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Abstract
The objective of this study is to determine the relationship between the emotional intelligence, motivations and organizational commitment of the teachers working at primary schools. The study is carried out using survey method. The population of the study consists of 1162 teachers working at public primary schools in Bartın Province during the school year of 2013-2014, while the sampling of the study consists of 525 teachers selected by the stratified sampling method. The data used in the study were “Schutte emotional intelligence scale”, “Global Motivation Scale” and “Organizational Commitment Survey”. In the study, the relationship between emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment was tested by structural equation modelling. The results of the study demonstrate that the teachers working at the primary schools have a good level of emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment and there is a positive and suggestive relevance between their emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment.
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Introduction
In the twentieth century, also referred to as the age of information, the roles of the schools and teachers have changed and qualities of teachers have become a decisive factor in providing the students with necessary skills and offering quality education. According to Jones (2001), “teacher is the most dynamic element when we take education as a system.” Teachers play a significant role in teaching the students to learn and think, increasing the quality of education and concluding the

---

1 This study has been derived from Oznur Tuluay Ates’s doctoral dissertation.
changes with accomplishments. Therefore, the notions of emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment are critical factors in the profession of teaching which mainly comprises of emotions and sensitivities.

Emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment are interrelated concepts, supported by their definitions. The word “emotion” is derived from the Latin word “movere” (to move). Emotion can be assumed to have a persistent tendency to behave (Konrad & Hendl, 2005). The word “motivation” is also derived from the word “movere” and “motum”. In psychology, it generally refers to process of movement and tendency of an individual to a certain objective through intrinsic driving forces and showing intentional behaviour (Bingöl, 1998; O’Connor & Carol, 1995; Tarakçıoğlu, Sökmen & Boylu: 2010). Commitment is “the force driving an individual to act towards a certain objective” (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Accordingly, the words “emotion” and “motivation” are derived from similar origins and they are closely related to the concept of commitment.

The studies on emotional intelligence in 1990s were popular and effective (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2000). The studies, carried out to find out why individuals with high intelligence levels have always been the best in their business and private lives, (Cooper & Sawaf, 2003) revealed that intelligence on its own was not sufficient for an individual to have achievements in family, education and business life (Maree & Eiselen, 2004). The studies, carried out so far, have generally examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership, problem solving, decision making, exhaustion, job satisfaction, creativity and academic achievement. Studies include topics like emotional intelligence of teachers (Walker, 2001; Nelson, Low & Nelson, 2005; Penrose, Perry & Ball, 2007; Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008; Özmen, 2009), emotional intelligence and motivation (Akpolat & İşık, 2012), emotional intelligence and organizational commitment (Nikolau & Tsaousis, 2002; Wong & Law; 2002; Gardner, 2005; Akın, 2010; Güleryüz, Güney, Aydın & Aşan, 2008; Doğan, 2009; Hosseinzadeh, Yousefzadeh & Mashaikhii, 2012).

Motivation is another concept that is emphasized in the profession of teaching and in emotional intelligence. Motivation can be defined as the driving force which is used by individuals to reach some goals or to meet some expectations and requirements (Mullins, 2006), and it has an important role in terms of personal performance and organizational performance (Vural & Coşkun, 2007). Therefore, several studies can be found in the literature on the relationship between motivation and job satisfaction, performance, communication and personal management. There are studies that examine the relationship between teachers’ motivation and various variables (Anderson & Iwanicki, 1984; Kelley, 1999; Moran, Kilpatrick, Abbott, Dallat & McClune, 2001; Wadsworth, 2001; Bennel, 2004; Barlu, Bilgili, Çelik & Bayrakçeken, 2005; Hettiarachchi, 2010; Alam & Farid, 2011; Karabenick & Conley, 2011; Schieb & Karabenick, 2011; Güçlü, Recepoglu & Kilinci, 2014) and underline the importance of intrinsic motivation of teachers (Latham, 1998; Thompson, 1979).

It is believed that organizational commitment is one of the critical elements in increasing the performance of teachers and schools. Organizational commitment is defined by Mowday et al. (1982, 20) as “integrity and harmony of objectives of organization and employee”. The importance of commitment has been emphasized and relevant studies have been conducted on the basis that it enables organizations to achieve their goals. Studies usually examine the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, leadership, justice, climate, exhaustion and conflict. Studies also include the organizational commitment of teachers (Firestone & Rosenblum, 1988; Shin & Reyes, 1991; Balay, 2000; Zeyrek, 2008; Topaloğlu, Koç & Yavuz, 2008; Buluç, 2009; Hulpia, Devos & Van Keer, 2010; Kurşunoğlu, Bakay & Tannögen, 2010; Çoban &
Demirtaş, 2011); intrinsic motivation with emotional commitment (Synder & Spreitzer, 1984; Ağça & Ertan, 2008) and emotional intelligence and organizational commitment in teachers (Doğan, 2009).

Emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment can be assumed to have an important role in educational organizations for achieving their goals, enabling effective operation of schools, and increasing individual and organizational achievement. However, it is noticed that researches on these subjects are usually in the fields of management and business administration and number of the studies in educational sciences on the subject of relationship between emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment is limited. However, there are also studies focused on the variables or on the relationship between various variables.

Emotional intelligence

Intelligence is described as a cognitive skill (Jordan, Ashkanasy, Haretl & Hooper, 2002) and notions on it were changed by the emphasis on social intelligence and non-cognitive aspect of intelligence in the definitions of Wechsler and Thorndike. The foundations of emotional intelligence were laid when Gardner stated between 1983-1999 that intelligence covered eight different skills and included interpersonal (social) and personal (internal) intelligence among these areas.

Although the study of Mayer and Salovey on the interaction between emotion and intelligence is a pioneer in the field of emotional intelligence (Bar-on, Brown, Kirkcaldy & Thome, 2000), researches of authors like Goleman, Bar-on, Cooper and Sawaf contributed to the popularity of emotional intelligence. Throughout 1990s, no consensus was reached on the conceptualization of emotional intelligence, and different definitions and measurement tools were developed.

There are two different views suggesting that emotional intelligence is either a skill or a personal quality (Petrides & Furnham, 2000). Therefore, two different models emerged: skill model assuming that emotions are decisive on relations and mixed model including skills like social skill, personal quality and behaviour (Cobb & Mayer, 2000). The model of Mayer and Salovey (1997:35), which define emotional intelligence as “a proper perception, evaluation and expression of emotions; skill of using feelings in the formation of thought; skill to understand emotion and emotional knowledge and to adjust and control emotions in ensuring emotional and intellectual development”, is distinct from others as it is one of the skill models. Models of Bar-on, Goleman and Cooper-Sawaf are referred to as mixed models.

According to Mayer and Salovey, who used the concept of emotional intelligence for the first time, the basic quality of emotional intelligence is the fact that it is a productive combination of cognitive and emotional systems. Mayer and Salovey (1993) suggested that emotional intelligence consists of three categories of adaptive abilities. These are appraisal of emotions by an individual herself/himself (verbal-nonverbal) and of others (verbal, emphatic), regulation of emotions (of himself and others) and utilization of emotions in solving problems (flexible planning, creative thinking, redirected attention and motivation).

This study uses the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale created on the basis of the model and Mayer and Salovey and covering the same sub-dimensions with this model.

Motivation

According to Greenberg and Bar-on (2000), motivation is a set of cyclical processes that constantly mobilize and direct the human behaviours in line with certain objectives. Factors like necessity, desire, fear and faith drive an individual towards behaviour (Herzberg, 1991).
As motivation is a complex issue, there is no general and comprehensive motivation theory available. However, the concept of motivation can be assumed to have formed by the writings of important theoreticians like Abraham Maslow, Douglas McGregor, Frederick Herzberg and Edward L. Deci (Ellis, 1984).

Human necessities and motivation are the basic elements that determine the behaviour of individuals in an organization (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). When employees are not motivated, there are increases in attendance, wasting time, gossip, resistance to system, challenging policy of institutions, and bureaucracy; while there may be reduction in interest, work speed, willingness to take responsibility, level of creative participants, punctuality, attention and protection of institutional culture (Forsyth, 2006).

Factors that are effective in motivation are explained on two viewpoints. According to one point of view, an individual is motivated by external factors. The second point of view suggests that an individual is internally motivated to obtain social and monetary benefits as well as to achieve their objectives (Basset-Jones & Llyod, 2005).

Several experimental studies on motivation demonstrated that functional, but salient and contingent, extrinsic rewards can undermine existing intrinsic motivation (Kruglanski, Friedman & Zeevi, 1971; Lepper, Greene & Nisbett, 1973) and that intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation are antithetical (Deci, Ryan & Koestner, 1999; Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000).

According to the self-determination theory of Deci and Ryan (1985), motivation should be examined in three-dimensions. These are intrinsic, extrinsic motivation and amotivation. Intrinsic motivation refers to participation in activity not for extrinsic rewards but for finding it to be enjoyable and fun. Individuals with intrinsic motivation voluntarily participate in an activity. It focuses on pleasure and satisfaction to be obtained from action (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier & Ryan, 1991; Frederick & Ryan, 1995; Ryan &Deci, 2000; Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992; Vallerand et al., 1992). Whereas, extrinsic motivation refers to participation in an activity to get rewards. Extrinsic motivation is participation in activities because of intrinsic or extrinsic pressures. In such cases, behaviour is objective oriented (Deci &Ryan 1985; Deci et al., 1991; Frederick & Ryan 1995; Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992; Vallerand et al., 1992).

This study uses motivation scale developed by Vallerand et al. Based on the self determination theory of Deci and Ryan, authors studied motivation in three dimensions: intrinsic, extrinsic and amotivation. The developed scale divided the intrinsic motivation into knowledge, accomplishment and stimulation, while extrinsic motivation is divided into subdimensions of external and introjected identified regulations and amotivation.

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment is the voluntary behaviour to pay efforts to provide conscious awareness to organizational objectives beyond passive loyalty to organization (Mowday et al., 1979: 226).

Studies show that groups that are committed to each other contribute better to the realization of objectives of an organization when proper conditions are ensured (Bursalıoğlu, 2000). Committed employees show strong desire to serve their organization and do not desire to leave their organization (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982).

One cannot ignore the contribution of committed employees, who adopt the objectives and values of the organization in the achievement of their goals (Buluç, 2009: 8). Therefore, the issue of
organizational commitment has received a great deal of interest especially in educational institutions.


The variety in definitions and classifications of organizational commitment also exists in scales developed to measure organizational commitment. In this study “Organizational Commitment Survey”, designed by Mowday et al. (1979) is applied to determine the organizational commitment levels of employees. Mowday et al. (1982) also divide organizational commitment into two as attitudinal and behavioural commitment having no subscales.

The purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to determine the relationship between emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment based on the views of teachers who work at primary schools. Answers to the following problems were sought in order to achieve this objective.

1. What is the level of emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment of the teachers working at primary schools?

2. As perceived by the teachers who study at primary schools, how is their organizational commitment as affected by their emotional intelligence and motivations?

Method

Study Group

The study uses relational survey method. The relationship between emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment behaviours of teachers is tested within the framework of structural equation model. The study group of the research consists of 1162 teachers working at 119 official primary schools in Bartın during the school year of 2013-2014. Stratified sampling technique is used in the study. Central, district, town and village schools of the Bartın province are used in order that the number of teachers in the sampling can represent the population. Surveys were applied in the study to 870 teachers in order to increase the validity of the sampling. Feedback was obtained from 636 of these surveys. 111 surveys were found to be non-conforming to the rules and accordingly the were excluded and the analyses were made with 525 surveys.

Data Collection Tools

Study data regarding emotional intelligence was collected with the “Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale” developed by Austin et al. (2004). Data regarding motivation were collected by the “Global
Motivation Scale” developed by Guay, Mageau and Vallerand (2003) and data regarding organizational commitment were collected by the “Organizational Commitment Survey” developed by Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974). Before conducting the real implementation during the research process, validity and reliability work was done for each of the three scales. For this purpose, scales were adapted to Turkish language by the author and three experts of the English language while validity and reliability work was implemented on a group of 150 teachers.

Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale

The original Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale consists of three subscales namely optimism/regulation of mood, use of emotions and appraisal of emotions. As a result of the test, conducted to determine whether the scale is suitable for factor analysis in the validity and reliability work for the scale, the KMO value of the scale was found to be .80, Barlett’s ($\chi^2$) coefficient to be 2.616 ($p<.001$), Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient to be .90. As these results indicated that the scale was suitable for the factor analysis, confirmatory analysis was conducted for the scale.

As the desired values couldn’t be reached in the DFA results which was applied for the first time to the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale, some items and use of emotions subscale were removed from evaluation, covariance were created between variants and DFA was re-applied to the changed measurement model. The results of the DFA application which was applied for the second time on the measurement model are given in Figure 1, and included the compliance values of the two applications are given in Table 1.
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Figure 1. Second Application DFA Results of the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale: First Order Path Diagram

The scale was found to be valid when the validity coefficients in Figure 1 were examined ($r>.30$). In addition, t values of the latent variables changed between 4.91 and 11.24 and therefore t values have significance of 0.01($t>1.96$; $p<.05$; $t>2.56$; $p<.01$). Table 1 includes the compliance indexes emerging as a result of DFA in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. First Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis Compliance Values of the Emotional Intelligence Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimization</th>
<th>Use of Emotions</th>
<th>Appraisal of Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 69.76, df = 50, P-value = 0.1277, RMSEA = 0.069
Table 1 shows that due to the 3-factor structure consisting of 41 items of the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale, CFI, GFI, AGFI and NFI values in the compliance indexes of \( X^2 = 658.77; \) \( sd = 347; \) \( X^2 / sd = 1.89; \) RMSEA = .07; CFI = .83; GFI = .76; AGFI = .72; RMR = .08; NFI = .69) don’t comply as desired, while the values \( (X^2 = 63.72; \) \( sd = 52; \) \( X^2 / sd = 1.22; \) RMSEA = .03; CFI = .97; GFI = .93; AGFI = .90, RMR = .04; NFI = .90) obtained in the second application as a result of changes and improvements after the measurement model showed usually perfect compliance.

The two sub-dimensions remained within the scale when the use of emotions subscale was removed after the evaluations were made in the study. Therefore, second order/higher order factor analysis application was not conducted. As stated by Kline (2005:249) “to be able to define second order factor, there should be at least three first order factor, and first order factors should have at least two indicators.

**Global Motivation Scale**

Global Motivation Scale (GMS 28) consists of three main parts: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and amotivation. Intrinsic motivation is divided into subdimensions of knowledge, accomplishment and stimulation, while extrinsic motivation is divided into subdimensions of external and introjected identified regulations and amotivation. As a result of the test that was done to determine whether the scale is suitable for factor analysis in the validity and reliability work for the scale, the KMO value of the scale was found to be .82, Barlett’s \( (\chi^2) \) coefficient to be 1.957 \( (p<.001) \), Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient to be .89. As these results indicated that the scale was suitable for the factor analysis, confirmatory analysis was conducted for the scale.

As the desired values couldn’t be reached in the DFA results which was applied for the first time to the Global Motivation Scale, some items and amotivation subscale were removed from evaluation, covariance were created between variants and DFA was re-applied to the changed measurement model. The results of the DFA application which was done for the second time to the measurement model were given in Figure 2, while Table 2 included the compliance values of the two applications.
The scale was found to be valid when the validity coefficients in Figure 2 were examined ($r>.30$). In addition, $t$ values regarding the exploratory status of latent variables for observed variables in general of the path analysis changed between 4.82 and 9.60. Therefore the significance of the values are $0.01(t>1.96; p<.05; t>2.56; p<.01)$. Table 2 includes the compliance indexes emerging as a result of DFA in the study.

Table 2. First Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis Compliance Values of the Global Motivation Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>$X^2$/sd</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First application</td>
<td>1119.16</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 dimensions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second application</td>
<td>104.77</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 dimensions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that due to the 3-factor structure consisting of 28 items of the Global Motivation Scale, RMSEA, CFI, GFI, AGFI, RMR and NFI values in the compliance indexes of ($X^2=1119.16; sd=347; X^2/sd=3.22; RMSEA=.12; CFI=.81; GFI=.65; AGFI=.59, RMR=.13; NFI=.74$) don't comply as desired, while the ($X^2=104.77; sd=61; X^2/sd=1.71; RMSEA=.06; CFI=.97; GFI=.91; AGFI=.86, RMR=.06; NFI=.93$) obtained in the second application as a result of changes and improvements after the measurement model showed perfect compliance in general.

Organizational commitment survey

Organizational Commitment Survey (OCQ) was examined in single dimension. As a result of the test that was conducted to determine whether the scale is suitable for factor analysis in the validity and reliability work for the scale, the KMO value of the scale was found to be .89, Barlett’s ($\chi^2$) coefficient to be 1.200 ($p=.001$), Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient to be .84. After these results indicated
that the scale was suitable for the factor analysis, confirmatory analysis was implemented for the scale.

As the desired values couldn't be reached in the DFA results which was applied for the first time to the Organization Commitment Survey, some items and amotivation subscale were removed from evaluation, covariance were created between variants and DFA was re-applied to the changed measurement model. The results of the DFA application which was conducted for the second time to the measurement model are given in Figure 3, and the compliance values of the two applications are included in Table 3.

The scale was found to be valid when the validity coefficients in Figure 3 were examined ($r>0.30$). In addition, t values regarding the exploratory status of latent variables for observed variables in general of the path analysis done changed between 4.65 and 12.00. Therefore, it can be said that t values regarding the exploratory status of latent variables for the observed variable have significance of 0.01 ($t>1.96; p<.05; t>2.56; p<.01$).

Table 3 includes the compliance indexes emerging as a result of DFA in the study. Table 3 shows that because of the structure of Organizational Commitment Survey consisting of 15 items, RMSEA, GFI, AGFI, RMR and NFI values in the compliance indexes of ($X^2 = 289.15; \ sd = 90; X^2/\ sd = 3.21; RMSEA = .12; CFI = .92; GFI = .79; AGFI = .73, RMR = .11; NFI = .88$) don’t comply as desired, while the ($X^2 = 60.71; \ sd = 41; X^2/\ sd = 1.48; RMSEA = .05; CF = .98; GFI = .93; AGFI = .89, RMR = .04; NFI = .96$) obtained in the second application as a result of changes and improvements after the measurement model showed perfect compliance in general.

Table 3. First Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis Compliance Values of the Organizational Commitment Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>$X^2/\ sd$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First application</td>
<td>289.15</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second application</td>
<td>60.71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

Data analysis were conducted in statistics programmes like SPSS 16.0, LISREL 8.80 and AMOS 22. Descriptive statistics on variables, arithmetic average, and standard deviation were determined using the SPSS 16.0 program, confirmatory factor analysis by LISREL 8.80, test of research model by AMOS 22.

Findings

Findings on the First Sub Problem

The perceptions of the teachers working at primary schools on the dimensions of emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment were examined and the findings were given in Table 4.

Table 4. Perception Based Emotional Intelligence Level of Primary School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of mood</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of emotions</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (Emotional intelligence)</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that the teachers’ regulation of mood (\( \bar{X} = 4.16 \)) is more than the appraisal of emotions (\( \bar{X} = 3.90 \)). In addition, it can be said that regulation of mood (s=.49) has a more homogenous distribution than appraisal of emotions (s=.60). Considering the average points of teachers from emotional intelligence dimension (\( \bar{X} = 4.01 \)), it can be inferred that they have a “good” level of mood regulation and emotion appraisal. Table 5 includes the findings on the motivation levels of participating teachers according to their perceptions.

Table 5. Motivation levels of primary school teachers according to their perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (Motivation)</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that the teachers’ extrinsic motivation (\( \bar{X} = 3.88 \)) is more than intrinsic motivation (\( \bar{X} = 3.61 \)). In addition, it can be said that extrinsic motivation (s=.57) has a more homogenous distribution than intrinsic motivation (s=.73). Considering the average points of teachers from motivation dimension (\( \bar{X} = 3.82 \)), it can be inferred that they have a “good” level of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Table 6 includes the findings on the organizational commitment levels of participating teachers according to their perceptions.
Table 6. Organizational Commitment Levels of Primary School Teachers According to Their Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General (Organizational Commitment)</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 6, it can be assumed that primary school teachers have a “good” level of organizational commitment given their average points in the organizational commitment dimension.

**Findings on the Second Sub Problem**

Figure 4 and 5 as well as Table 7 and 8 include the results on the structural equation modelling applied for the second sub problem.

![Figure 4](image)

Figure 4. First Application of Structural Equation Model on the Effect of Emotional Intelligence and Motivation on Organizational Commitment

Regarding the Structural Equation Model, beta (\( \beta \)) refers to the regression coefficients between one latent internal variable and another latent variable whereas gamma (\( \gamma \)) refers to the regression coefficients between latent external variable (independent) and latent internal variable (dependent) (Çelik & Yılmaz, 2013). Figure 1 shows that the \( \beta \) values vary between 0.33 and 1.07.

When the standardized path coefficients in the study are examined, a positive, double way and significant relation was found between emotional intelligence and motivation (\( \gamma = .46 \)). This value shows that there is a mutual relationship between emotional intelligence and motivations of teachers and that point .46 increases and decreases, and emotional intelligence and motivation may have mutual impact on each other. The positive significant relation (\( \gamma = .31 \)) between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment indicates that 1 point increase in emotional intelligence may cause an increase of .31 point in organizational commitment and vice versa. In other words, organizational commitment of teachers will increase in line with the increase in emotional intelligence.
When the findings on statistical compliance of YEM are examined, it can be assumed that the data set has an acceptable compliance with the model as the $\chi^2$/sd value is 3.86 and p value (.00<.01) has a significance of .01. Table 7 includes the findings on alternative compliance indexes on the model.

Table 7: Emotional intelligence, Motivation and Organizational Commitment Relation First Application Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>$X^2$/sd</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Equation Model</td>
<td>321.145</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 7, the compliance indexes ($X^2 = 321.145; sd = 83; \chi^2/sd = 3.86; RMSEA = .07; CFI = .93; GFI = .92; AGFI = .89; RMR = .04; NFI = .90$) obtained as a result of path analysis in the structural model generally have a good level of compliance and therefore the model is acceptable.

When the standardized path coefficients are examined in the study, a low level significant and positive relation was found between motivation and organizational commitment ($\gamma=.06$). Therefore, analysis was repeated in the path analysis removing the relation between motivation and organizational commitment.

![Figure 5](image)

Figure 5. Second Application of Structural Equation Model on the Effect of Emotional Intelligence and Motivation on Organizational Commitment

According to the findings on the model in Figure 5, the best indicator of emotional intelligence is the regulation of mood ($\lambda=.92$) while the best indication of motivation is the intrinsic motivation ($\lambda=1.08$). Standardized path coefficients showed a positive, double way and significant relation between emotional intelligence and motivation ($\gamma=.49$) and a positive and significant relation between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment ($\gamma=.36$). This value shows that a 1 point increase and decrease in the emotional intelligence and motivations of teachers will have mutual impact on each other like an increase or decrease of .49 point while a 1 point increase or decrease in emotional intelligence will have a .36 point effect on organizational commitment.
According to the results of the study, Table 8 includes the findings on alternative compliance indexes of model.

Table 8. Emotional Intelligence, Motivation and Organizational Commitment Relation Second Application Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>$X^2$/sd</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Equation Model</td>
<td>322.141</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8, the compliance indexes ($X^2 = 321.145; \text{sd} = 83; \chi^2/\text{sd} = 3.86; \text{RMSEA} = .07; \text{CFI} = .93; \text{GFI} = .92; \text{AGFI} = .89; \text{RMR} = .04; \text{NFI} = .90$) ($X^2 = 322.141; \text{sd} = 84; \chi^2/\text{sd} = 3.83; \text{RMSEA} = .07; \text{CFI} = .93; \text{GFI} = .92; \text{AGFI} = .89; \text{RMR} = .04; \text{NFI} = .90$) obtained as a result of path analysis in the structural model generally have an acceptable level of compliance.

**Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendation**

Results of the study show that regulation of the mood is the best indicator of emotional intelligence and intrinsic motivation is the best indicator of motivation. Some studies on employee motivation showed that intrinsic motivation means in especially western societies have a stronger effect than the external means provided by the organization (Mottaz, 1985; DeVoe & Iyengar, 2004; Brislin, Kabigting, Macnab, Zukis, Worthley, 2005). Thompson (1979), Ellis (1984), Latham (1998) and Scott (1986) pointed out the significance of intrinsic motivation of teachers as compared to extrinsic motivation.

According to the findings of this study, teachers of primary schools have a “good” level of emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational commitment. In addition, there is a positive significant relation between emotional intelligence and motivation of teachers as well as emotional intelligence and organizational commitment.

The results of the studies in different areas also found a correlation between emotional intelligence and motivation (Akpolat & Işık, 2012) also between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment (Akın, 2010; Gardner, 2005; Güleryüz et al. 2008; Hosseinzadeh et al. 2012; Nikolau & Tsaousis, 2002; Wong & Law, 2002).

Schilling stated that emotion and motivation processes are closely related. The theory guiding the development of emotional intelligence is based on the view that emotions are among the necessary mental activities together with motivation and cognition (Mayer et al., 2000). Therefore it can be said that there is a relation between emotion and cognition and that emotional intelligence and motivation of an individual are interrelated.

The measurement model developed by Goleman (2000) deals with motivation as a subdimension of emotional intelligence while Mayer and Salovey addressed emotional intelligence on the basis of skills and examined emotional intelligence in their measurement model in subscales of regulation of mood, use of emotions, appraisal of emotions and excluded motivation from the sub scales.

Christie, Jordan, Troth and Lawrence (2007) draw attention to this important contradiction regarding emotional intelligence. According to authors, researchers like Goleman claimed that emotional intelligence consists of many social and emotional components including personal motivation while authors like Mayer and Salovey limited emotional intelligence skills with those...
which correlate emotions directly to cognition. Mayer and Salovey’s model is different as being a skill model considering motivation as a different, association function not a factor. In the structural equality analyses in an experimental study carried out by Christie and friends to test these two different concepts, motivation is described as a factor related to emotional intelligence and not a component of emotional intelligence which supported the conceptualization of Mayer and Salovey. The results of this study showed that the relation between emotional intelligence and motivation is not a single way relation and that emotional intelligence is important for motivation and motivation is important for emotional intelligence.

Studied on various hormones in the periods of increasing interest in human emotions and motivation in the field of neurology proved that there are important drives on social and emotional behaviours of humans (Harmon-Jones & Van Honk, 2012). Goleman, Boyatzis and Mc Kee (2011) conducted brain researches through different methods and found out that there is a relation between emotional intelligence, motivation and commitment and that emotional intelligence has a contribution to increase motivation and commitment. Considering the power of emotions on perceptions and behaviours, it will be possible to clearly see the effects of emotional intelligence and motivation on personal, social and professional aspects.

Cherniss and Goleman (2001) draw attention to the interaction between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment. For them, emotional intelligence has effects on “organization effectiveness” in various fields. These fields are employment and retention of employees, skill development, team work, employment commitment, moral and health, innovativeness, efficiency, effectiveness, sales, profit, service quality, customer loyalty, customer outputs (student outputs in education).

Wong and Law (2002) found a supporting relation between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment. In their study, they stated that there is an interaction between emotional intelligence and variables including work performance, organizational commitment and intention to quit.

The findings of the study show that emotional intelligence is related to motivation and organizational commitment. Therefore it can be said that organizational commitment of teachers would increase if there is an increase in the levels of emotional intelligence and motivation of teachers. In this case, providing and increasing emotional intelligence and motivation through education would bring an advantage in increasing organizational commitment. Therefore, providing teachers and administrators with awareness on the importance emotional intelligence and motivation during degree programmes and in-service training programs along with organization of trainings could create positive results for educators and students.
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