

## **THE EFFECT OF INTERACTIONIST AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS PERCEIVED BY BANK EMPLOYEES ON THE LEVEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**

Hüseyin HÜDAOĞLULARI  
[huseyin.hudaoglulari@gmail.com](mailto:huseyin.hudaoglulari@gmail.com)  
Cyprus Health and Social Sciences University  
North Cyprus

### **INTRODUCTION**

Organizations are structures formed as a result of the joining forces of two or more individuals in order to achieve common goals. However, it is not enough to create an organizational structure alone in order to achieve the goals. In order to achieve these goals, the individuals forming the organizations should be willing to reach this goal and should proceed within the framework necessary to reach the goal. In this context, the necessity of high organizational commitment levels of the members of the organization emerges in order to have such willingness. The idea of working with more effective and qualified individuals in order to maintain their organizational existence in today's competitive environment emphasizes the fact of increasing the organizational commitment levels of the employees. Although the concept of organizational commitment has been examined by many researchers, it is seen that there is no common definition on it. It is known that there are many different definitions regarding the concept of organizational commitment.

According to a definition, organizational commitment is the whole of internalized normative pressures in order to behave in accordance with the goals determined by the organization (Wiener, 1982). According to Meyer and Allen (1991), organizational commitment is an attitude that shapes the relationship that the employee develops with the organization and makes them decide to be a permanent member of the organization. On the other hand, Mathews and Shepherd (2002) define the concept of organizational commitment as the process of shaping the attitudes and behaviors of the individual towards the job he/she works in and the organization he/she is involved in, and making sense of these behaviors.

O'Reilly states that this concept is a concept that qualifies the psychological dependence of the employee against the organization and includes the beliefs developed against the work participation, commitment and organizational goals and values (Çetin, 2004).

İnce and Gül (2005) define this concept as the employee's belief in the goals and values of the organization, their acceptance of these values and goals, their effort for the benefit of the organization and their desire to ensure continuity in the organization. Morrow (1983) defines the concept of commitment as the desire of the personnel to stay in the institution and to work for the institution, and the internalization of the goals and values of the institution.

According to Rowden (2000), organizational commitment is the desire of the employee to be included in an organization and to adopt the goals of the organization. Balay (2000) reports that although the employee has the opportunity to reach better opportunities in another institution, continuing in the institution he is involved in is related to organizational commitment. Boylu, Pelit, and Güçlü (2007) mention that the existence of organizational commitment is an important managerial dynamic that reduces absenteeism, being late for work, and intention to quit. There are a number of elements that affect organizational commitment. Some of these elements are in the figure mentioned below.

Individual factors are very important in order to adopt organizational goals and objectives and to exist in the institution for a long time (Çetin, 2004). Organizational commitment, which characterizes the individual's commitment to his organization and his effort to increase the performance of the organization he is involved in, is shaped by organizational elements such as age, seniority, and leadership characteristics of managers (Yalçın & İplik, 2005). The concept of organizational commitment is handled in two sub-categories as demographic elements and elements related to business life.

Factors such as gender, age, professional seniority, education level, psychological and social dynamics of the person, motivation, success motive and work habits and the value it places on business life are demographic factors. The elements related to business life are ranked as success motives, participatory and interest values (Gümüştekin and Emet, 2009).

Northcraft and Neale state that elements related to working life qualify organizational factors. In this context, it is possible to say that organizational commitment is associated with organizational elements. Organizational elements are elements such as work groups, the nature of the job, the importance and value attributed to the job, role conflict organizational culture elements, the skill capacities of the employees, work concentration, task awareness and identity, and internal rewards. Another factor affecting the level of organizational commitment of the individual is external factors. These factors are the opportunity to find a job in other organizations, the current conditions of the sector, the socio-economic characteristics of the society, professionalism and the unemployment level of the country (İnce and Gül, 2005).

Many innovations and developments in today's world have led to changes in administrative processes. As a result of the changes in this field, different types of management styles have emerged in institutions. As a result of the changes in the management understanding of institutions, the need for leaders has gained importance. As the need for leaders has become so evident, different leadership characteristics have emerged. Transformational leadership characteristics emerge as a result of all these developments and innovations. The attitudes and behaviors of the employees in the institutions have moved to an even more important position as a result of the changes in the administrative processes. The increasing competition in today's business life requires institutions to continue their activities in a sustainable way in order to gain a competitive advantage over their competitors. This requirement also reveals the importance of the concept of organizational commitment for institutions. The importance of leadership for institutions has also made the need for leadership in institutions to be felt more deeply. In this context, it can be said that leadership characteristics, especially transformational leadership characteristics, have a critical importance in determining the direction of institutions. Changes in the leadership and organizational field caused by the changes in managerial organizations have been effective in the development of the relationship between managerial process, transformational leadership characteristics and organizational commitment.

When the studies on the concept of leadership are evaluated, it is seen that there is a very rich leadership literature. Considering the leadership styles that have been examined and developed so far, it is also stated that creating a mutually accepted approach and model for the concept of leadership depends on a perspective and evaluation of the transformational leadership characteristics by determining the moral characteristics and transformational aspect of the leadership concept. This new role assigns leaders the task of managing and directing organizational efforts and actions within the framework of the transformational characteristics they characterize their organizations. While the leader directs the employees and the organization around him in line with the goals, he/she should manage the individual, situation and facts by evaluating them within the scope of transformational dimensions and moral values.

Managers with transformational leadership are the people who instantly notice an error or mistake in the organization and make an effort to eliminate the mistake. The goal of transformational leadership is to determine the limits of the transformational dimensions that exist in the decisions taken in every administrative process, to reveal them and to create transformational principles that shape the decision-making process in organizations. The aim of creating a transformational work environment within the framework of transformational features and codes within the institution adds new dimensions to the leadership approach. In line with these emerging transformative goals and codes, it will contribute to the equal and fair evaluation of work and work-related processes, which is one of the necessary elements in order to reveal both the individual satisfaction and happiness of the employees and the effectiveness they should display within the organization.

Organizations are environments where various events that affect and shape both employees, organizations and society as a result of intra-organizational dynamics occur and different attitudes and behaviors emerge. When they consider the level of commitment of individuals, workplaces where they spend most of their daily lives come first in these environments. Considering this issue within the scope of the concept of organizational commitment, employees agree that perceived commitment shapes the thoughts and behaviors of employees and that this situation has significant effects on productivity and effectiveness, emphasizing that it is an important phenomenon for understanding and evaluating organizational dynamics, intra-organizational behavior.

As a result of recorded technological developments, social and cultural innovations and increased competition, there is a need for transformation in order for institutions to keep up with these innovations. It is clear that leaders, especially those who exhibit transformational characteristics, can be successful in an intense competitive environment at the point of adapting to these innovations.

According to Bruns, transformational leadership is a type of leadership in which one or more individuals interact with each other and increase their efficiency and motivation. In other words, the focus is on mutual support of

organizational goals (Stewart, 2006). Burns also states that transformational leadership is the process of following and implementing collaborative goals within the framework of mutual interactions of internal processes and motives based on the desired efficiency and change of leaders and employees. Employees are made more efficient and prominent by transformational leaders, and they feel important and exalted for the organization (Celep, 2004).

According to Bass and Steidlmyer (1999), the main point of these leadership characteristics is personal acceptance and understanding, charisma and intellectual stimulation and inspiration principles (as cited in Özaralli, 2002). Based on all this information, the effect of leadership characteristics exhibited in today's business world on managerial dynamics such as organizational commitment is clear. In this study, it is aimed to examine the effect of perceived interactionist and transformational leadership characteristics of bank employees on organizational commitment.

## 2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

### 2.1 Organization

Since the existence of humanity, individuals have understood the necessity of acting in unity and solidarity in order to meet their own needs, and in this direction, needs have begun to be met through mutual cooperation. The cooperation arising from this unity, which emerged depending on the basic needs, laid the groundwork for the formation of the first organizations. Organizations that go back as far as human history are structures that were consciously formed by two or more people in a planned way in order to achieve certain goals (Olgungül, 2017).

Unions, corporate companies, government institutions, schools, hospitals, clubs, political organizations State institutions, schools, hospitals, clubs, political organizations are structures that can be counted among the organizations. Organizations; it ensures that the activities of a group of people proceed in harmony, within the framework of certain rules, in order to fulfill a clear and common purpose in responsibility, authority and hierarchy by distribution of tasks and division of labor (Evans, 2001). The most basic structures of organizations are human beings. They are structures that emerge as a result of conscious action to realize the goals that have been framed. Every organization is also a social unit and exhibits its actions in a social environment. The main functions of organizations are to integrate the acquired knowledge within the framework of a common purpose. However, organizations are reported to increase effectiveness and efficiency. They effectively address individuals' requirements and meet individuals' requirements for belonging. Another purpose of organization is material requirements. Individuals realize some goals that they cannot meet alone through organizations (Tutar, 2009). Organizations that act within the framework of a goal must be compatible with the members of the organization in order to achieve these determined goals. The concept that represents the process of ensuring this harmony is the management process. Organization and management are two concepts that cannot be considered separately (Blau and Peter, 1962). Management is the process of using the existing human and material resources and power in the most effective and efficient way to reach the goal (Bozkuş and Gündüz, 2016).

### 2.2 Organizational Commitment Concept

The extent to which the effort and talent of the personnel are demonstrated shows their commitment to the organization. Ensuring efficiency and effectiveness is very related to the commitment of the personnel to the organization (Aydın, 2018). Organizational commitment depends on the ability of the personnel to be directed positively by the organization and to develop their skills. It is necessary to draw attention to organizational commitment in order to develop organizations and achieve organizational success. It is necessary to draw attention to organizational commitment in order to develop organizations and achieve organizational success. The effort and desire of the personnel for the organization, the sense of commitment they feel to the organization, are important elements required for the realization of the organization's goals. Organizational effectiveness can be achieved with personnel who have a sense of commitment (Olgungül, 2017). In order to ensure the continuity of the organization and to adapt to changes, the bond and harmony of the personnel with the organization is of great importance. Positive effects such as decrease in absenteeism and increase in job performance show that organizational dependence increases. It ensures the correct orientation of personnel, increased organizational commitment and continuity of the organization. Organizational commitment is the desire of the personnel to make more effort to achieve the organizational goals, to adopt the organizational goals and to continue in the organization (Karakulle, 2020). The separate treatment of teachings such as psychology, communication, sociology and management leads to the inability to obtain a generally accepted full definition of organizational commitment (Maslow, 1954).

According to Allen and Meyer (1990), organizational commitment consists of the following three sub-dimensions: continuance commitment, affective commitment, and normative commitment.

**Emotional Commitment:** Here, the personnel stay in the organization because they "want". The personnel knows the organization well, establishes an emotional relationship with the organization and becomes a whole with the organization and becomes identical. Personnel who have a high level of emotional commitment to their organization are in the organization because they want to. Employees are committed to the interests, goals and values of the organization.

**Continuance Commitment:** In continuance commitment, the personnel are attached to the organization because they "need". Continuance commitment occurs if the personnel prioritizes values such as career, benefits, and seniority. In this case, the personnel will continue to stay in the organization even if they don't want it (Gül, 2002). Continuance commitment is the preference of the personnel to stay in the organization due to perceptions such as scarcity of job options and the costs of leaving the organization.

**Normative Commitment** Here, the employee continues to the organization because they "feel obliged". The employee prioritizes values such as loyalty and faithfulness. The employee believes in the correctness of the commitment to the organization, considers it a task. The employee is connected to the organization with a sense of obligation.

### 2.3 Leadership

One of the concepts that has the most interest in the social sciences is leadership. The concept of leader, which is the result of this situation, is one of the most studies on it. The reason why this concept has been emphasized so much has led to a large-scale analysis of leadership, as well as being an area where the disagreement that we encounter on all issues related to human beings is more intensely examined (Gedik, 2020). According to Özkan (2016), he said that he has as many definitions as people trying to define the concept of leader. The most important difficulty experienced in the definition of leadership is that it is confused with a concept such as management and manager. Aksaraylı (2015) is of the opinion that the functions of leaders and management activities are different. According to Akyüz (2018), the most important task of the management is to overcome the complexities within the organization and not to ensure harmony. On the other hand, leadership is overcoming change on the condition of producing action in line with the vision of the future. Similarly, according to Ardahan and Konal (2017), while managing is defined as being able to accomplish daily tasks and dominating routine life, they define the concept of leadership as influencing others and producing vision.

Managers and leadership are defined as individuals who do their duties correctly, and leaders as people who do the right job. Although there is no reconciled definition of the concept of leadership, it can be said that there is a compromise on the fundamental factors of leadership. If we talk about the basic elements that have been agreed on; It can be said that leadership is a process, an influential concept, leadership can only be in a group, and includes common goals (Altinkurt, 2015). In the light of these factors, Yangil (2016) defined the concept of leadership as a process that affects the group in order to realize the common goals of the individual. Defining the concept of leadership as a process emphasized the interaction between the leader and the followers rather than the character trait of this situation. According to Alga (2017), he defined leadership as overcoming change. According to Yalçın and İliç (2017), vision and goals are defined as the ability to influence the group or groups in order to be successful. According to Yeşil (2016), leadership is defined as the sum of the knowledge and ability to gather a group of individuals in line with the determined goals and to mobilize the people in the group to make these goals a reality. According to Korkut (2019), leadership is defined as a role behavior that drags the individuals in the group towards certain goals in certain environments and succeeds in mobilizing people on the plane of these goals. If we summarize the definitions, it can be defined as mobilizing a certain group towards the goal in line with determining and achieving goals (Dağlı and Ağalday, 2018).

According to Başar and Basım (2018), the concept of leadership has been defined in different ways with different approaches in the process. In the first studies on the concept of leadership, the concept of leadership was examined in terms of the characteristics that a leader should have. With these studies, it has been tried to determine the universal characteristics in effective leadership and it has been seen that the trait theory has been developed. Those who think that this theory is not sufficient to define the concept of leadership have developed the skills approach by emphasizing the importance of leaders' skills in the concept of leadership, as well as the characteristics of leaders. With the emergence of this approach, the view that leadership is not an innate feature has begun to dominate. Researchers trying to reveal the behaviors that make leadership effective have revealed the theory of behavior (Alga, 2017). Studies have continued in the form of an effort to find a valid way under all conditions in the universal qualities, skills and behavioral approaches that the traits approach is the subject of. Later on, it was understood that it was not possible to determine effective leadership characteristics or behaviors under all conditions with the effect of relativist thinking, and research on the concept of leadership evolved from



the universal dimension to the situational dimension. This change in the view of the concept of leadership has reached its conclusion with the emergence of situational approaches (Özmen, Eriş, & Özer., 2020).

#### **2.4 Transformative and Interactive Leadership**

Leadership studies started in the 1900s and developed in the 1950s. Developing leadership studies In the 1980s, classical leadership theories lost their currency and were replaced by innovative approaches that involve more change (Edizler, 2013). Researchers named Bass and Burns underlined the need for innovation and differentiation in definitions of leadership in 1978. They divided this differentiation into two as “Transactional” (processor, interactionist) and “Transformational” (transformational). Transactional leadership approach consisted of old and conservative, Transformational approach consisted of innovation and future-oriented leadership approaches. This theorem was put forward against Kurt Lewin's autocratic, democratic and liberating leadership style (Eren, 2001).

Considering the phenomenon of transformational leadership, leadership models are determined by looking at the traditions and past experiences of transactional leadership, while in transformational leadership, the leader indicates a model that thinks optimistically about the future and wants a radical change (Bakan and Büyükbeşe, 2010). To put it differently, approaches that combine yesterday and today are called processors, and approaches that combine today and tomorrow are called transformational leadership approaches (Sönmez, 2010). In his research, Burns concluded that the leader can show the characteristics of either transactional leadership or transformational leadership, but that he cannot exhibit the behaviors of both trends at the same time. Because, according to Burns, these two approaches are completely separate from each other. Bass, on the other hand, sees these two approaches not as opposites, but as parts of a whole, and argues that a leader can demonstrate the behaviors of both approaches. Many subsequent studies have also confirmed Bass' view, and it has been observed that many of the transformational leaders also display strong transactional leadership characteristics. The comparison of these two approaches was first made by Mc Gregor Burns, based on Weber's (1973) studies on charismatic leadership (Korkmaz, 2006). As the age of technology and knowledge evolves, it is now insufficient to express leadership behaviors solely with concepts of development and change. For this reason, change and development must be replaced by the concept of transformation. The society, institutions, companies, social structures have started to make great researches on how they will accelerate the development and changes they will reveal. These interactions will be followers of the transformations of the century we have left behind. When intense and dominant developments and changes occur, traditional leadership approaches are insufficient and it is predicted that transformational leaders can better adapt to these changes (Aslan, 2013).

### **3. METHOD**

In this study, descriptive screening model was used from quantitative research methods. The population of the study consists of Turkish speaking individuals between the ages of 18-65 working in private and public banks in the TRNC. 500 bank employees, determined by unselected sampling method, were included in the study. In the questionnaire of this research, there are questions about three variables: organizational commitment, transactional leadership and transformational leadership. In this study, before the data were collected, the participants were informed about the purpose, scope and way of answering the questions. After the information, questionnaires were given to individuals who agreed to participate voluntarily. Data were collected both face-to-face and online between 2022-2023 October-January. Ethical Approval was obtained from Cyprus University of Health and Social Sciences before data collection began. Questions were asked to the participants using 3 scales prepared depending on the research problem, and the analysis of the study was made in the light of the given data. The data obtained in the study were collected through Personal Information Form, Transactional Leadership Scale, Transformational Leadership Scale and Organizational Commitment Scale.

**Personal Information Form:** In this form prepared by the researcher, there are a total of 7 questions aiming to determine the demographic characteristics of bank employees such as gender, age, total working time and position.

**Organizational Commitment Scale:** In order to determine the organizational commitment levels of bank employees, the scale developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) and revised by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) was used. This 18-point scale is a scale used in many studies in domestic and foreign fields. In related studies, it has been reported that this scale is a measurement tool with high validity and reliability that will fully determine the level of organizational commitment. The scale was used as translated into Turkish by Gürkan (2006). The Organizational Commitment Scale includes 18 determinative statements consisting of three sub-dimensions: affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. The scale is in the form of a 5-point likert, and “1= Strongly Disagree”, “2= Disagree”, “3= No Opinion”, “4=Agree” and “5= Totally Agree” indicates different answers.

Interactive and Transformative Leadership Styles Scale: In this study, the perception of interactionist and transformational leadership styles, which are considered as independent variables, was examined with a measurement tool consisting of 26 questions developed by Bass (1985) and evaluating 2 sub-leadership styles, interactionist and transformational. When both domestic and foreign literature are examined, it is seen that this scale is used in many studies where the leadership phenomenon is studied, the reliability of the questions and sub-dimensions in the scale is at a high level, and the scale has sub-dimension contents that can measure the variables to be measured. In this study, Bass's (1985) Multi-Factor Leadership Scale was used to determine the perceived leadership characteristics of bank employees. The purpose of this scale is to examine the interactional and transformational leadership styles, which are sub-leadership styles. The abbreviated form of the scale, which was also used by Çeri-Booms (2009) in Turkey, was preferred. In the research, the transformational leadership characteristics perceived by the bank employees were evaluated with 20 questions and the interactionist leadership characteristics with 6 questions. According to the findings of the study conducted by Çeri Booms (2009), Cronbach's alpha reliability value for the transactional leadership scale was found to be 0.94, while the Cronbach's alpha reliability value for transformational leadership was 0.93.

The data of the research were analyzed in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 26.0 software. The reliability of the participants' responses to the Transactional Leadership Scale, Transformational Leadership Scale, and Organizational Commitment Scale were tested with Cronbach's Alpha, and the alpha coefficients were found to be 0.733 for the Transactional Leadership Scale, 0.826 for the Transformational Leadership Scale, and 0.715 for the Organizational Commitment Scale. The distribution of the participants according to their socio-demographic characteristics was determined by frequency analysis, and descriptive statistics were given for the Transactional Leadership Scale, the Transformational Leadership Scale and the Organizational Commitment Scale.

#### 4.FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

**Table 1.** *Distribution of the participants according to their socio-demographic characteristics*

	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	281	56,31
Male	218	43,69
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	175	35,07
Married	241	48,30
Widowed/Divorced	83	16,63
<b>Age</b>		
18-25	69	13,83
26-34	261	52,30
35-41	83	16,63
42 and above	86	17,23
<b>Educational Status</b>		
High School	77	15,43
University	339	67,94
Postgraduate	83	16,63
<b>Professional Experience</b>		
Less than 1 year	91	18,24
1-5 years	249	49,90
6-10 years	81	16,23
11-15 years	78	15,63
<b>Working Time in the Institution</b>		
Less than 1 year	69	13,83
1-2 years	261	52,30
3-6 years	83	16,63

7-14 years	86	17,23
<b>Working Time With the Manager</b>		
Less than 1 year	148	29,66
1-2 years	159	31,86
3-6 years	162	32,46
7-14 years	30	6,01

Table 1 shows the distribution of the participants included in the study according to socio-demographic characteristics, 56.31% of the participants were female and 43.69% were male, 535.07% were single, 48.30% were married and 16.63% were widowed/divorced, 13.83% were 18-25 years old, 52.30% were 26-34 years old, 16.63% were 35-41 years old and 17.23% were 42 years old and above, it was found that 15.43% of them are high school graduates, 67.94% are university graduates, 16.63% are postgraduate graduates. 18.24% of the participants had less than 1 year, 49.90% had 1-5 years, 16.23% had 6-10 years and 15.63% had 11-15 years of professional experience, 13%, 83 of them have been in the institution for less than 1 year. 52.30% of them have been working for 1-2 years, 16.63% of them for 3-6 years and 17.23% of them for 7-14 years, 29.66% of them with their manager less than 1 year, 31%, It was determined that 86 of them worked for 1-2 years and 32.46% of them worked for 3-6 years.

**Table 2.** *Participants' Interactive Leadership Scale, Transformational Leadership Scale, and Organizational Commitment Scale Scores*

	n	s	Min	Max
<b>Interactive Leadership Scale</b>	499	2,45	0,37	1,50
<b>Transformational Leadership Scale</b>	499	2,34	0,16	1,90
Emotional Commitment	499	2,45	0,30	1,67
Continuance Commitment:	499	3,03	0,40	2,00
Normative Commitment	499	2,89	0,37	1,80
<b>Organizational Commitment Scale</b>	499	2,79	0,23	2,17

In Table 2, the descriptive statistics of the participants' Interactive Leadership Scale, Transformational Leadership Scale and Organizational Commitment Scale scores are given. When Table 2. is examined, the average of the participants is  $2.45 \pm 0.37$  points from the Transactional Leadership Scale,  $2.34 \pm 0.16$  points from the Transformational Leadership Scale, and  $2.79 \pm 0.23$  points from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general. It was observed that they got an average of  $2.45 \pm 0.30$  points, an average of  $3.03 \pm 0.40$  points from continuance commitment and an average of  $2.89 \pm 0.37$  points from normative commitment.

**Table 3.** *Comparison of Participants' Organizational Commitment Scale Scores by Gender*

	Gender	n	s	t	p
Emotional Commitment	Female	281	2,46	0,30	0,227
	Male	218	2,45		
Continuance Commitment:	Female	281	3,05	0,40	1,196
	Male	218	3,01		
Normative Commitment	Female	281	2,89	0,37	0,033
	Male	218	2,89		
<b>Organizational Commitment Scale</b>	Female	281	2,80	0,23	0,800
	Male	218	2,78		

In Table 3, the comparison of the Organizational Commitment Scale scores of the participants by gender was made with the independent sample t-test. According to Table 3, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the participants in the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment sub-dimensions in the scale according to their gender ( $p > 0,05$ ). The scores of female and male participants in the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and in the sub-dimensions of affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment were similar.

**Table 4.** Comparison of Participants' Organizational Commitment Scale Scores by Marital Status

	<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>s</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>
Emotional Commitment	Single	175	2,46	0,29	1,83	3,33	0,078
	Married	241	2,45	0,31	1,67	3,33	
	Widowed/Divorced	83	2,46	0,30	1,67	3,33	
Continuance Commitment:	Single	175	3,04	0,40	2,00	4,00	0,155
	Married	241	3,03	0,38	2,25	4,00	
	Widowed/Divorced	83	3,01	0,41	2,00	4,25	
Normative Commitment	Single	175	2,88	0,34	2,00	3,80	0,419
	Married	241	2,90	0,39	2,00	4,00	
	Widowed/Divorced	83	2,87	0,37	1,80	3,60	
<b>Organizational Commitment Scale</b>	Single	175	2,79	0,22	2,21	3,36	0,123
	Married	241	2,79	0,24	2,17	3,61	
	Widowed/Divorced	83	2,78	0,23	2,27	3,32	

Table 4 presents the ANOVA results for the comparison of the Organizational Commitment Scale scores of the participants included in the study according to their marital status. According to Table 4, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the participants in the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment sub-dimensions in the scale according to their marital status ( $p > 0,05$ ). It was observed that the scores of the single, married and widowed/divorced participants in the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and in the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment sub-dimensions in the scale were similar.

**Table 5.** Comparison of Participants' Organizational Commitment Scale Scores by Age Group

	<b>Age Group</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>s</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>
Emotional Commitment	18-25	69	2,42	0,32	1,67	3,17	0,388
	26-34	261	2,46	0,30	1,83	3,33	
	35-41	83	2,46	0,35	1,67	3,33	
	42 and above	86	2,46	0,26	1,83	3,17	
Continuance Commitment:	18-25	69	3,08	0,39	2,25	4,25	0,705
	26-34	261	3,04	0,39	2,00	4,00	
	35-41	83	3,00	0,39	2,00	3,75	
	42 and above	86	3,01	0,42	2,25	4,00	
Normative Commitment	18-25	69	2,91	0,35	2,20	3,80	0,345
	26-34	261	2,89	0,38	1,80	4,00	
	35-41	83	2,86	0,40	2,00	3,80	
	42 and above	86	2,88	0,35	2,00	3,80	
<b>Organizational Commitment Scale</b>	18-25	69	2,80	0,25	2,23	3,34	0,399
	26-34	261	2,80	0,22	2,17	3,61	
	35-41	83	2,77	0,26	2,27	3,46	
	42 and above	86	2,78	0,22	2,21	3,27	

The ANOVA results for the comparison of the participants' Organizational Commitment Scale scores according to their ages are shown in Table 5. When Table 5 is examined, it has been determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of the participants included in the study from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment sub-dimensions in the scale ( $p > 0,05$ ). The scores of the participants aged 18-25, 26-34, 35-41 and over the age of 42 in the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and in the sub-dimensions of affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment were similar.



**Table 6.** Comparison of Participants' Organizational Commitment Scale Scores According to Professional Experience

	Professional Experience	n	s	Min	Max	F	p	
Emotional Commitment	Less than 1 year	91	2,44	0,32	1,67	3,17	0,410	0,746
	1-5 years	249	2,47	0,30	1,83	3,33		
	6-10 years	81	2,43	0,33	1,67	3,33		
	11-15 years	78	2,46	0,27	1,83	3,17		
Continuance Commitment:	Less than 1 year	91	3,08	0,39	2,25	4,25	1,070	0,361
	1-5 years	249	3,04	0,39	2,00	4,00		
	6-10 years	81	2,99	0,41	2,00	4,00		
	11-15 years	78	2,99	0,41	2,25	3,75		
Normative Commitment	Less than 1 year	91	2,94	0,34	2,20	3,80	0,986	0,399
	1-5 years	249	2,88	0,38	1,80	4,00		
	6-10 years	81	2,85	0,40	2,00	3,80		
	11-15 years	78	2,88	0,36	2,00	3,80		
Organizational Commitment Scale	Less than 1 year	91	2,82	0,24	2,23	3,34	1,171	0,320
	1-5 years	249	2,80	0,22	2,17	3,61		
	6-10 years	81	2,76	0,25	2,27	3,46		
	11-15 years	78	2,78	0,22	2,21	3,27		

In Table 6, the comparison of the Organizational Commitment Scale scores of the participants according to their professional experience was made with ANOVA. According to Table 6, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the participants in the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment sub-dimensions in the scale according to their professional experience ( $p>0,05$ ). Participants with less than 1 year of professional experience, 1-5 years, 6-10 years, and 11-15 years have similar scores in the Organizational Commitment Scale and in the sub-dimensions of affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment.

**Table 7.** Comparison of Participants' Organizational Commitment Scale Scores by Working Time in the Institution

	Working Time in the Institution	n	s	Min	Max	F	p	
Emotional Commitment	Less than 1 year	69	2,42	0,32	1,67	3,17	0,388	0,761
	1-2 years	261	2,46	0,30	1,83	3,33		
	3-6 years	83	2,46	0,35	1,67	3,33		
	7-14 years	86	2,46	0,26	1,83	3,17		
Continuance Commitment:	Less than 1 year	69	3,08	0,39	2,25	4,25	0,705	0,550
	1-2 years	261	3,04	0,39	2,00	4,00		
	3-6 years	83	3,00	0,39	2,00	3,75		
	7-14 years	86	3,01	0,42	2,25	4,00		
Normative Commitment	Less than 1 year	69	2,91	0,35	2,20	3,80	0,345	0,793
	1-2 years	261	2,89	0,38	1,80	4,00		
	3-6 years	83	2,86	0,40	2,00	3,80		
	7-14 years	86	2,88	0,35	2,00	3,80		
Organizational Commitment Scale	Less than 1 year	69	2,80	0,25	2,23	3,34	0,399	0,754
	1-2 years	261	2,80	0,22	2,17	3,61		
	3-6 years	83	2,77	0,26	2,27	3,46		
	7-14 years	86	2,78	0,22	2,21	3,27		

In Table 7, the comparison of the Organizational Commitment Scale scores of the participants within the scope of the research according to the length of time they worked in the institution was tested with ANOVA. When Table 7 is examined, no statistically significant difference was found between the scores of the participants in the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment sub-dimensions in the scale according to the length of time they worked in the institution ( $p>0.05$ ). It was determined that the scores of the participants with less than 1 year, 1-2 years, 3-6 years and 7-14 years of service in the institution were similar in the Organizational Commitment Scale and in the sub-dimensions of affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment.

**Table 8.** Comparison of Participants' Organizational Commitment Scale Scores by Working Time with the Manager

	Working Time With the Manager	n	s	Min	Max	F	p
Emotional Commitment	Less than 1 year	148	2,47	0,31	1,67	3,17	0,323
	1-2 years	159	2,44	0,33	1,83	3,33	
	3-6 years	162	2,46	0,28	1,67	3,33	
	7-14 years	30	2,48	0,30	2,00	3,17	
Continuance Commitment:	Less than 1 year	148	3,05	0,40	2,25	4,25	0,421
	1-2 years	159	3,04	0,39	2,25	4,00	
	3-6 years	162	3,03	0,40	2,00	3,75	
	7-14 years	30	2,96	0,38	2,25	4,00	
Normative Commitment	Less than 1 year	148	2,89	0,37	1,80	4,00	0,821
	1-2 years	159	2,91	0,36	2,00	3,80	
	3-6 years	162	2,86	0,38	1,80	3,80	
	7-14 years	30	2,95	0,41	2,20	3,80	
<b>Organizational Commitment Scale</b>	Less than 1 year	148	2,80	0,24	2,21	3,61	0,157
	1-2 years	159	2,79	0,23	2,17	3,46	
	3-6 years	162	2,78	0,23	2,27	3,31	
	7-14 years	30	2,80	0,21	2,23	3,18	

The comparison of the Organizational Commitment Scale scores of the participants according to the duration of working with the manager was made with ANOVA and the findings are shown in Table 8. When analyzed according to Table 8, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the participants from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment sub-dimensions in the scale according to the duration of working with the manager ( $p>0.05$ ). The scores of the participants with less than 1 year, 1-2 years, 3-6 years and 7-14 years of working with the manager were similar in the Organizational Commitment Scale and in the sub-dimensions of affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the scale.

**Table 9.** Correlations Between Participants' Interactive Leadership Scale, Transformational Leadership Scale, and Organizational Commitment Scale Scores

	Interactive Leadership Scale	Transformational Leadership Scale	Emotional Commitment	Continuance Commitment:	Normative Commitment	Organizational Commitment Scale
<b>Interactive Leadership Scale</b>	r 1					
	p					
	N 499					

<b>Transformative Leadership Scale</b>	r	0,303	1				
	p	0,000*					
	N	499	499				
Emotional Commitment	r	0,361	0,124	1			
	p	0,000*	0,005*				
	N	499	499	499			
Continuance Commitment:	r	0,409	0,161	0,160	1		
	p	0,000*	0,000*	0,000*			
	N	499	499	499	499		
Normative Commitment	r	0,441	0,233	0,095	0,113	1	
	p	0,000*	0,000*	0,034*	0,012*		
	N	499	499	499	499	499	
<b>Organizational Commitment Scale</b>	r	0,629	0,271	0,581	0,702	0,642	1
	p	0,000*	0,000*	0,000*	0,000*	0,000*	
	N	499	499	499	499	499	499

\* $p < 0,05$

In Table 9, the correlations between the Interactive Leadership Scale, Transformational Leadership Scale and Organizational Commitment Scale scores of the participants in the study were examined with the Pearson test. According to Table 9, there were statistically significant and positive correlations between the scores of the participants from the Interactive Leadership Scale and the scores they got from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and from the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the scale ( $p < 0.05$ ). As the scores of the participants from the Interactive Leadership Scale increase, the scores they get from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and from the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the scale increase. It was determined that there were statistically significant and positive correlations between the scores of the participants included in the study from the Transformational Leadership Scale and the scores they got from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and from the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the scale ( $p < 0.05$ ). As the scores of the participants from the Transformational Leadership Scale increase, the scores they get from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and from the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the scale increase.

**Table 10.** *The Prediction Status of the Participants' Interactive Leadership Scale and Transformational Leadership Scale Scores and Organizational Commitment Scale Scores*

	Non-Std.		Std.			F	R <sup>2</sup>
	$\beta$	S.H.	Beta	t	p	p	DüzR <sup>2</sup>
(Fixed)	1,587	0,116		13,712	0,000*	166,928	0,402
Interactive Leadership	0,372	0,023	0,602	16,515	0,000*	0,000*	0,400
Transformational Leadership	0,124	0,051	0,089	2,437	0,015*		

\* $p < 0,05$

In Table 10, the predictive status of the Organizational Commitment Scale scores of the Interactive Leadership Scale and Transformational Leadership Scale scores of the participants included in the study was examined by multivariate regression analysis, and it was determined that the model was significant and the explained variance was 40%. It was determined that the participants' Interactive Leadership Scale ( $\beta = 0.602; p < 0.05$ ) and Transformational Leadership Scale ( $\beta = 0.089; p < 0.05$ ) scores predicted the Organizational Commitment Scale scores statistically significantly and positively.

## 5. DISCUSSION

In the study, it was determined that the organizational commitment levels of bank employees did not differ according to gender. When the studies on the subject are examined, although there are similar studies with the findings of this study, there are also studies reporting that organizational commitment differs according to gender, unlike this result. Erkmén and Bozkurt (2011) in their study in which they examined the relationship between organizational culture and organizational commitment, found that there was no significant difference in

the levels of organizational commitment of women and men, similar to the findings of this study. In the study of Özkaya, Kocakoç, and Kara (2006) in which they investigated the commitment of administrators, it was seen that the dimensions of commitment did not differ according to gender. In the study conducted by San (2017), it was reported that the organizational commitment scores of the participants did not differ according to gender. Günce (2013) examined the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment and determined that the organizational commitment levels of women and men were similar as a result of the study. In the studies conducted by Pelit and Öztürk (2010) and Nartgün and Menep (2010), it was observed that organizational commitment did not differ according to gender. In the study of Karataş and Güleş (2010), in which they examined the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, it was concluded that the organizational commitment scores of female and male participants were similar. Unlike these findings, there are also studies reporting that organizational commitment levels of individuals differ according to gender. Yavuz and Bedük (2016) found that women's organizational commitment levels were higher in their study in which they examined the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism. İnce and Gül (2005) and Güllüoğlu (2011) reported that women's organizational commitment levels are higher than men. It is also stated that this result may be related to the fact that the problems women face in their business life motivate them more, they are persistent in the organization they are involved in, and they do not have the thought of constantly changing jobs. Küçüközkan (2015), on the other hand, found that women's emotional commitment and normative commitment levels were higher than men's. Türkmen (2016), on the other hand, stated that men work in higher positions compared to women and that business life is a priority for men; On the other hand, it is stated that women's priorities are family, so their organizational commitment is lower. In the studies carried out by Özkaya, Kocakoç and Kara (2006) and Gözen (2007), it was reported that organizational commitment differs according to the gender variable. The fact that there are different results in the literature on organizational commitment and gender may be due to the difference in the sample groups included in the studies.

In this study, it is observed that the organizational commitment levels of bank employees do not differ according to marital status. Günce (2013), similar to the findings of this study, stated that organizational commitment levels of individuals do not differ according to marital status; It has been reported that the organizational commitment scores of married and single individuals are similar. Cihangiroğlu (2010) examined demographic variables affecting organizational affiliation and found that marital status did not make significant differences on organizational commitment. Yıldız (2013) reported that there was no significant difference in the organizational commitment levels of married and single individuals in his study. Yavuz and Bedük (2016) examined the relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment and found that marital status did not make a significant difference on organizational commitment. Other studies on the subject have also found similar results; organizational commitment does not differ according to the marital status variable (Akgül, 2012; Cevahiroğlu, 2012; Coşkun, 2014; Kaygısız, 2012). Uzun and Yiğit (2011) examined the organizational commitment and organizational stress levels of managers and focused on the relationship between demographic factor and variables and stated that marital status is a demographic variable that creates a significant difference on organizational commitment. Günlük (2010) examined the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction and intention to leave, and revealed a relationship between marital status and organizational commitment. Sarıkaya (2011) reported that total organizational commitment scores of married individuals and continued commitment and emotional attachment lower dimension scores were higher than single individuals. The study also concluded that normative adherence sub-dimension scores did not differ according to marital status. It seems that the field of marital status and organizational affiliation is not consistent with each other. This situation, regardless of whether married or single, individuals need an income to keep their lives and a job to obtain this income. In this study and some related studies, the result that marital status does not differ on organizational commitment may be related to this situation.

The study concluded that the organizational commitment levels of bank employees did not differ significantly according to age groups. Özdemir, (2020) reported that the age variable is not a predictor of organizational commitment, similar to the findings of this study. Belloda, Bilir Güler, and Oğuzhan (2017) similarly reported that organizational commitment and age were not related. Demirkol (2014) states that, unlike the findings of this study, age and total organizational commitment scores and emotional and normative commitment sub-dimension scores differ according to the age variable. Cihangiroğlu, Teke, Özata, and Çelen (2015) revealed in their study that organizational commitment differs significantly according to the age variable. According to this result, the total scores of organizational commitment and emotional attachment lower dimension scores of individuals in the age group 41 and older were higher than those of other age groups. Also, Gider (2010) concluded that the age variable made a significant difference on the total scores of organizational commitment and emotional and normative dependence. Kardeşahin (2019) stated that there is a significant difference between emotional commitment and age; He reported that the emotional commitment levels of individuals aged 18-28 and

individuals aged 51-61, and individuals aged 40-50 and those aged 18-28 differed. Robins and Judge (2013) examined the factors affecting organizational dynamics and found that the age variable is related to organizational commitment, and the level of organizational commitment increases as age increases. In another study examining organizational commitment, organizational cynicism and associated variables, it was found that organizational attachment increases in parallel with age (Yücel and Çetinkaya, 2015).

Another variable considered in the study is professional experience. Accordingly, the organizational commitment levels of bank employees do not differ according to their professional experience. Although similar results are reached with the findings of this study in the literature on professional seniority and organizational commitment, there are also studies reporting that professional seniority creates a significant difference on organizational commitment. Memişoğlu and Kalay (2017) reported that professional seniority is not an effective variable on organizational commitment. In another study on the subject, similar to these results, it was revealed that there was no significant difference between seniority and organizational commitment (Eğriboyun, 2013). In the study conducted by Polat and Yavuz (2021), it was concluded that total organizational commitment scores and continuance commitment sub-dimension scores differ according to the seniority variable. Accordingly, organizational commitment total scores and continued commitment sub-dimension scores increase as seniority increases. In the study, however, it was found that normative commitment and emotional attachment scores did not differ according to seniors. As the seniority increases, the experience gained in the profession increases, the person gets used to the institution and his colleagues, and internalizes the goals, culture and value judgments of the organization (Canbaz, 2019). As a result, organizational commitment is increasing. On the other hand, Güner (2015) states that employees with this seniority have a higher fear of losing all their professional capital; reported that this situation will increase organizational commitment. Alcan (2018) stated that organizational commitment of individuals with lower professional seniority due to their feeling of alienation to both the organization and other employees in the organization; In other related studies, it has been determined that as professional seniority increases, the level of organizational commitment also increases (Atik and Üstüner, 2014; Ertürk, 2014). Finally, in the study conducted by Nartgün and Menep (2010), it was determined that continuance commitment and normative commitment did not differ according to professional seniority, but emotional commitment sub-dimension scores differed according to professional seniority.

In the study, it was determined that the working time of the bank employees in the institution did not make a difference on organizational commitment. Dikmen (2012), in his study examining the effects of leadership theories and transformative leadership theory on individuals' organizational commitment levels, reached similar results with the findings of this study and reported that the working time in the institution did not make a significant difference from the organizational commitment levels of individuals. In a study conducted by Zagenczyk et al., (2020) on bank employees, organizational commitment and job satisfaction levels of bank employees were examined; as a result of the study, it was determined that the working time in the institution was related to job satisfaction but did not make a significant difference on organizational commitment. In their study, Bayer and Özkan (2019) examined the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational commitment and the factors affecting perceived organizational support and commitment, and reported that, unlike these results, the working time in the institution has a predictive effect on organizational commitment. The perceived leadership styles and organizational commitment levels of individuals working in private banks were examined, and as a result of the study, it was determined that organizational commitment increased as the working time in the bank increased (Kim, Eisenberger, & Baik, 2016). In another study conducted on bank employees, demographic variables affecting individuals' organizational commitment levels were examined and it was determined that the total working time in the bank made a significant difference on organizational commitment. According to this difference, the organizational commitment levels of individuals who have worked in the current bank for 6-10 years are higher than those who have worked for 1-3 years (Knight & Haslam, 2010).

In this study, organizational commitment levels of bank employees were examined according to the time they worked with their managers, and it was determined that the duration of working with the manager did not make a significant difference on organizational commitment. When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that there is no study that directly examines the effect of working time with the manager on organizational commitment. However, in studies on the subject, there are studies examining the effect of trust in the manager on organizational commitment. Khan, Mukhtar, and Khan (2010) stated in a comprehensive study that organizational commitment increases as employees' trust towards their managers increases. Collie, Shapka, and Perry (2011) report that employees who have worked with their managers for many years have higher levels of organizational harmony and organizational commitment than other individuals. In the study conducted by Knoll and Van Dick (2013), it is stated that individuals who have worked with a manager for 4-7 years perceive their managers more democratic than individuals who have worked for 1-3 years, and this situation positively affects



many organizational dynamics, including organizational commitment. It is clear that there are no direct results on the subject, but related studies should be increased.

In the study, it was determined that there were statistically significant and positive correlations between the scores of the bank employees from the Interactive Leadership Scale and the scores they got from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and from the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the scale. In addition, in the study, it was determined that there were statistically significant and positive correlations between the scores of the bank employees from the Transformational Leadership Scale and the scores they got from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and from the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the scale. These findings are consistent with the field. Kaygın and Güllüce (2012) state that employees' commitment to the organization increases in return for the emotional bond and value they show to the leaders who exhibit transformational leadership characteristics. In the study conducted by Çakınberk and Demirel (2010), it was reported that there is a strong relationship between transformational leadership style organizational commitment and emotional commitment. Accordingly, as transformative leadership traits increase, organizational commitment total scores and emotional attachment sub-dimension scores increase. Similar results were obtained in another study; The relationship between transformational leadership and emotional and normative commitment was mentioned (Morçin & Bilgin, 2014). In a study conducted in the USA on 322 employees, it was determined that there is a positive and significant relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment (Porter, 2015). Çankaya (2023) reported that transformative leadership characteristics increase the level of organizational commitment in the study between transformative leadership and organizational commitment. In a study conducted on individuals working in public institutions, it was revealed that transformational leadership characteristics have a strong relationship with affective commitment and normative commitment sub-dimensions. Accordingly, the levels of emotional and normal attachment increased as the scores received from the transformation leadership scale increased (Kara and Bozkurt, 2021). Similar results were obtained in a study conducted in the health sector, and as a result of the study, there was a strong positive correlation between transformative leadership and emotional commitment sub-dimensions; it was determined that there is a moderate positive relationship with continuance commitment and commitment sub-dimensions (Sorucuoğlu and Öztürk, 2021). Kulinskaya, Morgenthaler, and Staudte (2008) found that there is a strong positive relationship between transactional and transformational leadership, organizational commitment and organizational cohesion in their study on bank employees. The interactional leadership characteristics, which describe the fact that the employees receive the rewards given by the leader when they successfully complete the tasks and responsibilities given by the leader, motivate the employees towards the work and the organization; it is stated that this situation increases their organizational commitment if it persists (Owen, Hodgson, & Gazzard ., 2011). When the studies on the subject are examined, it is possible to say that there are positive relations between interactionist and transformational leadership and organizational commitment, although the levels differ. In this context, the importance of interactionist and transformational leadership characteristics has been demonstrated once again in order to increase commitment in organizations.

Finally, in this study, it was determined that the Interactive Leadership Scale and Transformational Leadership Scale scores of the bank employees predicted the Organizational Commitment Scale scores statistically significantly and positively. Similar results are achieved when examining the relevant field. Schaijk (2018) and Xerri and Brunetto (2013) reported in their studies that interactionist and transformational leadership predicted organizational commitment positively and significantly. This result is consistent with the findings that the level of organizational commitment, which is related to the fact that the employees see themselves as a permanent member of the organization and reveal attitudes that will integrate with the organization, is shaped according to the attitudes and behaviors of the leaders, and the results of the research that the interactionist and transformational leadership characteristics increase organizational commitment (Avolio, Zhu, Koh and Bhatia, 2004; Dunn, Dastoor and Sims, 2012; Hulpia, Devos and Keer, 2011; Jackson, Meyer and Wang, 2013; Khasawneh, Omari and Abu-Tineh, 2012; Leithwood and Sun, 2012; Lok and Crawford, 2004; Thamrin, 2012). It is seen that the results obtained in many studies examining the effects of leadership theories on organizational dynamics are that transformational leadership characteristics increase organizational commitment in general. Transactional and transformational leaders are positively related to the attitudes and behaviors of their employees; and predicts these attitudes and behaviors positively (Bo, 2013; Dum Dum, Lowe, and Avolio, 2002). It is seen that similar results were obtained in the meta-analysis study conducted by Leithwood and Sun (2012). In this context, it is possible to say that interactionist and transformational leadership characteristics increase the motivation of employees and this positively affects their commitment to the organization (Jackson, Meyer, and Wang, 2013; Khasawneh, Omari, and Abu-Tineh, 2012; Thamrin, 2012). In studies conducted by Jafri (2010), Hakimian, Farid, İsmail, and Nair (2016), transformational leadership characteristics are an important predictor of organizational commitment; It has been reported that as the transformational leadership characteristics

increase, the organizational commitment levels of the employees also increase. Bozalp Ünal, Karadağ, and Gök (2023), in their study examining the effect of transformational leadership on organizational outputs, reached such results and concluded that transformational leadership positively and moderately predicts organizational commitment.

## 6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the study, it was concluded that the scores of the bank employees in the Organizational Commitment Scale and in the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment sub-dimensions in the scale did not differ according to gender, age, marital status, professional experience, working time in the institution and working with the manager. It has been determined that there are statistically significant and positive correlations between the scores of the bank employees from the Interactive Leadership Scale and the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and the scale. According to this finding, as the scores of the participants from the Interactive Leadership Scale increase, the scores they get from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and from the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the scale increase. It was determined that there were statistically significant and positive correlations between the scores of the bank employees included in the study from the Transformational Leadership Scale and the scores they got from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and from the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the scale. Accordingly, as the scores of the participants from the Transformational Leadership Scale increase, the scores they get from the Organizational Commitment Scale in general and from the emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the scale increase. Finally, it was determined that the Interactive Leadership Scale and Transformational Leadership Scale scores of the bank employees predicted the Organizational Commitment Scale scores statistically significantly and positively.

Today, it is clear that organizations that want to adapt better to changing conditions with globalization and to ensure their employees' loyalty to the organization should invest more in expanding their existing human resources. In addition, the quality and level of the relationship between leader member interaction and leadership styles is an important way to ensure organizational commitment of employees. Considering the mission of leaders to guide employees, it can be said that leaders who value their employees and who show transformative leadership styles have an important determining role in organizations. It is necessary to consider the importance of transformative leaders in order for qualified human resources to be committed to the organization and to perform their work in a peaceful, happy and productive way, especially in sectors such as banks, where working conditions are difficult.

Increasing the number of leaders who adopt interactionist and transformational leadership styles will be possible with long-term training rather than short-term planning. In this context, it is important to organize training programs that aim to provide these leadership characteristics to the managers who are already working in banks, to give priority to individuals with transformative leadership characteristics in the selection of leaders, and to add training contents that aim to bring these skills to the curricula of training programs that train bank managers. All these interventions will be effective in increasing the number of happy and committed employees in the institutions of the future.

## REFERENCES

- Akgül, S. (2012). *Relationship between perception of organizational identity and organizational adherence of primary school teachers (Sakarya as a model)* (Master Thesis), Institute of Educational Sciences, Sakarya University, Sakarya.
- Aksaraylı, M. F. (2015). Transformational leadership and transformational leadership paradigm in change. *Süleyman Demirel University Vizyoner Journal*, 6 (12), 108-124.
- Alcan, E. E. (2018). *The relationship between teachers' organizational support, organizational identification and organizational commitment perceptions* (Master's Thesis). Sabahattin Zaim University, Istanbul.
- Alga, E. (2017). The effect of perceived leadership styles in organizations on employee burnout. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, (28), 97-124.
- Altinkurt, Y. (2015). *Strategic leadership in educational organizations and strategic leadership practices of school principals* (PhD Thesis), Anadolu University, Eskişehir.
- Ardahan, M., and Konal, E. (2017). Management and leadership in nursing. *Gümüşhane University Journal of Health Sciences*, 6 (1), 140-147.
- Aslan, Ş. (2013). *Leadership theories from the past to the present from the perspective of health management*. Eğitim Publishing House.
- Atik, S. and Üstüner, M. (2014). The relationship between the organizational type of primary schools and the organizational commitment of teachers. *Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Faculty of Education*,

- 15 (2), 133-154.
- Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W. & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 25, 951-968.
- Aydın, M. (2018). *Educational management*. Hatiboğlu Publishing House.
- B.M. Bass, Leadership and performance beyond expectations, *Free Press* New York, 1985, 1-266, p. 2
- Bakan, İ., Büyükebeşe, T. (2010). Current-future situation comparison of leadership “types” and “power sources”: A field study based on the perceptions of educational institution administrators. *KMU Journal of Social and Economic Research*, 12 (19), 73-84.
- Balay, R., (2000). *Organizational commitment in managers and teachers*, Ankara: Nobel Publication Distribution.
- Bass, B. M., Steidlmyer P. (1999). Ethics, character and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181-217. Academic database
- Başar, U., and Basım, N. (2018). Paradoxical leadership model. *Journal of Amme İdaresi*, 51 (3), 121-153.
- Bayer, E., & Özkan, Ş. (2019). The relationship between the perception of organizational support and organizational commitment: A research on nurses. *The Journal*. 12(68).
- Belloda, B., Bilir Güler, S. and Oğuzhan, A. (2017). *Management of differences and organizational commitment*. A survey of Kosovo Prizren public schools. *Journal of Balkan and Near East Social Sciences*. 3(2). . 1-19
- Blau, Peter M., W. R. Scott. (1962). Formal organizations. *Chandler Publishing Company*.
- Bo, Y. (2013). The influence study of transformational leadership in university on teachers' organizational commitment: the construction and verification of a theoretical model. *Canadian Social Science*, 9(4), 126-137.
- Boylu, Y., Elbeyi, P. ve Güçer, E., (2007). A research on the organizational commitment levels of academicians. ”<http://www.acikarsiv.gazi.edu.tr/dosya/akademisyenlerinorgutselbagliliklari.pdf>.
- Bozalp Ünal, S., Karadağ, E., & Gök, H. (2023). Effect of transformational leadership on organizational outputs: A meta-analysis study. *Journal of Society, Educational and Cultural Studies*, 2(1), 12–33. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7881771>
- Bozkuş, G. and Gündüz, Y. (2016). Modeling the relationship between spiritual leadership and organizational commitment. *Kastamonu Journal of Education*, 24 (1), 405 — 420.
- Canbaz, O. (2019). *The relationship between the ability of secondary school administrators to manage differences and teachers' organizational commitment*. (Master's Thesis). Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.
- Celep, C., (2004). *Transformational leadership in educational organizations*, Ankara: Anı Publishing
- Cevahiroğlu, E. (2012). *The relationship between primary school branch teachers' perceived leadership behaviors and organizational commitment: Example of Bayrampaşa District of Istanbul Province*. (Master's Thesis). Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, Yeditepe University, Istanbul.
- Cihangiroğlu, N. (2010). A study on the organizational levels of attachment of military medical. *Gulhane Medical Journal*, 52 (2), 82.
- Cihangiroğlu, N., Teke, A., Özata, M., & Çelen, Ö. (2015). Analysis of the relationship between professional commitment and organizational commitment. *Gulhane Medical Journal*, 57 (4), 367-72.
- Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2011). Predicting teacher commitment: the impact of school climate and social- emotional learning. *Psychology in the Schools*. 48(10), 1034- 1048.
- Coşkun, E. (2014). *The relationship between the effectiveness of school administrators and teachers' organizational commitment: Example of Istanbul-Bağcılar*. (Master's Thesis). Graduate School of Social Sciences, Department of Educational Management and Supervision. Yeditepe University, Istanbul.
- Çakınberk, A., & Demirel, E. T. (2010). Leadership as a determinant of organizational commitment: Example of health workers. *Selçuk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 24, 103—119.
- Çankaya, M. (2023). Examining the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment: an application in the health sector. *Journal of EKV Academy*, (94), 206-217. DOI: 10.17753/sosekev.1257344
- Çeri-Booms, M. (2009). *An empirical study on transactional, transformational and authentic leaders: Exploring the mediating role of trust in leader on organizational identification*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Yeditepe University, Istanbul.
- Çetin, M., (2004). *Organizational commitment*, Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Dağlı, A., and Ağalday, B. (2018). Analysing headmasters' paternalistic leadership behaviours *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 17(66), 518-534.
- Demirkol, A. Y. (2014). Organizational commitment in educational institutions: A research on vocational schools. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 1-15.
- Dikmen, B. (2012). *An applied research on the effects of leadership theories and transformational leadership*

- theory on employees' perceptions of organizational commitment.* (Master's Thesis). Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Department of Business Administration, Aydin University, Istanbul.
- Dumdum, U. R., Lowe, K. B. & Avolio, B. (2002). *A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension*, B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Ed.). Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead 2 (pp. 35-66). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.
- Dunn, M. W., Dastoor, B. & Sims, R. L. (2012). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: A cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(1), 45-59.
- Edizler, G. (2013). A literature study on the emotional intelligence dimension and gender factor in charismatic leadership. *Selçuk İletişim*, 6 (2), 137-150. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/josc/issue/19020/200638>.
- Eğriboyun, D. (2013). *Relation among organizational trust, organizational support and organizational commitment of the administrators/teachers who are charged in secondary education schools* (Example of Bolu province) (Unpublished PhD Thesis), Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Bolu.
- Eren, E. (2001). *Management and organization*. Istanbul: Beta Publications.
- Erkmen, T. & Bozkurt, S. (2011). A Study About the Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment *Marmara University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 31 (2), 197-227. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/muibd/issue/498/4453>
- Evans, D. (2001). Supervisory management: Principles and practice. *Cengage Learning EMEA*.
- Gedik, Y. (2020). Transformational and transactional leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies: Theory and Practice*, 3 (2), 19-34.
- Gider, Ö. (2010). "Investigation of organizational commitment, organizational trust and job satisfaction levels of personnel working in training and research hospitals". *Istanbul University Faculty of Business Administration Institute of Business Administration Journal of Management*, 65: 81-105.
- Gözen, E.D. (2007). *A research on job satisfaction and organizational commitment insurrances companies* (Unpublished Master's Thesis), Atılım University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Güllüoğlu, Ö. (2011). *Organizational communication-communication satisfaction and organizational commitment*. Konya: Eğitim Akademi Publications.
- Gümüştekin, E.G. and Emet, C., (2009). "The interaction of change in empowerment perceptions on organizational culture and commitment" <http://sbe.dumlupinar.edu.tr/17/90-116.pdf>, date of access: 20.05.2023. p.1-25.
- Günce, S. (2013). *The relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment in primary schools.* (Master's Thesis), Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, Harran University, Şanlıurfa.
- Güner, A. G. (2015). *Evaluation of the organizational commitment levels of the instructors* (Example of Giresun University). (Master's Thesis). Cumhuriyet University, Sivas.
- Günlük, M. (2010). *A research on accountants' professional and organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover tendencies.* (Unpublished PhD Thesis), Institute of High Technology. Social Sciences Institute,
- Gürkan, G. Ç., (2006). *Organizational commitment: The effect of organizational climate on organizational commitment and the investigation of the relationship between organizational climate and organizational commitment at Trakya University.* (Master's Thesis). Trakya University, Institute of Social Sciences, Edirne.
- Hakimian, F., Farid, H., İsmail, M.N. ve Nair, P.K. (2016). Importance of commitment in encouraging employees' innovative behaviour. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 8(1), 70- 83.
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G. & Keer, H. V. (2011). The relation between school leadership from a distributed perspective and teachers' organizational commitment: Examining the source of the leadership function. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(5), 728-771.
- İnce, M. and Gül, H. (2005). *A New Paradigm in Management: Organizational commitment*: Ankara: İleri Giden Ofset.
- Jackson, T. A., Meyer, J. P. & Wang, X. H. (2013). Leadership, commitment, and culture: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(1) 84–106.
- Jafri, M.H. (2010). Organizational commitment and employee's innovative behavior. *Journal of Management Research*, 10 (1), 62-68.
- Kara, E., & Bozkurt, Ş. (2021). Determining the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment *EKV Academy Journal*, (87), [143-160](https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/sosekev/issue/71551/1151060). <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/sosekev/issue/71551/1151060>
- Karakulle, I. (2020). *The effects of employees' perceptions of human resource management practices on organizational commitment and job satisfaction: an application in the service sector, (PhD Thesis)*



*Karabuk University*

- Karaşahin, T. (2019). *Management of differences and organizational commitment*. (Master's Thesis). Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Institute of Social Sciences, Karaman.
- Karataş, S. & Güleş, H. (2010). The relationship between primary school teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Uşak University Journal of Social Sciences*, 3 (2), 74-89. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/usaksosbil/issue/21650/232758>
- Kaygın, E., & Güllüce, A. Ç. (2012). Determining the transformational leadership perceptions of employees: a comparative study. *Atatürk University, Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 16(3)
- Kaygısız, A. (2012). The relationship between primary school teachers' organizational commitment levels and their participation in decision making (Example of Kütahya ). (Master's Thesis). Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences.
- Khan, S., Mukhtar, S. N., & Khan, M. A. (2010). Link between organizational justice and employee job performance in the work place. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(3), 121-132.
- Khasawneh, S., Omari, A. & Abu-Tineh, A. M. (2012). The relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment: The case for vocational teachers in Jordan. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(4), 494-508
- Kim, K. Y., Eisenberger, R., & Baik, K. (2016). Perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment: Moderating influence of perceived organizational competence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(4), 558-583.
- Knight, C. ve Haslam, S. A. (2010). Your place or mine? Organizational identification and comfort as mediators of relationships between the managerial control of workspace and employees' satisfaction and well-being. *British Journal of Management*. 21(3). 717-735.
- Knoll, M., & Van Dick, R. (2013). Do I hear the whistle...? A first attempt to measure four forms of employee silence and their correlates. *Journal of business ethics*, 113(2), 349-362.
- Korkmaz, M. (2006). The relationship between the personality traits of school administrators and their leadership styles. *Journal of Educational Management in Theory and Practice*, 12 (46), 199-226.
- Korkut, H. (2019). Leadership behaviors of university academic administrators. *Ankara University Journal Of Faculty Of Educational Sciences (Jfes)*, 25(1), 93-111.
- Kulinskaya, E., Morgenthaler, S. & Staudte, R. G. (2008). *Meta analysis: A guide to calibrating and combining statistical evidence*. London: John Wiley & Sons.
- Küçüközkan, Y. (2015). The relationship between organizational commitment and gender: A research on health personnel working in hospitals. *International Journal of Academic Management Sciences*, 1 (1), 14-37. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/yonbil/issue/42548/512774>
- Leithwood, K. & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 387-423.
- Leithwood, K. & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 387-423.
- Lok, P. & Crawford, C. (2004). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(4), 321-338
- Maslow, A.H. (1954) *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mathews, BP, Shepherd, JL. (2002). Dimensionality of cook and wall's (1980) british organizational commitment scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 369-375.
- Memişoğlu, S. P., & Kalay, M. (2017). The relationship between the organizational commitment and motivation of teachers working in primary and secondary schools (Example of Bolu province). *Turkish Studies (Electronics)*.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 78, 538-551.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Morçin, S. E., & Bilgin, N. (2014). The effect of transformational leadership on organizational commitment: Example of a group travel agencies in Adana. *Çukurova University, Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 23(2), 113-128
- Morrow, P.C., (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: the case of work commitment, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol:8, 486-500, 1983.
- Nartgün, Ş. S. and Menep, İ. (2010). Examining the perception levels of teachers working in primary schools about organizational commitment: Example of Şırnak/İdil. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 7 (1), 288-316.
- Olgungül, F. K., (2017). A research on the relationship between Organizational Commitment and working time:



- the example of teachers working in public and private secondary schools (PhD Thesis) Gazi University
- Owen, H., Hodgson, V. & Gazzard, N. (2011). *Leadership handbook*. (Çev., M. Çelik). İstanbul: Optimist.
- Özarallı, N., (2003). Effects of transformational leadership on empowerment and team effectiveness. *Leadership Organization*. 24(6), 335-344.
- Özdemir, H. Ö. (2020). Predicting organizational commitment perceptions of health workers from organizational justice perceptions and other factors. *Journal of Business Economics and Management Research*, 3 (2), 172-181. DOI: 10.33416/baybem.702316
- Özkan, M. (2016). What adjectives does leadership acquire and how? Examination of articles on leadership. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 15 (2), 615-639.
- Özkaya, M. O., Kocakoç, İ.D. and Kara, E. (2006). A field study to examine the relationships between managers' organizational commitment and demographic characteristics. *Celal Bayar University Journal of Management and Economics*. 13 (2), 77-96.
- Özmen, Ö. N., Eriş, E., and Özer, P. (2020). A look at digital leadership studies. *Journal of Süleyman Demirel University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 25 (1), 57-69.
- Pelit, E., & Öztürk, Y. (2010). Business satisfaction levels of hotel business employees: A research on the employees of summer resort and city hotel businesses. *Journal of Business Research*, 2 (1), 43-72.
- Polat, I. and Yavuz, Y. (2021). The relationship between teachers' participation in decision making and their organizational commitment. *Academia Journal of Educational Research*, 6 (1), 263-281.
- Porter, J. A. (2015). The relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment in nonprofit long term care organizations: The direct care worker perspective. *Creighton Journal of Interdisciplinary Leadership*, 1(2), 68–85.
- Robins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior* (translation: İnci Erdem). Ankara: Nobel Publications.
- Rowden, R., (2000). The relationship between charismatic leadership behaviors and organizational commitment. *The Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*. 21(1), 30-35.
- San, İ. (2017). *An empirical study to determine the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment*. (Master's Thesis). Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul Ticaret University, İstanbul.
- Sarıkaya, E. (2011) The relationship between primary school teachers' organizational commitment and performance. (Master's Thesis). Maltepe University, Institute of Social Sciences. İstanbul.
- Schajik, V. S. (2018). *The relationship between affective organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and innovative behavior (Unpublished Master's Thesis)*. Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Sorucuoğlu, A. Y., & Öztürk, Z. (2021). The effect of hospital staff's transformational leadership perceptions on their organizational commitment (Example of a state hospital in Ankara). *Journal of Sağlıkta Performans ve Kalite*, 18 (1), 61-88. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1342984>
- Sönmez, S. (2010). *The effect of emotional intelligence on transformational leadership in organizations*. (Unpublished Master Thesis), Zonguldak Kara Elmas Üniversitesi.
- Stewart, J., (2006). Transformational leadership: an evolving concept examined through the Works of Burns, Bass, Avolio and Leitwood.
- Thamrin, H. M. (2012). The influence of transformational leadership and organizational commitment on job satisfaction and employee performance. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 3(5), 566-572.
- Tutar, H. (2009). *Organizational communication*. Seçkin Publishing
- Türkmen, F. (2016). *The effect of secondary school administrators' servant leadership behaviors on teachers' organizational commitment (Example of Sinop province)*. (Master's Thesis). Ondokuz Mayıs University Educational Sciences Institute Educational Sciences Department Educational Administration Inspection. Planning and Economics Department, Samsun.
- Uzun, Ö. and Yiğit, E. (2011). A study on the relationship between organizational stress and organizational commitment on middle-level hotel managers. *Eskişehir Osmangazi University İİBF Journal*. 6 (1), 181-213.
- Weber, M. (1973). “Kirchen und Sekten in Nordamerika”, *Soziologie – Universalgeschichtliche Analysen: Politik*. J.Winckelmann (drl.). Alfred Kröner Verlag, Stuttgart, 382-397.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations, anormative view. *Academy Of Management Rewiev*, 1(7), 418-428.
- Xerri, M.J. ve Brunetto, Y. (2013). Fostering innovative behaviour: The importance of employee commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(16), 3163-3177. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.775033>.
- Yalçın, A and İplik, F.N., (2005). “A study to determine the relationship between the demographic characteristics of employees in five-star hotels and their organizational commitment: Example of Adana Province”. *Çukurova University, Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 23(2), 113–128 14 (1): 395–412.

- Yalçın, B., and İlic, D. K. (2017). Differentiating business values and leadership perceptions of its generation. *Yaşar University E-Journal*, 12 (46), 136-160.
- Yangil, F. M. (2016). Leadership in the information society: Sustainable leadership. *Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences*, (48), 128-143.
- Yavuz, A. & Bedük, A. (2016). The relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment: Sample application in Konya branches of a public bank. *Atatürk University, Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 35(301-313) Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/susbed/issue/61815/924920>
- Yeşil, A. (2016). A conceptual review of leadership and motivation theories. *International Journal of Academic Management Sciences*, 2 (3), 158-180.
- Yıldız, B. (2013). *Examination of primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions of job stress, organizational commitment and job satisfaction*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Maltepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Yücel, İ., & Çetinkaya, B. (2015). Relationship Between Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Commitment and Moderating Effects of Age of Employees on the Relationship- "Sometimes We May Have to Stay Even if We Don't Want it!" *Atatürk University, Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 19(3)
- Zagenczyk, T. J., Purvis, R. L., Cruz, K. S., Thoroughgood, C. N., & Sawyer, K. B. (2020). Context and social exchange: Perceived ethical climate strengthens the relationships between perceived organizational support and organizational identification and commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-20.