it is thought that with the use of motivational language by school principals, teachers' commitment to their schools will increase and thus the success of the schools will increase.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research is to examine the impact of the motivational language which school principals use on teachers' organizational commitment. In addition, it is aimed to examine the relationship between the motivational language which school principals use and teachers' organizational commitment in terms of different variables.

Research Problem

What is the impact of motivational language which school principals use on teachers' organizational commitment? What is the relationship between motivational language which school principals use and organizational commitment of teachers according to different variables?

Sub Problems

1- At what level do teachers perceive the motivational language which school principals use?

2- Is there a significant difference in determining the level of motivational language which school principals use according to a-Gender of teachers, b-Seniority of teachers, c-Educational status of teachers, d-Gender of school principals, e-Educational status of school principals, f- Type of school variables?

3- At what level are the organizational commitment of teachers?

4- Is there a significant difference in determining the organizational commitment levels of teachers according to a-Gender of teachers, b-Seniority of teachers, c-Educational status of teachers, d-Gender of school principals, e-Educational status of school principals, f- School type variables?

5- What is the impact of motivational language which school principals use on teachers' organizational commitment?

3. METHOD

3.1. Research Model

The survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods, was used in this research. It is widely used in social sciences and the situation is described in detail in this model (Baştürk, 2014).

3.2. Universe and Sample

In the selection of the sample, it is taken into account that it represents the characteristics of the universe (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The universe of this research consists of teachers who work in state high schools in Çanakkale province in Turkey. Simple random sampling method was used because it was easily accessible in sample selection. According to the statistics of Çanakkale Provincial Directorate of National Education, 1796 teachers work in public high schools in the 2018-2019 academic year, excluding private schools (Çanakkale İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü, 2019). Considering the sample size, a total of 826 people were reached.

3.2.1. Participants

The demographic information of the teachers in the reasearch; their gender, seniority and educational status, the gender and educational status of their principals and the type of school are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Participants

Teacher Gender	f	%
Female	435	52.70
Male	391	47.30
Total	826	100
Teacher Seniority (years)	f	%
1-5	118	14.30
6-10	134	16.20
11-15	106	12.80
16-20	184	22.30
21-25	159	19.20
26- over	125	15.10
Total	826	100
Teacher Educational Status	f	%
Undergraduate	675	81.70
Graduate	151	18.30
Total	826	100
Principal Gender	f	%
Female	107	13
Male	719	87
Total	826	100
Principal Education Status	f	%

Graduate	157	19
Undergraduate	669	81
Total	826	100
School Type (High School)	f	%
Anatolian	255	30.90
Vocational	426	51.60
Imam- Hatip	73	8.80
Science- Social Sciences	72	8.70
Total	826	100

According to Table 1, it is seen that the gender of the participating teachers is 52.7% female and 47.3% male; the professional seniority of teachers is 11-15 years with a minimum of 12.8%, and with a maximum of 22.3% of them is 16-20 years; the education level of teachers is at undergraduate level with 81.7% and at graduate level with 18.3%; 13% of teachers work with female school principals and 87% with male school principals; 19% of the teachers work with the school principal who has graduate education and 81% with the principal who has undergraduate education. In addition, it is seen that 30.9% of the teachers work in Anatolian high schools, 51.6% in Vocational high schools, 8.8% in Imam hatip high schools, 8.7% in Science and social sciences high schools.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

A total of two scales were used in the research, namely Motivational Language Scale (Mayfield, Mayfield & Kopf, 1995) and Organizational Commitment Scale (Üstüner, 2009). The scales are in the form of a five-point Likert scale, with a score range of 1.00-1.80 (Strongly Disagree), 1.81-2.60 score range (Disagree), 2.61-3.40 score range (Moderately Agree), 3.41-4.20 score range (Agree), 4.21-5.00 score range (Strongly Agree).

Mert et al. (2011) and Özen (2013) conducted validity and reliability studies to adapt the Motivational Language Scale, which consists of 24 items, into Turkish. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed for the scale and the Cronbach Alpha values were calculated as 0.94 in the perlocutionary language dimension, 0.93 in the illocutionary language dimension, and 0.88 in the locutionary language dimension, and this scale was accepted as reliable and valid (Özen, 2013). Organizational Commitment Scale consists of 17 items. It was developed by Üstüner (2009) to measure the teachers' organizational commitment level. The internal consistency coefficient of the Organizational Commitment Scale was found as "0.96" and the test-retest correlation coefficient as "0.88" and it was accepted as appropriate by conducting validity and reliability studies (Üstüner, 2009).

3.4. Data Collection and Analysis

Permission has been obtained from the Çanakkale Provincial Directorate of National Education for the application of scales. After obtaining permission, Motivational Language and Organizational Commitment Scales were applied face-to-face to 826 teachers who work in state high schools throughout Çanakkale in the 2018-2019 academic year, and data were collected. Volunteering is the basis for data collection.

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program was used to analyze the data. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was applied to determine the normal distribution of the data. As a result of the normality test, it was determined that the scores were not normally distributed according to the independent variables. Therefore, non-parametric analysis techniques were applied while performing statistical operations. In the process of data analysis; reliability analysis, non-parametric analyzes (Mann Whitney U Test and Kruskal Wallis Test) and descriptive analyzes were applied. In the analysis of the research, $p < .05$ value was taken as basis and this value was accepted as significant. If a significant difference is detected after the Kruskal Wallis Test, Tukey HSD and Games Howell tests from Post Hoc sub-analyses were used.

3.4.1. Reliability analysis

The Cronbach alpha test was applied to measure the reliability of the Motivational Language Scale and the Organizational Commitment Scale used in this research. Values with Cronbach Alpha coefficients of 0.70 and higher are considered reliable (Tavşancıl, 2005). As the Cronbach Alpha coefficient gets closer to 1, the answers given by the participants indicate that the level of internal consistency is high and reliable (Kartal & Dirlik, 2016). In the internal evaluation of the calculations resulting from the Cronbach alpha test; A value between 0-0.4 (very low), value between 0.4-0.6 (low), value between 0.6-0.8 (satisfactory), and value between 0.8-1.0 (high) are considered reliable at a level (Alpar, 2017).

In correlational studies, the relationships between two or more variables are analyzed. The relationship between the variables can consist of different values between -1 and +1 (Karakaya, 2014). Thanks to the correlation coefficient, it can be understood that the variables are related to each other, not or at what level. Correlation coefficient ; 0- 0.2 (Relationship is Very Weak or No), 0.2- 0.4 (Relation is Weak), 0.4- 0.6 (Relationship is Moderate), 0.6- 0.8 (Relationship is High), and 0.8-1.0 (Relationship is Very High) is accepted (Salkind, 2015).

According to the Cronbach's alpha test results, Motivational Language Scale in general, perlocutionary language (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14), illocutionary language (15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24) and locutionary language (7, 10, 11, 12, 16) dimensions Cronbach Alpha coefficient calculation results were found as respectively 0.98, 0.96, 0.95 and 0.90. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient value was found to be 0.97 as a result of the Organizational Commitment Scale. According to the results of the Cronbach Alpha test, it is understood that the internal consistency reliability levels of the scales used in the research are high.

4. FINDINGS

The findings obtained by determining the extent to which teachers' organizational commitment is affected by the motivational language which school principals use and the relationships considering the independent variables related to them are presented in this section.

4.1. The Level of Perception of the Motivational Language Use of School Principals by Teachers

As can be seen in Table 2 below, it is understood that school principals' motivational language use level is high ($\bar{x}=3.73$) according to teacher perceptions. In addition, the item in which the motivational language used by the school principals was calculated with the lowest average was "Item 23: The principal tells the stories of the teachers who were rewarded for their success at school" ($\bar{x}=3.32$), while the item calculated with the highest average was "Item 1: The principal makes useful explanations about the things to be done" ($\bar{x}=4.15$). In this case, it can be said that the principals have clearly stated the instructions about the work to be done, but they are lacking in telling rewarding successful teachers and conveying them.

Table 2. Distribution of Responses to the Motivational Language Scale

My principal...	\bar{x}	Ss
1. Makes useful explanations about the things to be done.	4.15	0.90
2. Gives useful directions on how to get the job done.	4.07	0.90
3. Makes understandable explanations about my job.	4.03	0.94
4. Gives useful advice to be better at my job.	3.77	1.33
5. Tells me how I should work in order to be rewarded.	3.48	1.10
6. Guides me to solve problems related to my work.	3.89	1.02
7. Gives explanations about how I will be supervised before the supervision	3.99	0.98
8. Informs about the developments (informatics, method, technique, etc.) that may exist in the future education.	3.82	1.00
9. Informs about the developments in the field of education (informatics, method, technique, etc.) in the past.	3.75	1.02
10. Shares information about school (success, financial situation, etc.) with me.	3.85	1.04
11. Praises me at school.	3.57	1.10
12. Encourages me at school	3.78	1.05
13. Deals with my professional satisfaction.	3.59	1.08
14. Supports me in my career.	3.74	1.07
15. Deals with whether my job provides me well-being (materially and morally).	3.49	1.13
16. Trusts me.	4.03	0.95
17. Tells very important events in the past of the school.	3.67	1.03
18. Helps me with the problem that I can't solve in official ways.	3.95	1.00
19. Talks about the teachers who were admirable in the past of the school.	3.48	1.05
20. Talks about the hardworking teachers in the school's past.	3.49	1.06
21. Guides me on how to behave in social gatherings.	3.57	1.06
22. Advises me to establish good relations with other teachers at school.	3.51	1.11
23. Tells the stories of teachers who were rewarded for their success at school.	3.32	1.10
24. Talks about teachers who worked at our school in the past.	3.45	1.08
Total	3.73	0.84

According to Table 3, the mean of the motivational language scale was determined as $\bar{x}=3.73$. The sub-dimension means are from the most to the least; locutionary language ($\bar{x}=3.84$), perlocutionary language ($\bar{x}=3.83$) and illocutionary language ($\bar{x}=3.55$). It is seen that the level of motivational language use of school principals is perceived as high by teachers in terms of dimensions and in general of the scale.

Table 3. Statistics of the Motivational Language Scale

The Impact of Motivational Language Which School Principals Use on Teachers' Organizational Commitment

	\bar{x}	Ss
General Scale	3.73	0.84
Perlocutionary Language	3.83	0.86
Illocutionary Language	3.55	0.91
Locutionary Language	3.84	0.87

4.2. The Perception of the Motivational Language Which School Principals Use According to Different Variables by Teachers

The findings showing that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of the motivational language which school principals use according to the variables of teachers' gender, seniority and educational status are presented in Table 4, Table 5 and Table 6.

Table 4. *The Mann-Whitney U Test of the Motivational Language Scale According to the Gender of Teachers*

Scale and Subdimensions	Gender	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	z	p
General Scale	Female	395.26	171939.50	77109.50	-2.31	0.02
	Male	433.79	169611.50			
Perlocutionary Language	Female	404.74	176061.50	81231.50	-1.11	0.27
	Male	423.25	165489.50			
Illocutionary Language	Female	390.90	170040.50	75210.50	-2.87	0.00
	Male	438.65	171510.50			
Locutionary Language	Female	389.11	169261.50	74431.50	-3.11	0.00
	Male	440.64	172289.50			

According to Table 4, a statistically significant difference was found between the Motivational Language Scale in general, the illocutionary and locutionary language sub-dimensions according to the gender of the teachers ($p < 0.05$). Male teachers perceive motivational language at a higher level than the female teachers. But, there is no important difference in the sub-dimension of the perlocutionary language according to teachers's gender.

Table 5. *Kruskal Wallis H-Test of the Motivational Language Scale According to Professional Seniority*

	Professional Seniority (Years)	n	Mean Rank	χ^2	(df)	p
General Scale	1-5	118	449.63	7.04	5	0.21
	6-10	134	391.39			
	11-15	106	400.00			
	16-20	184	436.57			
	21-25	159	395.61			
	26- over	125	403.34			
Perlocutionary Language	1-5	118	470.47	12.69	5	0.02
	6-10	134	390.63			
	11-15	106	394.34			
	16-20	184	437.11			
	21-25	159	392.81			
	26- over	125	392.04			
Illocutionary Language	1-5	118	435.89	3.69	5	0.59
	6-10	134	396.97			
	11-15	106	409.10			
	16-20	184	430.32			
	21-25	159	394.08			
	26- over	125	413.77			
Locutionary Language	1-5	118	425.72	4.27	5	0.51
	6-10	134	388.93			
	11-15	106	402.85			
	16-20	184	438.27			
	21-25	159	412.95			
	26- over	125	401.59			

When Table 5 is examined; there is a significant difference only in the sub-dimension of perlocutionary language according to professional seniority. Tukey HSD test has been used to determine this significant difference. It has been determined that motivational language perception levels of 1-5 years senior teachers are higher than those of 21-25 years senior teachers. But there is no important difference in illocutionary language and locutionary language sub-dimensions and in general scale.

Table 6. Mann Whitney U Test of the Motivational Language Scale According to Teachers' Educational Status

	Education Satatus	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	z	p
General Scale	Undergraduate	427.41	288489.50	41575.50	-3.54	0.00
	Graduate	351.33	53051.50			
Perlocutionary Language	Undergraduate	427.11	288289.00	41776.00	-3.47	0.00
	Graduate	352.66	53252.00			
Illocutionary Language	Undergraduate	426.40	287817.50	42752.50	-3.28	0.00
	Graduate	355.85	53733.50			
Locutionary Language	Undergraduate	425.50	287212.50	42862.50	-3.06	0.00
	Graduate	359.86	54338.50			

When Table 6 is examined, it has been determined that there is a statistically significant difference in the general scale and in all sub-dimensions according to the education status of the teachers ($p < 0.05$). It is seen that undergraduate teachers perceive the motivational language which school principals use at a higher level than graduate teachers. It can be said that this situation is due to the higher expectation status of graduate teachers.

The findings regarding that there is a significant difference in teachers' perceptions of the motivational language which school principals use according to the variables of school principals' gender and school type are presented in Table 7 and Table 8 respectively.

Table 7. Mann Whitney U Test of The Motivational Language Scale According to The Gender of The Principal

	Principal Gender	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	z	p
General Scale	Female	462.79	49519.00	33192.00	-2.29	0.02
	Male	406.16	292032.00			
Perlocutionary Language	Female	458.29	49036.50	33674.50	-2.08	0.03
	Male	406.84	292514.50			
Illocutionary Language	Female	457.23	48923.50	33787.50	-2.03	0.04
	Male	406.99	292627.50			
Locutionary Language	Female	460.85	49310.50	33400.50	-2.20	0.02
	Male	406.45	292240.50			

When Table 7 is examined, there is a statistically significant difference in motivational language use in general and in all sub-dimensions of the school principal's gender ($p < 0.05$). The difference was found to be in favor of female school principals. This may be due to the fact that female school principals use motivational language more than male principals. On the other hand, there is no important difference in the motivational language scale and in all its sub-dimensions according to the education level of the principals.

Table 8. Kruskal Wallis H-Test of The Motivational Language Scale According to School Type

	School Type (High School)	n	Mean Rank	χ^2	(df)	p
General Scale	Anatolian	255	412.35	40.47	3	0.00
	Vocational	426	450.19			
	Imam Hatip	73	280.82			
	Science & Social Science	72	334.99			
Perlocutionary Language	Anatolian	255	416.39	40.43	3	0.00
	Vocational	426	448.28			
	Imam Hatip	73	278.94			
	Science & Social Science	72	333.94			
Illocutionary Language	Anatolian	255	403.61	33.70	3	0.00
	Vocational	426	451.13			
	Imam & Hatip	73	306.35			
	Science & Social Science	72	334.24			

The Impact of Motivational Language Which School Principals Use on Teachers' Organizational Commitment

Locutionary Language	Anatolian	255	417.01	38.39	3	0.00
	Vocational	426	445.50			
	Imam Hatip	73	270.24			
	Science & Social Science	72	356.97			

According to Table 8, there is a statistically significant difference according to school type in teachers' perception of motivational language in general and all sub-dimensions of the Motivational Language Scale ($p < .05$). Tukey HSD test was used to determine this difference. It is seen that vocational high school teachers perceive the motivational language used by the school principal at a higher level than the teachers working in imam hatip high schools and science-social sciences high schools. In addition, it is understood that Anatolian high school teachers perceive motivational language at a higher level than teachers working in imam hatip high schools.

4.3. Findings on Teachers' Level of Organizational Commitment

As seen in Table 9 below, it is understood that their organizational commitment level is high ($\bar{x}=3.78$) according to teachers' perceptions. In addition, the item with the lowest perception of organizational commitment of teachers was "Item 10: The feeling that I am a part of the administration prevents me from leaving this school." ($\bar{x}=3.46$), the highest item was "Item 1: I feel more committed to this school as I am involved in planning, organizing and executing in my school." ($\bar{x}=3.99$).

Table 9. Distribution of Responses to the Organizational Commitment Scale ($n=826$)

	\bar{x}	Ss
1. I feel more committed to this school as I am involved in planning, organizing and executing in my school.	3.99	0.97
2. The high level of confidence that prevails in this school keeps me in my job for so long.	3.85	1.02
3. I have a strong feeling that I am part of the administration at this school.	3.59	1.07
4. The fact that there are professional development opportunities in my school makes me committed to this school.	3.54	1.08
5. I feel committed to this school because the right jobs are given to the right people at this school.	3.71	1.01
6. I think that my school has a stable and development-oriented structure.	3.86	1.02
7. I feel a part of this school completely.	3.88	1.02
8. The fact that our principal supports and encourages my efforts makes me feel closer to this school.	3.96	1.05
9. I identify largely with this school because of its fair and thoughtful administration.	3.85	1.04
10. The feeling that I am part of the administration prevents me from leaving this school.	3.46	1.10
11. I can also work outside of class hours at this school without thinking about any monetary gain.	3.73	1.09
12. The objective evaluation of one's performance rather than whoover makes me feel committed to this school.	3.76	1.03
13. The fact that our administrators encourage us to cooperate while making decisions and solving problems makes me feel committed to this school.	3.79	0.98
14. I feel highly committed to this school because my superiors appreciate the work I have done.	3.75	1.06
15. I think that the balance of freedom and responsibility in my school really commits me to this school.	3.80	1.00
16. I feel committed here because I think that I am taken into account in this school.	3.84	1.03
17. Since my suggestions are taken into account by the school administration, I feel committed to this place.	3.84	1.02
Total	3.78	0.84

4.4. Organizational Commitment Level of Teachers According to Different Variables

The findings that there is a statistically significant difference in the level of organizational commitment perceived by the teachers according to the variables of teachers's gender and educational status are presented in Table 10 and Table 11 respectively. However, there is no statistically important difference in the level of teachers' perception of organizational commitment according to teachers' professional seniority.

Table 10. The Mann-Whitney U Test of Organizational Commitment Scores According to Teacher Gender

Gender	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	z	p
--------	-----------	--------------	---	---	---

Organizational Commitment	Female	385.19	167559.00	72729.00	-3.59	0.00
	Male	444.99	173992.00			

When Table 10 is examined, it is understood that the male teachers' organizational commitment level is higher than the level of organizational commitment of female teachers ($p < 0.05$).

Table 11. *The Mann-Whitney U Test of Organizational Commitment Scores According to the Educational Status of Teachers*

	Education Satatus	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	z	p
Organizational Commitment	Undergraduate	426.72	288035.00	42040.00	-3.36	0.00
	Graduate	354.41	53516.00			

According to Table 11, it has been determined that there is a statistically significant difference in the level of organizational commitment according to the educational status of the teachers. It is seen that the organizational commitment levels of undergraduate teachers are better than those of graduate teachers ($p < 0.05$). On the other hand, there is no statistically important difference in the level of teachers' perception of organizational commitment according to the school principal's gender and educational status.

When Table 12 below is examined, there is a statistically significant difference in the level of teachers' organizational commitment according to school type ($p < 0.05$). Tukey HSD test was applied to determine this difference. It was found that teachers who work in vocational high schools, Anatolian high schools and Science- social sciences high schools perceived higher levels of organizational commitment than teachers who work in Imam hatip high schools.

Table 12. *Kruskal Wallis H-Test of Organizational Commitment Scores According to School Type*

	School Type	n	Mean Rank	χ^2	(df)	p
Organizational Commitment	Anatolian	255	423.40	37.27	3	0.00
	Vocational	426	441.02			
	Imam Hatip	73	264.93			
	Science & Social Science	72	366.24			

4.5. The Impact of Motivational Language Which School Principals Use on Teachers' Organizational Commitment

The relationship between the motivational language school principals use and teachers' organizational commitment, and then the impact of motivational language on teachers' organizational commitment are presented in Table 13 and Table 14 respectively.

Table 13. *Spearman RHO Correlation Analysis for the Relationship between the Motivational Language Used by School Principals and the Levels of Teachers' Organizational Commitment*

Variables	r	Motivational Language
Organizational Commitment	r	0.83**

n =416, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

According to Table 13, Spearman RHO correlation analysis was done to determine the relationship between the motivational language used by school principals and teachers' organizational commitment and the correlation value was calculated as ($r = 0.83$). According to this calculation, it was found that there is a positive and high level relationship between motivational language and organizational commitment.

The regression analysis to determine the impact of motivational language which school principals use on teachers' organizational commitment is presented in Table 14. When the results of multiple regression analysis were examined according to Table 14, a statistically significant relationship was found between motivational language and organizational commitment ($p < 0.01$). In addition, it was found that motivational language can explain organizational commitment by 70%, and the part in the proportion of 30% can be explained by other variables ($R = 0.84$, $R^2 = 0.70$, $F = 1975.43$, $p < 0.01$).

Table 14. *Regression Analysis Between Motivational Language and Organizational Commitment*

Organizational Commitment	B	SHB	β	t	p
Stable	0.62	0.7	-	8.59	0.00
Motivational Language	0.84	0.2	0.84	44.44	0.00

N=826, R=0.84, R²=0.70, F=1975.43, p<0.01

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to the results of this research, a high level ($r = .83$) positive relationship was found between the motivational language used by school principals and teachers' organizational commitment. Similarly, Sivik (2018) found a statistically positive relationship between the motivational language which school principals use and organizational dedication. Latifoğlu (2015) found a positive and significant relationship between the motivational language used by the administrators of ÇAYKUR Organization and the organizational commitment of the employees. Mayfield & Mayfield (2009b) found that motivational language used by managers increases work attendance. Mayfield & Mayfield (2007) found a positive significant relationship between motivational language and employees' intention to stay in the organization. The research showing a positive relationship between motivational language and organizational commitment are similar to this research.

In this research, it was found that the motivational language level used by school principals ($\bar{x}=3.73$) and teachers' organizational commitment level ($\bar{x}=3.78$) were "high". Demir (2018c) ($\bar{x}=3.83$), Sivik (2018) ($\bar{x}=3.42$) and Karaaslan (2010) ($\bar{x}=3.51$) determined the motivational language level used by school principals as "high" and Yavuz (2018) as "medium". Yavuz (2018) ($\bar{x}=3.38$) and Latifoğlu (2015) ($\bar{x}=2.61$) found the motivational language level as "medium". Latifoğlu (2015) found the organizational commitment level ($\bar{x}=2.99$) as "medium".

In teachers' motivational language perception levels; A statistically significant relationship was determined according to the variables of teachers' gender, educational status and professional seniority, school principal gender and school type. According to teacher gender, male teachers perceive motivational language at a higher level than female teachers. Demir (2018b), Sivik (2018) and Yavuz (2018) did not find a significant difference in the perception of motivational language according to teacher gender. In the perlocutionary language sub-dimension, a significant difference was found in the perception of motivational language according to teachers' professional seniority. Less experienced teachers perceive motivational language at a higher level than more experienced teachers. However, Demir (2018b) and Sivik (2018) did not find a significant difference according to teachers' professional seniority in their research. According to the education status of the teachers, the teachers with a undergraduate degree perceive a higher level of motivational language than the teachers with a graduate degree. According to the gender of the school principal, it has been determined that female principals use motivational language at a higher level than male principals. A difference was determined according to the type of school, and it is perceived that the teachers who work in Vocational and Anatolian high schools use motivational language at a higher level than the teachers who work In imam hatip high schools.

In the organizational commitment levels of teachers; A statistically significant relationship was determined according to the variables of teachers' gender, educational status and school type. The level of organizational commitment of male teachers is better than the female teachers. Similarly, Latifoğlu (2015) found that male employees perceive higher organizational commitment level than female employees. In addition, undergraduate teachers perceive higher organizational commitment level than graduate teachers. It has been determined that the organizational commitment level of the teachers who work in Anatolian, Vocational and Science-social sciences high schools is higher than the teachers who work in Imam hatip high schools.

6. SUGGESTIONS

-As a result of this research, it was seen that as the motivational language level which school principals use increased, the teachers' commitment level to their schools also increased. School principals can provide many advantages to their schools by using motivational language effectively. It can increase teachers' commitment to school, so it is expected that school success will also increase.

-School principals should prefer interactive management style instead of autocratic management style and use motivational language. Schools with high motivation will be more advantageous than other schools and their competitive power will increase.

-School principals can identify their own strengths and weaknesses using the motivational language scale. Thus, it can improve principal-teacher communication.

-Motivating teachers will increase their commitment to the school and their willingness to work. Therefore, it will be possible for students and parents to have a more positive view of the school.

-Factors that will increase the motivation of teachers, especially the reward mechanism, should be considered in the education system. Using motivational language together with these factors can increase the effectiveness of the education system.

REFERENCES.

- ABSTON, R., L. (2015). *Faculty trust in principal and organizational commitment* (Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation). The University of Alabama. Tuscaloosa, Alabama.
- AKYOL, B., VURAL, R. K. & GÜNDOĞDU, K. (2017). İlkokul öğrencilerinin okula aidiyet, okul atmosferi, iklimi ve müdürlerin öğretimsel liderlik becerilerinin incelenmesi. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(1), 291-311.
- ALPAR, R. (2017). *Uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistiksel yöntemler*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- ASLAN, M. & BAKIR, A. A. (2014). Öğretmenlerin okullarındaki örgütsel bağlılığa ilişkin görüşleri. *International Journal of Social Science*, 25(1), 189-206.
- BANKS, T. (2014). *The effects of leader speech and leader motivating language on employee self-esteem* (Unpublished doctorate dissertation). School of Business and Leadership, Regent University, USA.
- BAŞTÜRK, R. (2014). Deneme modelleri. A. Tanrıoğen (Ed.), *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (ss. 31- 53). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- BEYTEKİN, O. F., ARSLAN, H. & DOĞAN, M. (2020). Investigation of teachers' emotional labour and organizational alienation behaviours. *Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(3), 308-321.
- 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.
- BRANNON, K. L. (2011). *The effects of leader communication medium and motivating language on perceived leader effectiveness* (Unpublished dissertation). Northcentral University, Prescott Valley, AZ.
- BULUÇ, B. & GÜNEŞ, A. M. (2014). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment in primary schools. *Anthropologist*, 18(1), 145-152.
- CULIBRK, J. DELIC, S. & CULIBRK, D. (2018). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement: The mediating role of job involvement. *Front.Psychol*, 9(132), 1-18.
- ÇANAKKALE İL MİLLİ EĞİTİM MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ, (2019). <https://canakkale.meb.gov.tr/> (accessed on 15/02/2019).
- DELİVELİ, K. (2018). *Öğretim elemanlarının duygusal emek davranışları ile örgütsel bağlılık algı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.
- DEMİR, S. (2018a). Okul yöneticilerinin motivasyonel dili ile öğretmen öz yeterliği arasındaki ilişki üzerine bir çalışma. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(2), 177-183.
- DEMİR, S. (2018b). Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları motivasyonel dil ile öğretmen motivasyonu arasındaki ilişki. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(5), 633-638.
- DEMİR, S. (2018c). *Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları motivasyonel dil ile öğretmen motivasyonunun incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Gaziantep.
- DEVOS, G., TUYTENS, M., & HULPIA, H. (2014). Teachers' organizational commitment: Examining the mediating effects of distributed leadership. *American Journal of Education*, 120(2), 205-231.
- DOĞRUÖZ, E. & ÖZDEMİR, M. (2018). Eğitim örgütlerinde üretim karşıtı iş davranışları ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi. *İlköğretim Online*, 17(1), 396-413.
- EMRAHIMI, A., ZINALI, S. & DODMAN, K. (2013). Explanation of component of emotional intelligence and organizational commitment: case study of managers and assistants of city public school in Piranshahr. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 2(4), 192-199.
- GRIFFIN, M. L., HOGAN, N. L., LAMBERT, E. G., TUCKER-GAIL, K. A. & BAKER, D. N. (2010). Job involvement, job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and the burnout of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice And Behavior*, 37(2), 239-255
- GUTIERREZ-WIRSCHING, S., MAYFIELD, J., MAYFIELD, M. & WANG, W. (2014). Motivating language as a mediator between servant leadership and employee outcomes. *Management Research Review*, 38(12), 1234-1250.
- HANKE, D. (2020). Can Employees Motivate Themselves? The Link between Peer Motivating Language and Employee Outcomes, *The International Trade Journal*, DOI: 10.1080/08853908.2020.1826021

- HARGIE, O., TORIH, D. & WILSON, N. (2002). Communication audits and the effects of increased information: a follow-up study. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 39(4), 414-436.
- HAROON, M. (2018). *Impact of leader's motivating language on employees' job performance with mediation of job satisfaction and affective commitment* (Unpublished doctorate dissertation). Social Sciences Department of Management Sciences, Capital University of Science and Technology, Islamabad.
- HOLMES, W. T. (2012). *The motivating language of principals: A sequential transformative strategy* (Unpublished dissertation). University of Nevada, Las Vegas, NV, United States.
- HULPIA, H., DEVOS, G. & VAN KEER, H. (2010). The influence of distributed leadership on teachers organizational commitment: A multilevel approach, *The Journal of Educational Research*, 103(1), 40-52.
- KAHVECİ, G. (2010). *İlköğretim okullarında örgütsel sessizlik ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkiler* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Fırat Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ.
- KARAASLAN, Ö. (2010). *Motivasyonel dilin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ile olan ilişkisinde lider üye etkileşimin aracılık etkisinde incelenmesi: Yapısal eşitlik modelinde bir uygulama* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Harp Akademileri Komutanlığı Stratejik Araştırmalar Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- KARAKAYA, İ. (2014). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. A. Tanrıoğen (Ed.), *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (ss. 57-76). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- KARTAL, K. & DİRLİK, E. M. (2016). Geçerlik kavramının tarihsel gelişimi ve güvenilirlikte en çok tercih edilen yöntem: Cronbach Alfa katsayısı. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(4), 1865-1879.
- KAVRAYICI, C. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin mesleki kimlik algıları ve örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- KAYA, İ. (2017). *Okul yöneticileri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık ve tükenmişlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- KIM, J. S. & RYU, S. (2017). Employee satisfaction with work-life balance policies and organizational commitment: A Philippine study. *Public Administration and Development*, 37(4), 260-276.
- KOÇAK, O. (2019). *Okul yöneticilerinin otantik liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ve örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Fırat Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Elazığ.
- KÖYLÜ, D. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin karar alma sürecine katılım düzeylerinin örgütsel bağlılık ve psikolojik iyi oluş ile ilişkisi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Samsun.
- LATİFOĞLU, N. (2015). *Motivasyonel dil kullanımının örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki etkisi: Çaykur'da bir uygulama* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Rize.
- LASHARI, M., MOAZZAM, A., SALMAN, Y. & IRFAN, S. (2016). Impact of organizational trust on organizational justice and organizational commitment: A case of university of Sargodha. *JRSP*, 53(2), 170-194.
- LUSCHER, L.S. & LEWIS, M.W. (2008). Organizational change and managerial sensemaking: working through paradox. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2), 221-240.
- MAYA, İ. (2014). Kamu ilkokullarında yöneticilerin sergiledikleri kriz yönetimi beceri düzeylerine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(23), 209- 235.
- MAYFIELD, J., MAYFIELD, M. & KOPF, J. (1995). Motivational language: exploring theory with scale development. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 32(4), 329-344.
- MAYFIELD, J., MAYFIELD, M. & KOPF, J., (1998). The effects of leader motivating language on subordinate performance and satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 37(3-4), 235-235.
- MAYFIELD, J. & MAYFIELD, M. (2002). Leader communication strategies: critical paths to improving employee commitment. *American Business Review*, 20(2), 89-94.
- MAYFIELD, J. & MAYFIELD, M. (2004). The effects of leader communication on worker innovation. *American Business Review*, 22(2), 45-51.
- MAYFIELD, J. & MAYFIELD, M. (2006). The benefits of leader communication on part-time worker outcomes: a comparison between part-time and full-time employees using motivating language. *Journal of Business Strategies*, 23(2), 131-153.

- MAYFIELD, J. & MAYFIELD, M. (2007). The effects of leader communication on a worker's intent to stay: an investigation using structural equation modeling. *Human Performance*, 20(2), 85-102.
- MAYFIELD, J. & MAYFIELD, M. (2009b). The role of leader motivating language in employee absenteeism. *Journal of Business Communication*, 46(4), 455-479.
- MAYFIELD, J. & MAYFIELD, M. (2010). Leader-level influence on motivating language. *Competitiveness Review*, 20(5), 407-422.
- MAYFIELD, M. & MAYFIELD, J. (2016). The effects of leader motivating language use on worker decision making. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 53(4), 465-484.
- MAYFIELD, M. & MAYFIELD, J. (2017). Leader talk and the creative spark: A research note on how leader motivating language use influences follower creative environment perceptions. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 54(2), 210-225.
- MAYFIELD J. & MAYFIELD M. (2019). The diffusion process of strategic motivating language: an examination of the internal organizational environment and emergent properties. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 56(3) 368-392.
- MERT, İ. S. (2011). Yöneticilerin kullandıkları motivasyonel dil ve performans üzerindeki etkisi. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14(26), 197-213.
- MERT, S. M., KESKİN, N. & BAŞ, T. (2011). Motivasyonel dil (md) teorisi ve ölçme aracının Türkçe'de geçerlik ve güvenilirlik analizi. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 12(2), 243-255.
- MERT, E. (2019). *İlkokul ve ortaokul öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılıklarının incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- MOUSA, M. (2017). Organizational cynicism and organizational commitment in egyptian public primary education: when spring yields black flowers. *Management Research and Practice*, 9(3), 13-29.
- ÖZEN, H. (2013). Okul müdürlerine yönelik Motivasyonel Dil Ölçeği: Türk kültürüne uyarlama, dil geçerliği ve faktör yapısının incelenmesi. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(1), 87-103.
- ÖZEN, H. (2014). Motivasyonel dil teorisi ışığında okul müdürlerinin kullandığı motivasyonel dilin öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına olan etkisi. *Turkish Studies*, 9(5), 1731-1746.
- ÖZEN, H. (2015). *Okul müdürlerinin kullandığı motivasyonel dilin intibak ettirici liderlik üzerine etkisi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- ÖZMEN, A. (2019). Paternalist liderlik ile mobbing ilişkisi: kamu kurumlarında bir araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24(2), 253-262.
- SALKIND, N. (2015). *İstatistikten nefret edenler için istatistik* (Çev. A. Çuhadaroğlu, Z.Ç. Özcan, Y. İmamoğlu). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- SIMMONS, S. A. & SHARBROUGH III, W. C. (2013). An analysis of leader and subordinate perception of motivating language. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 10(3), 11-27.
- SİVİK, S. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel adanmışlıkları ile lider-üye etkileşimi ve motivasyonel dil kullanımı arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kahramanmaraş.
- SÖNMEZ, H. (2018). *Okul müdürlerinin motivasyonel dil kullanımı ile öğretmenlerin okul iklimi algısı arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- SULLIVAN, J. J. (1988). *Three roles of language in motivation theory*. The Academy of Management Review, 13(1), 104-115.
- SUN, P., PAN, F. & HO, C. (2016). Does motivating language matter in leader-subordinate communication? *Chinese Journal of Communication*, 9(3), 264-282, DOI: 10.1080/17544750.2016.1206029.
- ŞAN, B. (2017). *Öğretmenlerin ve okul yöneticilerinin psikolojik güçlendirme ve örgütsel bağlılıklarına ilişkin alguları* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Denizli.
- TABACHNICK, B. G. & FIDELL, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*. Massachusetts: Pearson Publish.

- TAŞ, A. (2017). *İş doyumu ve örgütsel bağlılık: Özdemir ve Cemaloğlu (Ed.), Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetimi* (ss. 421- 445). Ankara: Belgeç Yayınevi.
- TAVŞANCIL, E. (2005). *Tutumların ölçülmesi ve SPSS ile veri analizi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- ULUDAĞ, G. (2019). Lider üye etkileşiminin işgören performansına etkisi üzerine bir alan araştırması, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 23(2), 719-739.
- ÜSTÜNER, M. (2009). Öğretmenler için Örgütsel Bağlılık Ölçeği: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(1), 1-17.
- WANG, C.-W., FAN, K.-T., HSIEH, C.-T. & MENEFEE, M.L. (2009). Impact of motivating language on team creative performance. *The Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 50(1), 133-140.
- WILLIAM, C. S. & SUSAN, A. S. (2006). Motivating language in industry. *Journal Business Communication*, 43(4), 322-343.
- WERANG, B. & PURE, E. (2018). Designing strategy for improving teacher's organizational commitment in the remote elementary schools of Merauke district, Papua, *Indonesia. International Journal of Research Studies in Education* (7)1, 15-28.
- XIAO, J. & WILKINS, S. (2015). The effects of lecturer commitment on student perceptions of teaching quality and student satisfaction in Chinese higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37(1), 98-110.
- YANAR, A. İ. (2011). *Anadolu lisesi öğretmenlerinin mesleki tükenmişliklerinin ve örgütsel bağlılıklarının çalıştıkları okulların 2010 YGS' deki başarılarına göre incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Ege Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- YAVUZ, Ş. (2018). *Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları motivasyonel dil ile öğretmenlerin rol fazlası davranışları arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Düzce Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Düzce.