



## The Relationship between the Influence Tactics Primary School Principals Use and Teachers' Organizational Commitment \*

Serkan Koşar <sup>1</sup>, Ümit Pehlivan <sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between the influence tactics primary school principals use and teachers' organizational commitment. In the study correlational survey model was used. The teachers that worked at primary schools in 8 districts of the city center of Ankara in the academic year of 2016-2017 made up the sample of this study. The participants were 397 teachers who were chosen via stratified sampling. Influence Behavior Questionnaire and The Scale of Organizational Commitment were used to collect the data. For data analysis, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to designate the relationship between the variables and Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was used to study the predictor variables. The results demonstrated that the most frequent influence tactic the principals used was "legitimizing" and the least used ones were "exchange and personal appeal". On the other hand, the teachers were found to be committed to the organization the most in the internalization dimension. The findings of the study imply that principals should prefer to use mild tactics (ingratiation, apprising and collaboration). In addition, compared to other dimensions, teachers' commitment to their schools are low in the dimension of compliance with their schools. Accordingly, studies that will increase teachers' compliance with their schools may be undertaken.

### Keywords

Primary school  
Organization  
Teacher  
Influence tactics  
Organizational commitment

### Article Info

Received: 12.29.2018  
Accepted: 08.28.2019  
Online Published: 01.15.2020

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2020.8392

\* This article is derived from Ümit Pehlivan's master's thesis entitled "The relationship between the influence tactics used by primary education administrators and teachers' organizational commitment", conducted under the supervision of Serkan Koşar.

<sup>1</sup> Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, [skosar@gazi.edu.tr](mailto:skosar@gazi.edu.tr)

<sup>2</sup> Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Turkey, [pehlivanumit1806@gmail.com](mailto:pehlivanumit1806@gmail.com)

## Introduction

The influence that an individual makes on another individual or organization forms the center of influencing process (Werner, 1993), and maintaining and mobilizing interpersonal interaction increases the importance of influencing stage. School systems are based on the idea of serving human beings and as social characteristics are intensively observed in these organizations, influencing process is much more significant. Schools are the organizations that work in interaction and they arise as a management process that starts the organized move. Therefore, the duty school principals are expected to undertake is leading their subordinates namely the teachers to do their duties. As principals are expected to lead organizations that consist of people who have different characteristics, this increases the significance of influencing process and it is important to unite the workers towards a common goal (Haimann, 1962). It is suggested that influencing people is very critical in developing organizational commitment and especially leadership characteristics such as rational persuasion, holding consultations and encouragement are very effective in this process (Yukl, 2013). In addition, according to Moideenkutty and Schmidt (2011), the use of positive influence tactics affect workers performance in a positive way.

Today, influential leaders need skills of planning and time management in addition to organizing and coordination. Whether they are teachers or from another job, the people in the leadership position should help their workers by support, encouragement and forming consensus and they should have the competence in developing interpersonal relationships (Gümüşeli, 2014). As a result of the changes in time and conditions, school principals are assigned further duties. Due to these new duties, the competences and characteristics principals need are also being updated continuously. Consequently, principals need to incorporate the powers they have into their leadership (Şişman, 2016). Schools are places that consist of various partners and dynamics. Also, schools are the organizations in which the expectations and wishes of various groups intensify. In these organizations, the power displays of different groups towards each other are much more common compared to other organizations. This is why it is acknowledged that there is more influence activity between managers and subordinates namely principals and teachers (Açıkalın, 1993).

Teachers' commitment to schools is a very significant component in the effectiveness of a school. The teachers that are committed to their schools indicate strong dedication for their students and working environment. In organizations such as schools where there are many disputes over which goals should be accomplished initially and where there are profound difficulties in controlling the work, a sincere commitment to the organization gains more importance. The reason is that it is not totally possible to assess teachers' performance. This is why a good teaching overwhelmingly depends on teachers' commitment to their organization and their knowledge (Firestone & Pannel, 1993).

### *Influence Tactics*

The concept of influence can emerge at differing ways and degrees in organizations depending on the requirements of the context. For instance, senior managers in an organization try to influence their subordinates more compared to lower ranking managers. Lower ranking managers try to influence their subordinates to have them use the solutions they have developed for organizational problems. Managers' effective display of performance for the subordinates and their ability to have the subordinates accept, support and put into action the decisions they have made to attain the goals of the organization are really essential in effective influencing (Yukl, Seifert, & Chavez, 2008).

Influence tactics are stated as intentional behaviors that are displayed to change a person's attitude or behavior, create a positive atmosphere or form better relationships with that person (Yukl, 2013). In addition, influencing is a concept that forms the base of management processes. One of the

most significant factors that enables adapting an organization to changing circumstances and sustaining its existence, increasing efficiency and being able to compete with the other organizations is the manager's ability of influencing. The full display of an executive's influencing behavior is dependent upon his/her success in coordinating, leading, participating into decisions, motivating, consulting and bringing the employees together in accordance with the goals of the organization (Koşar, 2016). Influencing factor is said to exist when interaction among employees in an organization starts and maintained. This is only possible through attempts to change the employees' beliefs, attitudes and values, and when this attempts lead to a tangible positive change, the influence is argued to exist. Education organizations are institutions where people have different wishes, expectations and needs co-existence. In line with the goals of an organization, principals need to use influence tactics to realize the goals of the organization (Kondakçı & Zayim, 2013).

The researchers that studied influence tactics paid attention to the following variables in classifying influence tactics: (i) the direction of the influence, (ii) the purpose of the influence, (iii) the outcome of the influence, (iv) individual and organizational variables, (v) the frequency of tactic use, (vi) the ordering of influence tactics, (vii) the combination of influence tactics and (viii) the efficiency of tactic use (Faeth, 2004). French and Raven (1959) on the other hand made their classification based on power. According to this classification, influence tactics were assessed according to legal (legitimate), expertness, suppressive (pressure), charismatic and rewarding power. This ordering also laid the foundation of organizational influence tactics classifications. Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson's (1980), approach was the first step for the assessment of influence tactics. This study had made significant contributions to the field of influence tactics. Initially, they grouped influence tactics in three categories which were (i) strong, (ii) weak and (iii) rational. Then, they renamed these categories and they used them as *hard, soft and rational* tactics. Hard influence tactics foreground authority and the use of power, soft influence tactics underline the use of personal power and rational influence tactics prioritize logic. Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) analyzed influence tactics in six categories which were (i) exchange, (ii) establishing himself/herself, (iii) rationality (iv) entrepreneurship, (v) upward appeal and (vi) coalitions. The most significant, comprehensive and systematic classification for influence tactics in organizations is the classification prepared by Yukl et al. (2008). This classification was prepared by utilizing the studies that had been undertaken previously and it mentioned 11 influence tactics. These are:

*Rational Persuasion:* In this tactic, in order to attain the goal, rational explanations were made in addition to real evidence. The requested tasks is shown to be necessary and definitely possible and it is made sure that this task will provide ease for attaining the goals and targets. The manager who uses this tactic should be able to present the information, documents or evidence that are necessary for the change requested (Yukl, 2013). In influencing through rational persuasion, individuals' emotional responses and information should be considered together taking rational data into consideration through two different viewpoints. In this way, it is the action of making individuals believe and persuasion is achieved by using emotional communication together with factual and rational documents (McShane & Von Glinow, 2008).

*Exchange:* The tactic of exchange is the tactic in which there is always the win-win policy and a reward is promised when a favor is done. In response to the completion of a task upon a principal's request, the principals offer a reward. This tactic also argues that when help is received for a necessary task, the profits of this task should be shared with the person that has helped (Yukl, 2013).

*Inspirational Appeal:* This tactic is looking for some values and ideals to increase commitment emotionally before attempting to influence. In this tactic there are emotions and values instead of logical documents. Inspirational appeal can be described as integrating one's needs, values, hopes with his/her

ideas for an appeal or a suggestion (Yukl, 2013). At this point, the manager touches the emotions of the employees to mobilize them. The managers try to realize their self-confidence by dealing with their values, cravings and wishes (Yukl & Falbe, 1990).

*Legitimizing:* Legitimizing states the idea that decisions can be made depending on the formal authority. In this tactic, the work requested from a worker is underlined to be a legal one. The manager mentions that he/she has the authority to have this work done. It is explaining the fact that the work needed is appropriate for the policies and traditions of the organization (Yukl, 2013).

*Pressure:* The pressure tactic is defined as the use of threatening mentioning the needs to persuade the subordinates to help with a demand. This tactic is usually applied to the workers namely, it is not likely to be used against the managers (Yukl, 2013).

*Apprising:* Appraising can be defined as providing suggestions for a person's (the person to be influenced) career and explaining how that person's career will be maintained. In this tactic, the employee also has benefits. The benefits are career development and job satisfaction (Yukl, 2013).

*Collaboration:* The collaboration tactic can be defined as getting help from other workers while you are trying to influence the employee that you want to influence. When an employee wants to do a task, the manager proposes how to do that job and this shows that the manager uses this tactic (Yukl, 2013). Collaboration can be defined as ensuring consensus in some cases. Although collaboration usually refers to peaceful consensus, it is defined as a persuasion attempt for a change (Pounder, 1998).

*Ingratiation:* This tactic makes a person feel well. It comprises behaving respectfully, complimenting and doing a favor before doing a kindness. When the employee is influenced by his/her manager, he/she feels ingratiated, his/her dignity increases and he/she is more likely to be willing to do the requested duty (Yukl, 2013). As for Kipnis et al. (1980), ingratiation is first influencing attempt. According to these researchers, doing ingratiation one after another is not perceived as sincere and it decreases the reliability of the person who attempts this.

*Consultation:* This tactic is defined as encouraging the person to make suggestions or supporting him/her to catch up with the aspired change. In this tactic, if the employee has any worries about the applicability issues or any negative outcomes, the manager tries different ways to deal with this concern (Yukl, 2013). The purpose of this tactic is to make people feel that they are a part of the decision-making process. In order for the individuals to accept decisions, they should have contribution in the decision-making or application stage (Maher, 1999).

*Personal Appeals:* It is defined as attracting attention by kindness, generosity or asking for a favor based on friendship or commitment. Before requesting a favor from the person to be influenced, he/she is approached in a friendly manner and this is presented as an appeal in this tactic (Yukl, 2013).

*Coalitions:* This tactic is defined as getting help from others while trying to influence a person. The partnership formed to do coalitions can consist of those who work for the same duty, managers or individuals from other environments. Coalition is used the most to affect those who work for the same duty and the executive managers. Coalition is observed to be used very rarely for affecting subordinates. The reason is that there are more tactics to affect the subordinates (Yukl, 2013). Coalition is especially used for deciding which behavior is the right one. In other words, whether the behavior is true or false is decided depending on the ideas of those who are around. The more people support an idea/behavior, the more the individual believes that the idea/behavior is appropriate (Cialdini, 2001).

The reactions of the subordinates in response to the influence tactics vary. The factors which affect the consequences of the influence are: the selection of the influence tactic, the purpose of the influence attempt, the power type between the manager and the worker, a manager's incompetence in using the power he/she has, the behavior expected from the worker, his/her attitude towards the duty and previous experience (Falbe & Yukl, 1992). Influence attempts lead to results such as commitment, compliance and resistance (Yukl, 2013). *Commitment* is the proof that the influence tactic has been succeeded. A worker's commitment indicates that he/she has identified himself/herself with the organization and that he/she wants to be permanent in the organization (Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Robbins & Coulter, 2003). *Compliance*, although not necessarily completely, indicates that an influence tactic is partially successful. The behavior of a worker may have changes as a result of the influence tactic, but a change in managers' behavior is beside the point.

Resistance shows that the influence tactic has failed. Objecting to the manager's influence behavior means rejecting it. Resistance may emerge out in different ways. These are postponing, objection, slowdown, unwillingness and damaging the organization (Yukl, 2013). It can be argued that the managers who have strong interaction, who are charismatic and use both the rewarding and proficiency powers use influence tactics such as rational persuasion, coalitions, ingratiation, collaboration and apprising and as a result, commitment to them is high. In contrast, the principals who use suppressive power prefer to use suppression as a tactic more often and as a result, a rise in resistance from the subordinates can be expected (Koşar, 2016).

#### ***Organizational Commitment***

Organizational commitment is defined as an individual's working harder than usual to reach the goals of the organization, his/her strong belief in the value judgements of the organization, his/her positive relationships with the others in the organization and his/her strong desire to be in the organization and maintain his/her membership to the organization (Morrow, 1983). Organizational commitment is a condition that is related to the workers' attitudes and behavior towards their jobs. It is the workers' loyalty, identification and compliance with their job. Organizational commitment can be mentioned when the outcomes of the work, work job satisfaction, motivation and performance level are above the expected level (Chen & Chen, 2008).

One of the real targets that is needed to protect the existence of organizations and maintain their existence is organizational commitment. As a result, the people who have organizational commitment are more agreeable, productive, loyal and responsible and they lead to less cost. In an environment where there is a fierce competition, commitment is very significant for each organization. The reason is that organizational commitment can help understand and develop workers' behavior about their jobs (Balci, 2003). Commitment to an organization's goals leads to a qualitative and quantitative increase in the level of success and a decrease in absence and labor turnover. Also, it leads the individual to various essential actions that are necessary for organizational life and a top level success of the system (Katz & Kahn, 1977). The development of organizational commitment depend on the process of linking employee's' emotional energy and attention with each other. This situation reflects their relationship with each other and their feelings and ideas about the organization. Decreasing competition in many cases in the organization requires the employees' commitment (Balay, 2000a)

Researchers proposed different classifications for organizational commitment. To exemplify, Allen and Meyer (1990, 1991) defined organizational commitment as emotional commitment, continuation and normative commitment while O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) defined it as compliance, identification and internalization. Wiener (1982) defined it as instrumental commitment-normative commitment while Katz and Kahn (1977) classified it as instrumental circuit-expressive circuit. Finally, Etzioni (1975) proposed a more different classification by negative/alienation, neutral/cheeseparating and positive/moral. In this study organizational commitment was studied under three dimensions. These are (i) compliance, (ii) identification and (iii) internalization dimensions. These three dimensions are totally independent and different than each other. To put it in a nut shell, when necessary, the compliance dimension foregrounds commitment and punishment-reward evaluation. The identification dimension foregrounds commitment, and the internalization dimension foregrounds

being a member of an organization, adopting its values and meeting the expectations of the organization (İmamoğlu, 2011).

*Compliance Dimension:* Compliance is the first phase of commitment. In this phase, the individual accepts the others' influence just to learn things from them and have some advantages. The individual supports the organization in some situations without going into detail. These individuals wish to get some rewards and avoid punishments by appearing coherent. This type of commitment which occurs without going into detail is named as compliance (Brockner, Tyler, & Schneider, 1992). The one who has the authority in compliance dimension is in an advantageous position and in the short term this is valid for providing immediate solutions to problems (Balay, 2000a).

*Identification Dimension:* This is the second phase of commitment. It is related to individuals' wish to be close to the organization and its members, and it is an emotional aspect. In this aspect, the employee accepts the external effects in exchange for establishing and maintaining relationships which help him/her identify himself/herself with the organization. The employee starts having a close relationship with the members of the organization, accepts the goals, targets and values of the organization, identifies himself/herself with the organization and forms a commitment to the organization. The employee who formed a commitment in the identification dimension feels responsible towards the organization and he/she makes sacrifices, forms an emotional link with the organization and identifies his/her values with the values of the organization (Balay, 2000a).

*Internalization Dimension:* It is the final stage of commitment. It can be stated as the mutual coherence of organizational and individual values. In this dimension individuals see the values of the organization as compatible with their own values. At the same time, this dimension focuses the effects on individuals' attitudes and behavior (Balay, 2000a). The commitment dimension which the organizations want the most is internalization. At this level, the individual has formed a single entity with the organization and s/he has become a loyal worker. As a result, all the organizations want their employees to be committed to their organization in this manner (Başyigit, 2009).

The level of commitment unearths the results of the commitment. In this context, the following levels, which can lead to negative and positive outcomes, can be mentioned (Randall, 1987): (i) low level, (ii) normal (mild) level and (iii) high level organizational commitment.

*Low Level Organizational Commitment:* In this commitment level, the commitment of employees is not strong. However, because of various reasons, they need to stay in the organization (Bayram, 2005). When the appropriate conditions emerge, the employees are expected to leave (Balay, 2000a). This level of commitment is called obligatory commitment or continuation commitment (Randall, 1987).

*Normal (Mild) Level Organizational Commitment:* In this commitment style, employees value the existence of the organization and when the time they spend at the organization increases, their wish to leave the organization decreases (Agun, 2011). This commitment level is named as formal commitment or normative commitment (Randall, 1987).

*High Level Organizational Commitment:* In this commitment type, employees' commitment to the organization is very strong. The time they work at the organization is very long and they do not want to leave the organization in general (Bayram, 2005). This commitment level is named as identification or emotional commitment (Randall, 1987).

Schools principals use some tactics to influence teachers and other employees. However, they are expected to choose these tactics in accordance with the context. While influencing their subordinates, school principals generally use soft tactics. Rational persuasion, consultation, ingratiation and having himself/herself acknowledged are some of these tactics (Dağlı, 2015). Principals' use of suppression tactics to influence teachers will lead to the failure of the influencing process. When harsh tactics such as legitimating or suppression are used all the time in school environments, the trust between teachers and principals decreases, the school's academic success decreases and a resistance against behavior change is formed (Koşar, 2013). Consequently, principals in schools should choose their influence tactics carefully. For the school principals who have goals such as increasing effectiveness in their school,

creating change and being able to apply a project using influence tactics to influence teachers is much more vital. As a result, when a principal who has earned the trust of teachers via soft persuasion tactics mentions the importance of a project using reasonable documents, he/she is more likely to persuade teachers. Moreover, teachers' commitment to the school also increases. School principals' collaboration with teachers, acting together and taking teachers' needs, values and believes seriously increase teachers' commitment and this can give them the feeling that they are useful for the school. Therefore, school principals should do the necessary analyses about teachers' behavior and take the necessary steps (Dağlı, 2015).

In order to realize the goals of their institutions, primary school principals should have leadership competences, they should be able to affect teachers and have positive influence on them. Although there are studies on the relationship between influence tactics and pre-school principals' management skills (Dağlı, 2015), organizational citizenship and school mindfulness (Dağlı, 2015), the link between influence tactics and organizational justice (Kuru Çetin, 2013), its relation with personality types (Aydın & Pehlivan, 2010), the relationship between leadership styles (Derya, 2010), and a cultural analysis on the main influence tactics (Duyar, Aydın, & Pehlivan, 2009) there is not sufficient research about the effects of primary school principals' influence tactics on teachers. Schools are the places where the efforts to influence are faced intensively. That is why it is essential to do research about the influence tactics used in schools. It is significant to understand the relationship between influence tactics and organizational commitment which can be defined as an individual's contribution to the organization and his/her sincere efforts in accordance with the goals and objectives of the organization. Accordingly, this current article specifically studies the relationship between the influence tactics principals use and teachers' organizational commitment.

### *Research Questions*

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between the influence tactics primary school principals use and teachers' organizational commitment. In accordance with this main goal, the sub goals below were researched:

1. Is there a significant relationship between the influence tactics primary school principals use and teachers' perception of organizational commitment?
2. Are the influence tactics primary school principals use significant predictors of teachers' organizational commitment dimensions?

## **Method**

### *Research Model*

This study which investigated the relationship between the influence tactics primary school principals use and teachers' organizational commitment utilized "correlational survey model". Correlational surveys are "a research model that aims to designate the correlation between 2 or more variables and the level of this relationship" (Karasar, 2005). There are two variables one of which is the independent variable (influence tactics) and the other is the dependent variable (organizational commitment).

### *Population and the Sample*

The sample consisted of teachers who worked at the primary schools (Primary and Secondary schools) of Altındağ, Çankaya, Etimesgut, Keçiören, Mamak, Pursaklar, Sincan and Yenimahalle districts in Ankara during the academic year 2016-2017. The sample was chosen via stratified sampling. Stratified sampling "is a sampling method which enables the representation of sub groups in the sample in accordance with their ratio" (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2016). In the study each of the districts of Ankara (Altındağ, Çankaya, Etimesgut, Keçiören, Mamak, Pursaklar, Sincan, and Yenimahalle) were considered as a stratification. In this way, the aim was to represent the number of teachers in each district according to their ratio in comparison to the total number of teachers (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Population and the Sample of the Research

| District    | The Number of the Schools | The Number of the Teachers |      |       | School (%) | School (n=25) | Teacher (%) | Teacher (n=500) |
|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------|-------|------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|
|             |                           | Female                     | Male | Total |            |               |             |                 |
| Altındağ    | 103                       | 2084                       | 717  | 2801  | 13         | 3             | 10          | 50              |
| Çankaya     | 159                       | 3481                       | 949  | 4430  | 20         | 5             | 16          | 80              |
| Etimesgut   | 67                        | 2488                       | 722  | 3210  | 8          | 2             | 12          | 60              |
| Keçiören    | 123                       | 3946                       | 1487 | 5433  | 15         | 4             | 20          | 100             |
| Mamak       | 135                       | 2694                       | 987  | 3681  | 17         | 4             | 13          | 65              |
| Pursaklar   | 27                        | 645                        | 295  | 940   | 3          | 1             | 3           | 15              |
| Sincan      | 87                        | 2651                       | 942  | 3593  | 11         | 3             | 13          | 65              |
| Yenimahalle | 108                       | 2789                       | 944  | 3733  | 13         | 3             | 13          | 65              |
| Total       | 809                       | 20888                      | 7043 | 27931 | 100        | 25            | 100         | 500             |

According to Balcı (2004) when the population is too large, it is assumed that 384 people on the 95% reliability level, are enough for representing the population. The study aimed to have access to 500 teachers from 25 schools and surveys were obtained from 406 teachers. This means that the 81.2% percent of the participants filled and returned the surveys back. The data of 9 participants were excluded as they were outside the normal distribution range and 397 of the surveys were considered as valid.

64.2% of the participants ( $n=255$ ) were female teachers while 35.8% of them were ( $n=142$ ) male teachers. Around half of the participants were between the 31-40 age group (48.6%;  $n=194$ ), while 51 and above made up 6.8% ( $n=27$ ) of the sample and the ratio of the young teachers who were between 23-30 was 15.1% ( $n=59$ ). Finally, the teachers in the 41-50 age range made up 29.5% ( $n=117$ ) of the sample. When the job experience of the participants were analyzed, 24.9% of them ( $n=99$ ) were found to have an experience of 11-15 years, 22.2% of them ( $n=87$ ) have 21 years and more, 21.4% ( $n=86$ ) of them have 6-10 years, 21.2% ( $n=84$ ) have 16-20 years and 10.3% ( $n=41$ ) have 1-5 years. When the education level was checked, most of them (82.6%;  $n=328$ ) were found to have an undergraduate degree and 14.4% ( $n=57$ ) of them had a master's degree while 2.5% of them ( $n=10$ ) had an associate's degree. Only two teachers (0.5%) had a PhD degree. 60.2% ( $n=239$ ) of the teachers worked as primary school teachers while 39.8% ( $n=158$ ) of them worked as subject matter teachers. When the graduated faculty was checked as a variable, the majority of the teachers (78.1%;  $n=310$ ) were found to be faculty of education graduates, while 12.3% ( $n=49$ ) were graduates of faculty of science and literature. Also, teachers from education institutes ( $n=11$ ; %2.8), teacher colleges ( $n=4$ ; %1) and other faculties ( $n=23$ ; %5.8) participated in the study. These other faculties were theology, economics, management, agriculture, communication, architecture and veterinary schools.

#### **Data Collection Tools**

*Influence Behavior Questionnaire:* This data collection tool was preferred due to the previous researches where vice principles (Maher, 1999) and teachers' influence tactics (Dohlen, 2012) were investigated and its proven reliability and validity. This scale which was developed by Yukl et al. (2008) and adapted to Turkish by Gözü (2012) was developed in two types which are influencing (manager) and being exposed to the influence (the target). This study utilized the target version. Influence Behavior Questionnaire was prepared as a five-point Likert scale and the degrees used in the scale are (1) I never remember this tactic used for me, (2) this tactic is used very rarely for me, (3) this tactic is sometimes used for me, (4) this tactic is used frequently for me, (5) this tactic is used very frequently for me. The questionnaire consists of 44 items and it assesses 11 different influence tactics in groups of 4. The sub dimensions of the questionnaire are rational persuasion, exchange, inspirational appeal, legitimating, appraising, pressure, collaboration, ingratiation, consultation, personal appeals and coalition. In this study a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was undertaken to test the construct validity of the scale.

According to the CFA results, the conformity values were:  $\chi^2 = 2063.16$  (sd= 847;  $p < .001$ ),  $(\chi^2/\text{sd}) = 2.44$ , RMSEA=0.060, AGFI= 0.78, GFI= 0.97, CFI= 0.97, NFI= 0.95, NNFI= 0.97, IFI= 0.97, RMR= 0.045. According to this result, the values belonging to the whole model were observed to have acceptable conformity values. In order to test the reliability, Cronbach's Alpha (internal consistency coefficient) values were checked. The internal consistency coefficient for all the items was found to be 0.93. This indicates that the overall scale is reliable at a high level. As for the internal consistency of the sub dimensions, it was found to be .91 for rational persuasion, .93 for exchange, .89 for inspirational appeal, .93 for fairness, .86 for suppression, .94 for appraising, .93 for collaboration, .94 for ingratiation, .92 for holding a consultation, .92 for personal appeal and .89 for forming coalitions with others. This demonstrates that the sub dimensions of the scale are reliable at a high level.

*The Scale of Organizational Commitment:* It was developed by Balay (2000b). The scale was prepared in 5-point Likert scale format and the points are as follows: (1) I do not agree at all, (2) I do not agree mildly, (3) I agree at medium level, (4) I agree and (5) I completely agree. The scale consists of 27 items and it has 3 sub dimensions. The sub dimensions of the scale are (i) compliance (items 1-8), (ii) identification (items 9-16) and (iii) internalization (items 17-27). A CFA was undertaken to test the construct validity of the study. According to the CFA results, the conformity values were:  $\chi^2 = 1267.28$  (sd= 321;  $p < .001$ ),  $(\chi^2/\text{sd}) = 3.95$ , RMSEA= 0.086, AGFI= 0.77, GFI= 0.81, CFI= 0.94, NFI= 0.92, NNFI= 0.92, IFI= 0.94, RMR= 0.079. According to this result, the values belonging to the whole model were observed to have acceptable conformity values. In order to designate the reliability of The Scale of Organizational Commitment, Cronbach's Alpha (internal consistency) values were checked. The internal consistency coefficient for all the items was found to be 0.80. This indicated that the scale is reliable in general. The coefficient consistency values were found to be .77 for compliance, .86 for identification and .91 for internalization. This demonstrated that the compliance sub dimension was at a reliable level and that identification and internalization dimensions were also at a high reliability level.

### **Data Analysis**

SPSS and LISREL software packages were used to analyze the data. Before undertaking the statistical analysis, the data was checked for erroneous data set coding and missing or deviant values. Firstly, missing values were assigned values in accordance with the mean values. Then, the normality of the data was checked via Kolmogorov Smirnov Test. If the test result is between -1 and +1 for coefficient of skewness (CS), this implies that there is not a big diversion from the normal distribution (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016). The data of 9 people which were out of the normal distribution were excluded and the data of the remaining 397 people were found to show normal distribution. The demographic values in the first part of the data collection tool were identified using frequency and percentages. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to designate the relationships between the variables and Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was undertaken to analyze predictor variables. Moreover, autocorrelation problems were checked among the variables that were the assumptions of the Regression analysis ( $VIF < 10$ ; Tolerance value  $> .20$  and  $CI < 30$ ). The undertaken regression analysis concluded that there was no autocorrelation problem.

## **Results**

In this section, the analysis belonging to each sub problem was presented.

### ***The Relationship between Influence Tactics and Organizational Commitment Dimensions***

In order to designate the correlation between the influence tactics the primary school principals use and the sub dimensions of teachers' organizational commitment, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Analysis was undertaken and the results were presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** The Mean and Standard Deviation of the Variables and the Correlations between the Variables (n = 397)

|                         | $\bar{X}$ | S    | 1 | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5      | 6     | 7      | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12     | 13     | 14     |
|-------------------------|-----------|------|---|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Rational Persuasion  | 3.66      | .85  | 1 | .13** | .44** | .47** | -.25** | .49** | .44**  | .47** | .45** | .02   | -.08  | -.33** | .35**  | .30**  |
| 2. Exchange             | 1.90      | .94  |   | 1     | .26** | .11*  | .31**  | .26** | .08    | .22** | .18** | .46** | .37** | .16**  | -.05   | .06    |
| 3. Inspirational Appeal | 3.26      | .80  |   |       | 1     | .36** | -.07   | .35** | .50**  | .49** | .47** | .07   | .16** | -.13*  | .23**  | .20**  |
| 4. Fairness             | 3.72      | .95  |   |       |       | 1     | -.07   | .47** | .43**  | .47** | .38** | .01   | .01   | -.18** | .20**  | .15**  |
| 5. Pressure             | 1.99      | .93  |   |       |       |       | 1      | -.09  | -.17** | -.04  | -.03  | .29** | .41** | .38**  | -.24** | -.14** |
| 6. Apprising            | 3.20      | 1.02 |   |       |       |       |        | 1     | .51**  | .46** | .41** | .20** | .11*  | -.18** | .31**  | .29**  |
| 7. Collaboration        | 3.62      | .91  |   |       |       |       |        |       | 1      | .51** | .49** | -.02  | .04   | -.22** | .27**  | .21**  |
| 8. Ingratiation         | 3.30      | 1.06 |   |       |       |       |        |       |        | 1     | .64** | .18** | .13*  | -.15** | .30**  | .18**  |
| 9. Consultation         | 3.29      | .87  |   |       |       |       |        |       |        |       | 1     | .19** | .21** | -.15** | .32**  | .23**  |
| 10. Personal Appeal     | 1.90      | .92  |   |       |       |       |        |       |        |       |       | 1     | .61** | .18**  | -.01   | .05    |
| 11. Coalition           | 2.10      | .94  |   |       |       |       |        |       |        |       |       |       | 1     | .27**  | -.09   | .02    |
| 12. Compliance          | 1.66      | .62  |   |       |       |       |        |       |        |       |       |       |       | 1      | -.50** | -.39** |
| 13. Identification      | 3.27      | .82  |   |       |       |       |        |       |        |       |       |       |       |        | 1      | .59**  |
| 14. Internalization     | 3.58      | .94  |   |       |       |       |        |       |        |       |       |       |       |        |        | 1      |

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

When Table 2 is examined, according to teachers' perceptions, out of the influence tactics primary school principals were found to use legitimating the most ( $\bar{X}=3.72$ ), and exchange and personal appeal the least ( $\bar{X}=1.90$ ). When standard deviation values were checked, the most homogeneous dispersion was observed in inspirational appeal ( $S=.80$ ). Teachers were found to show commitment the most for internalization dimension ( $\bar{X}=3.58$ ) and the least for compliance dimension ( $\bar{X}=1.66$ ). When the standard deviations were considered, the most homogeneous dispersion was observed in the compliance dimension ( $S=.62$ ). Various relationships were observed between the sub dimensions of influence tactics and the sub dimensions of organizational commitment. A positive correlation was observed between rational persuasion and identification ( $r=.35; p<.01$ ), pressure and compliance ( $r=.38; p<.01$ ), apprising and identification ( $r=.31; p<.01$ ) and consultation and identification ( $r=.32; p<.01$ ). A positive and low level correlation was found between rational persuasion and internalization ( $r=.30; p<.01$ ), exchange and compliance ( $r=.16; p<.01$ ), inspirational appeal and identification ( $r=.23; p<.01$ ), legitimating and identification ( $r=.20; p<.01$ ), apprising and internalization ( $r=.29; p<.01$ ), collaboration and identification ( $r=.27; p<.01$ ), ingratiation and internalization ( $r=.18; p<.01$ ), consultation and internalization ( $r=.23; p<.01$ ), personal appeal and compliance ( $r=.18; p<.01$ ) and coalitions and compliance ( $r=.27; p<.01$ ). While there was a negative and medium level correlation between rational persuasion and compliance ( $r=-.33; p<.01$ ); there was a negative and low level correlation between inspirational appeal and compliance ( $r=-.13; p<.01$ ), legitimating and compliance ( $r=-.18; p<.01$ ), pressure and identification ( $r=-.24; p<.01$ ), pressure and internalization ( $r=-.14; p<.01$ ), apprising and compliance ( $r=-.18; p<.01$ ), collaboration and compliance ( $r=-.22; p<.01$ ), ingratiation and compliance ( $r=-.15; p<.01$ ) and consultation and compliance ( $r=-.15; p<.01$ ).

#### *The Predictor Level of Influence Tactics for Organizational Commitment Dimensions*

The results of the Regression Analysis undertaken to check whether influence tactics are significant predictors of organizational commitment sub dimensions were presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** The Results of the Regression Analysis regarding the Prediction of Organizational Commitment Dimensions

| Variables            |         | Compliance                                    | Identification                               | Internalization                              |
|----------------------|---------|---|--|--|
|                      |         | $R=.49; R^2=.24$<br>$F_{(3,26)}=10.93; p=.00$ | $R=.47; R^2=.22$<br>$F_{(3,26)}=9.68; p=.00$ | $R=.37; R^2=.14$<br>$F_{(3,26)}=5.53; p=.00$ |
| Rational Persuasion  | $\beta$ | -.20  | .13  | .18  |
|                      | $t$     | -3.40   | 2.17   | 2.82   |
|                      | $p$     | .01   | .03  | .01  |
| Exchange             | $\beta$ | .09   | -.11   | -.02   |
|                      | $t$     | 1.61  | -2.05  | -.29   |
|                      | $p$     | .11   | .04  | .78  |
| Inspirational Appeal | $\beta$ | .01   | .05  | .06  |
|                      | $t$     | .06   | .83  | .89  |
|                      | $p$     | .95   | .41  | .38  |
| Fairness             | $\beta$ | -.01  | -.05   | -.06   |
|                      | $t$     | -.23  | -.81   | -.99   |
|                      | $p$     | .82   | .42  | .32  |
| Pressure             | $\beta$ | .23   | -.13   | -.09   |
|                      | $t$     | 4.34  | -2.50  | -1.61  |
|                      | $p$     | .00   | .01  | .11  |

**Table 3.** Continued

| Variables                       |         | Compliance                  | Identification             | Internalization            |
|---------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
|                                 |         | $R= .49; R^2= .24$          | $R= .47; R^2= .22$         | $R= .37; R^2= .14$         |
|                                 |         | $F_{(3,26)}= 10.93; p= .00$ | $F_{(3,26)}= 9.68; p= .00$ | $F_{(3,26)}= 5.53; p= .00$ |
| Appraising                      | $\beta$ | -.05                        | .16                        | .19                        |
|                                 | $t$     | -.83                        | 2.67                       | 3.01                       |
|                                 | $p$     | .41                         | .01                        | .01                        |
| Collaboration                   | $\beta$ | -.05                        | -.01                       | -.01                       |
|                                 | $t$     | -.86                        | -.11                       | -.07                       |
|                                 | $p$     | .39                         | .91                        | .95                        |
| Ingratiation                    | $\beta$ | .01                         | .09                        | -.05                       |
|                                 | $t$     | .13                         | 1.34                       | -.70                       |
|                                 | $p$     | .90                         | .18                        | .48                        |
| Holding a Consultation          | $\beta$ | -.06                        | .16                        | .09                        |
|                                 | $t$     | -.90                        | 2.49                       | 1.37                       |
|                                 | $p$     | .37                         | .01                        | .17                        |
| Personal Appeals                | $\beta$ | .02                         | .05                        | .01                        |
|                                 | $t$     | .28                         | .78                        | .18                        |
|                                 | $p$     | .78                         | .44                        | .86                        |
| Forming a Coalition with Others | $\beta$ | .13                         | -.09                       | .03                        |
|                                 | $t$     | 2.18                        | -1.38                      | .41                        |
|                                 | $p$     | .03                         | .17                        | .68                        |

When Table 3 was analyzed, a medium level and significant relationship was observed between influence tactics and teachers' compliance behavior ( $R= .49; R^2= .24; F_{(3,26)}= 10.93; p= .00$ ). These predictor variables accounted for around 24% of the variance regarding the compliance behavior. When the results regarding regression coefficients were analyzed, rational persuasion ( $t = -3.40; p < .01$ ), pressure ( $t = 4.34; p < .01$ ) and forming coalitions with others ( $t = 2.18; p < .05$ ) were found to be significant predictor variables for compliance behavior. According to standardized regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ), the effect of predictor variables on the compliance variable from the highest to lowest was as follows: Pressure ( $\beta = .23$ ), rational persuasion ( $\beta = -.20$ ), forming coalitions with others ( $\beta = .13$ ), exchange ( $\beta = .09$ ), holding a consultation ( $\beta = -.06$ ), appraising ( $\beta = -.05$ ), collaboration ( $\beta = -.05$ ), personal appeal ( $\beta = .02$ ), ingratiation ( $\beta = .01$ ), inspirational appeal ( $\beta = .01$ ) and fairness ( $\beta = -.01$ ).

A medium level and significant relationship was observed between influence tactics and teachers' identification behavior ( $R= .47; R^2= .22; F_{(3,26)}= 9.68; p= .00$ ). These predictor variables accounted for around 22% of the variance regarding the identification behavior. When the results regarding regression coefficients were analyzed, rational persuasion ( $t = 2.17; p < .05$ ), exchange ( $t = -2.05; p < .05$ ), pressure ( $t = -2.50; p < .05$ ), appraising ( $t = 2.67; p < .01$ ) and holding a consultation ( $t = 2.49; p < .05$ ) were observed to be significant predictors for teachers' identification behavior. According to standardized regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ), the effect of predictor variables on the identification variable from the highest to the lowest was as follows: Appraising ( $\beta = .16$ ), holding a consultation ( $\beta = .16$ ), rational persuasion ( $\beta = .13$ ), pressure ( $\beta = -.13$ ), exchange ( $\beta = -.11$ ), ingratiation ( $\beta = .09$ ), forming a coalition with others ( $\beta = -.09$ ), inspirational appeal ( $\beta = .05$ ), personal appeal ( $\beta = .05$ ), fairness ( $\beta = -.05$ ) and collaboration ( $\beta = -.01$ ).

A medium and significant correlation was observed between influence tactics and teachers' internalization behavior ( $R = .37$ ;  $R^2 = .14$ ;  $F_{(3,26)} = 5.53$ ;  $p = .00$ ). This accounted for 14% of the variation regarding the predictive variable of identification behavior. When the regression coefficient results were analyzed, rational persuasion ( $t = 2.82$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and apprising ( $t = 3.01$ ;  $p < .01$ ) were observed to be significant predictor variables for internalization behavior. According to the standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ), the significance order of predictor variables on identification variable was as follows: Apprising ( $\beta = .19$ ), rational persuasion ( $\beta = .18$ ), holding a consultation ( $\beta = .09$ ), ingratiation ( $\beta = .09$ ), pressure ( $\beta = -.09$ ), inspirational appeal ( $\beta = .06$ ), fairness ( $\beta = -.06$ ), holding a coalition with others ( $\beta = .03$ ), exchange ( $\beta = -.02$ ), personal appeal ( $\beta = .01$ ) and collaboration ( $\beta = -.01$ ).

### Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

In the study, firstly, the influence tactics the principals used were analyzed according to the teachers' perceptions. The analysis of the study demonstrated that primary school principals used legitimating, rational persuasion and collaboration frequently whereas ingratiation, holding a consultation, inspirational appeal and apprising from time to time and coalitions, suppression, exchange and personal appeal tactics very rarely. When the standard deviations were analyzed, the most homogeneous dispersion was observed in inspirational appeal dimension and the most heterogeneous dispersion was observed in the ingratiation dimension. The findings of this study are in line with the studies of Dağlı (2015), Gözü (2012), Faeth (2004), Yukl and Tracey (1992), and Yukl and Falbe (1990). To exemplify, Dağlı's (2015) study concluded that principals used legitimating tactics frequently; rational persuasion, collaboration, consultation, inspirational appeal, apprising and ingratiation from time to time and forming a coalition with others, pressure, personal appeal and exchange tactics very rarely. According to the results of Yukl and Tracey's (1992) study, the most effective tactics were defined as "rational persuasion, motivation via prompting and consultation". As for the least effective tactics, they were observed to be "pressure, coalition and legitimating".

The results of the studies undertaken by Kuru Çetin (2013) and Aydın and Pehlivan (2010) contrasted with the findings of this study. In these studies the organizational influence strategies scale developed by Kipnis et al. (1980) was used. The biggest cause of the difference might be the use of this scale. In the study undertaken by Kuru Çetin (2013), "using friendship, bargaining, forming a coalition with others and insistence" were found to be used at a high level. On the other hand, in the study done by Aydın and Pehlivan (2010), school principals were found to use "friendship, justification, coalition and bargaining" at a high level and they were found to use the sanction tactic at a low level.

In the study, the most frequent tactic was found to be legitimating. The reason might be that the principals adopted bureaucracy and they considered the duties as a part of legal tasks. The least used tactic was personal appeal and exchange. This indicated that the relationship between the principals and teachers was not at a friendship level. This meant that social relationships were not developed in these organizations. According to the results of the study, mild tactics (rational persuasion, ingratiation, consultation, inspirational appeals, using personal closeness, collaboration and apprising) were found to be used more commonly and as a result, the employees' commitment increased and they had positive feelings in their social relationships (Yukl, 2013).

In the study the sub dimensions of teachers' organizational commitment (compliance, identification and internalization) were analyzed. According to the results, in internalization, the commitment was at I agree level and in identification dimension, it was at I agree at medium level. As for the compliance dimension, the commitment was at I do not agree at all level. When the standard deviation scores were checked, the most homogenous was found to be compliance while the least homogenous one was internalization. The results of this study are in line with the studies of

Çavundurluoğlu (2016) and Dönmez (2015). Çavundurluoğlu's (2016) study demonstrated that teachers' commitment to the organization was at I agree level for internalization, I agree at medium level for identification and I do not agree mildly for compliance dimension. In Dönmez's (2015) study teachers' commitment level was at I agree level for internalization, I agree at medium level for identification and I do not agree mildly for compliance dimension. In addition, in this study, the mean scores for internalization and identification were higher compared to these studies while the mean score for compliance dimension was lower.

According to the teachers' perceptions, while a positive and high level correlation was detected between principals' influence tactics and the sub dimensions of teachers' organizational commitment, many medium and low level relationships were also observed. Moreover, although no high level negative relationship was found, medium and low level relationships were detected. According to Yukl and Falbe (1990), influence tactics were used for people and organizations in addition to formal and informal groups. As the nature of leadership depends on influencing process, managers' use of influence tactics is indispensable. While teachers are dealing with the problems in the education system, they need the support of principals immensely. For this reason, school principals are suggested to use influence tactics to manage schools better and have better relationships with the subordinates as an indicator of their leadership ability (Yukl, 2013).

The results obtained in this study are similar to the ones in the study undertaken by Dağlı (2015). In that study positive and medium level relationship was detected between rational persuasion, inspirational appeal, legitimating, apprising, cooperation, ingratiation and consultation, and principal awareness, while a negative and medium relationship was found between pressure and principal awareness. In the study undertaken by Kuru Çetin (2013), various relationships were found between organizational influence tactics and teachers' organizational justice types. However, it was acknowledged that the relationship between teachers' influence tactics and organizational justice types was not at a very high level. In the study undertaken by Taşçı and Eroğlu (2007), no correlation was found between persuasion and influence tactics. Some correlations were detected between rational persuasion and extraversion, being inspirational and emotional stability, change and being reconcilable, personal appeal and openness to experience, and pressure and being reconcilable. In Dulebohn and Ferris's (1999) study, which focused on the influence tactics managers and workers use and their relationship with process justice, a significant correlation was found between influence tactics and process justice.

According to the regression analysis results, rational persuasion, pressure and coalitions which were used by the primary school teachers significantly predicted the compliance sub dimension of organizational commitment. The other tactics did not predict compliance. The study found that pressure and coalitions positively predicted compliance while it negatively predicted rational suppression. Considering these results, it was found that when principals used pressure and coalitions, compliance perceptions increased while the use of rational persuasion decreased compliance perceptions.

Out of the influence tactics principals use, rational persuasion, exchange, pressure, apprising and consultation significantly predicted identification sub dimension of organizational commitment. The other tactics did not predict identification dimension. The findings demonstrated that rational persuasion, apprising and consultation positively predicted identification sub dimension while exchange and pressure negatively predicted it. Considering these results, it was detected that when principals used pressure and exchange tactics, identification perception decreased while rational persuasion, apprising and consultation increased identification perceptions.

Out of the influence tactics principals use, rational persuasion and apprising significantly predicted internalization sub dimension of organizational commitment. The other tactics did not predict internalization sub dimension. Rational persuasion and apprising predicted internalization in a positive way. Considering these results, it was found that when primary school principals used rational persuasion and apprising tactics, internalization perceptions increased.

Primary school principals need to be more active and dynamic, and they should have leadership abilities to be able satisfy their organization's needs. Managers of an organization are usually known by their successes in their organization. On the other hand, influence can be defined as the emotional link between managers and workers by which the managers have work done. While influencing is very important for all the leaders, it is much more important for the leaders in democratic environments. Therefore, it is really essential for primary school principals to participate in the influencing process and manage their schools in this way as a leader who can successfully utilize leadership skills (Schlechty, 2011).

The study done by Dağlı (2015) focused on whether influence tactics predicted the sub dimensions of organizational citizenship and school awareness in a significant way. The results demonstrated that legitimating and coalitions predicted cooperation sub dimension and legitimating and ingratiation predicted civic virtue sub dimension. On the other hand, the results demonstrated that the influence tactics school principals' used did not predict the gentleman ship and conscience sub dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior significantly. In addition to this, rational persuasion, exchange, cooperation and consultation were found to significantly and positively predict principal awareness which is a sub dimension of school awareness. Pressure and coalitions were found to significantly and negatively predict principal awareness. According to the results of Kuru Çetin (2013), the organizational influence tactics of the managers were affected by distribution justice, process justice and interaction justice the most out of the organizational justice types. According to the results of the study undertaken by Derya (2010), rational persuasion, inspirational appeal, consultation, ingratiation, personal magnetism, change, coalitions, legitimating and pressure were found to be significant predictors of leadership styles.

The influence tactics primary school principals used the most is legitimating and studies should focus on mild tactics (ingratiation, apprising and collaboration). Accordingly, precautions should be taken to ensure that principals develop their interactional skills, praise their workers' good conducts and have an effective mutual information flow with the subordinates.

When teachers' organizational commitment for their schools were checked, internalization and identification were found to be higher compared to the compliance dimension. In this context, some studies to increase teachers' commitment in the compliance aspect can be undertaken in the future. It is thought that the teachers who have just started teaching or who has just been appointed to a new school have a low level of commitment. For this reason, in order to increase teachers' commitment, collaboration between the experienced and inexperienced teachers in a school should be improved and exchange of information should be aimed. Primary school principals should make the school environment workable, improve their management skills and maximize their interaction with teachers and satisfy their expectations to increase teachers' organizational commitment.

When the use of rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, legitimating, apprising, collaboration, ingratiation and consultation by primary school principals increased, identification and internalization perceptions were found to increase and a decrease was observed in the compliance perception. In addition, when the use of pressure tactic increased, compliance perceptions increased while identification and internalization were found to decrease. In other words, when the use of mild

tactics increased, compliance perception decreased while the increase in the use of hard/strict tactics increased compliance perception. Without utilizing hard tactics, primary school principals can increase compliance perceptions using respecting and affection, and they can do this through developing their interpersonal relationship with the teachers, ingratiating teachers' work and exchanging information with them.

The principals who focus on the success of schools should know which tactic to use in their relationships with the teachers in order to increase the teachers' organizational commitment. According to the findings, while teachers' perception of compliance was higher in schools where principals used pressure and forming coalition with others whereas teachers' perception of compliance was found to be lower in schools where principals used rational persuasion tactic. In schools where principals used pressure and exchange tactics, teachers' perception of identification decreased and their perception of identification increased in schools where principals used rational persuasion, apprising and holding a consultation tactics. On the other hand, in schools where principals used rational persuasion and apprising tactics, teachers' perception of internalization was observed to increase. For this reason, it is suggested that primary school principals should be aware of all the types of influence tactics and that Ministry of National education should compensate for the lack of training in this area via in service training for all the principals.

This study aimed at revealing out the relationship between principals' influence tactics teachers' and organizational commitment. Future studies may focus on concepts such as school satisfaction, academic optimism, organizational culture and climate, and self-efficacy as well. In addition to this quantitative study at primary school level, pre-school and high school levels may also be studied and qualitative or mixed methods studies may also be undertaken.

## References

- Açıkalin, Ş. Ş. (1993). Öğretmenlerin okul müdürlerini etkileme güçleri (Ankara örneği). *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9, 183-192.
- Agun, H. (2011). *Örgütsel güven ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki üzerine bir araştırma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-69.
- Aydın, İ., & Pehlivan, Z. (2010). Strategies and personality types used by primary school principals in Turkey to influence teacher (Ankara case), influence teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 3652-3659.
- Balay, R. (2000a). *Yönetici ve öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Balay, R. (2000b). *Özel ve resmi liselerde yönetici ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University, Ankara.
- Balcı, A. (2003). *Örgütsel sosyalleşme: Kuram strateji ve taktikler*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Balcı, A. (2004). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma: Yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Başıyigit, F. (2009). *Öğretmenlerin karar alma sürecine katılım düzeylerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleriyle ilişkisi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Bayram, L. (2005). Yönetimde yeni bir paradigma: Örgütsel bağlılık. *Sayıştay Dergisi*, 59, 125-139. Retrieved from <https://www.sayistay.gov.tr/tr/Upload/95906369/files/dergi>
- Brockner, J., Tyler, T. R., & Schneider, R. C. (1992). The influence of prior commitment to an institution on reactions to perceived unfairness: The higher they are, the harder they fall. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(2), 241-261.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Chen, H. F., & Chen, Y. C. (2008). The impact of work redesign and psychological empowerment on organizational commitment in a changing environment, an example from taiwan's state-owned enterprises. *Public Personnel Management*, 37(3), 279-302.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *İknanın psikolojisi: Teorik ve pratik bir arada* (Y. Fletcher, Trans.). İstanbul: Media Cat.
- Çavundurluoğlu, E. (2016). *İlköğretim kurumlarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Dağlı, E. (2015). *İlköğretim okullarında müdürlerin kullandıkları etkileme taktiklerinin öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ve okul farkındalığı ile ilişkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Derya, S. (2010). *Liderlik tarzları ve liderlerin astlarını etkileme taktikleri arasındaki ilişki: Antalya ili beş yıldızlı otel yöneticileri üzerinde bir araştırma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta.
- Dohlen, H. B. V. (2012). *Teacher leadership behaviors and proactive influence tactics in North Carolina public schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Carolina University, United States.
- Dönmez, N. (2015). *Ortaokullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin psikolojik sözleşme düzeyleri ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Uşak University, Uşak.
- Dulebohn, J., & Ferris, G. (1999). The role of influence tactics in perceptions of performance evaluation' fairness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(3), 288-303.

- Duyar, I., Aydın, I. and Pehlivan, Z. (2009). Analyzing principal influence tactics from a cross-cultural perspective: Do preferred influence tactics and targeted goals differ by national culture?. In Wiseman, A. (Ed.), *Educational leadership: Global contexts and international comparisons* (Vol. 11, pp. 191-220). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. doi: 10.1108/S1479-3679(2009)0000011009
- Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free.
- Faeth, M. A. (2004). *Power, authority and influence: A comparative study of the behavioral influence tactics used by lay and ordained leaders in the episcopal church* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Falbe, C. M., & Yukl, G. (1992). Consequences for managers of using single influences tactics and combination of tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 638-652.
- Firestone, W. A., & Pannel, J. R. (1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions and differential incentive policies. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(4), 489-525.
- French, J. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Michigan-Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.
- Gözü, C. (2012). *Influence tactics and leadership effectiveness in Turkey and USA: Mediating role of subordinate commitment* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). State University of New York At Albany, USA.
- Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2014). *Eğitim ve öğretim yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Haimann, T. (1962). *Professional management theory and practice*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Haveydi, C. (2017). *Okul öncesi eğitim kurumu müdürlerinin yönetim becerileri ile etkileme taktikleri arasındaki ilişkilerin öğretmen görüşlerine göre incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul.
- İmamoğlu, G. (2011). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri ve örgütsel adalet algıları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1977). *Örgütlerin toplumsal psikolojisi* (H. Can & Y. Bayar, Trans.). Ankara: Nadir.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(4), 440-452.
- Kondakçı, Y., & Zayim, M. (2013). Yönetim süreçleri. In S. Özdemir (Ed.), *Eğitim yönetiminde kuram ve uygulama* (pp. 9-57). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Koşar, D. (2016). Liderlerin etkileme taktikleri. In N. Güçlü (Ed.), *Eğitim yönetiminde liderlik teori, araştırma ve uygulama* (pp. 217-244). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Koşar, S. (2013). Okul yönetiminde dinamikler: Güç, politika ve etkileme. In S. Özdemir (Ed.), *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi* (pp. 96-123). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Kuru Çetin, S. (2013). *Okul yöneticileri ve öğretmenlerin birbirlerini etkileme taktiklerinin örgütsel adalet ile ilişkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University, Ankara.
- Maher, B. L. (1999). *Influence tactics employed by high school assistant principals in attempting to influence their principals* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Nebraska University, United States.
- McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2008). *Organizational behavior: Essentials*. New York: McGraw.
- Moideenkutty, U., & Schmidt, S. M. (2011). Leadership tactics: Enabling quality social exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. *Organization Management Journal*, 8(4), 229-241.
- Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 8(3), 486-500.
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492-494.

- Pounder, D. G. (1998). *Restructuring schools for collaboration: Promises and pitfalls*. Albany, State University of New York Press.
- Randall, D. M. (1987). Commitment and organization: The organizational man revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 460-471.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2003). *Management*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Schlechty, P. C. (2011). *Okulu yeniden kurmak* (Y. Özden, Trans.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(3), 246-257.
- Şişman, M. (2016). *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Taşçı, D., & Eroğlu, E. (2007). Yöneticilerin kişilik özellikleri ile kullandıkları ikna ve etkileme taktiklerinin kullanım sıklığı arasındaki ilişkinin değerlendirilmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17, 533-546.
- Werner, I. (1993). *Liderlik ve yönetim* (V. Üner, Trans.). İstanbul: Rota.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 418-428.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(2), 132-140.
- Yukl, G., & Tracey, J. B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(4), 525-535.
- Yukl, G., Seifert, C. F., & Chavez, C. (2008). Validation of the extended influence behavior questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), 609-621.