The Effect of Empowering Leadership Characteristics of School Principals According to Teachers' Perceptions on Teachers' Psychological Ownership and Work Engagement

Esra TÖRE[*]

Department of Educational Sciences, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Istanbul, Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0001-9133-6578

Burak UZUN

Silivri Necip Sarıbekir Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School, Istanbul, Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0002-2334-8072

This study examines the effect of school principals' empowering leadership according to teachers' perceptions of teachers' psychological ownership and work engagement. The study sample consists of 463 teachers. The relational survey model, one of the quantitative research methods, was used in the study. Empowering Leadership Scale, Psychological Ownership Scale and Work Engagement Scale were used to collect the data. As a result of the research, according to teachers' perceptions, the empowering leadership levels of school principals and teachers' psychological ownership and work engagement levels were found to be high. Teachers' psychological ownership and work engagement levels show significant differences according to age, seniority, and education level variables. A significant positive relationship was found between the empowering leadership of school principals and teachers' psychological ownership. A medium-level positive significant relationship was found between the empowering leadership of school principals and teachers' work engagement. Empowering leadership characteristics of school principals significantly positively affect teachers' psychological ownership and work engagement. The study emphasized the role of empowering leadership in understanding teachers' work engagement and psychological ownership. Based on the results, school principals are recommended to demonstrate empowerment leadership behaviors to build an understanding of teachers' work engagement and psychological ownership.

Introduction

Empowering leadership increases teachers' motivation and improves their self-efficacy by engaging in behaviors that support teachers (Konan & Çelik, 2018). Depending on the development of self-efficacy, teachers will feel effective in the organization and become a part of the organization (Aras, 2013; Ötken, 2015). Psychological ownership, which causes teachers to feel like a part of the organization, will increase their commitment and enable

---

them to fulfill their duties more (Yavuz, 2021). Commitment to the organization and the intention to perform their duties enthusiastically emphasize teachers' work engagement (Kara & Kaya, 2020). In this direction, this study aims to examine the effect of school principals' empowering leadership on teachers' psychological ownership and work engagement.

Literature Review

Empowering Leadership

Empowering leadership is the process of further empowering employees through processes such as increasing the self-perception of individuals, ensuring effective participation of employees in decision-making processes, eliminating the points where employees feel powerless, encouraging employees to take risks and continuing their development (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Konczak et al., 2000; Thomas & Velthous, 1990; Zhang & Zhou, 2014). Employee empowerment is a philosophy on how to achieve success. Employees are informed about evaluation processes and criteria. Employee empowerment is a process that requires patience (Russ, 1995). As a result of research on this process, Konczak, Stelly, and Trusty (2000) explain empowering leader behavior in six dimensions. The empowerment dimension is when the manager delegates his/her work-related authority to his/her employees. The accountability dimension is the leader's accountability for the results of his/her work. The self-determination dimension is the ability of employees to make their own decisions about the work. It indicates that the employee plans the entire work process by himself/herself. The information-sharing dimension refers to sharing information and documents necessary for completing the work with employees. The skill development dimension aims to empower employees by training them. Coaching for innovative performance refers to encouraging employees to take risks within the scope of the work (Konczak et al., 2000).

Psychological Ownership

Psychological ownership is the development of motivation for the employee to exhibit possessive behaviors toward the organization's goal and to protect and improve the current situation (Avey et al., 2009; Dawkins et al., 2015; Dyne & Pierce, 2004; Morewedge, 2020). The concept of psychological ownership is explained by three different answers to the question, "What do I feel is mine?". These are influence, self-identity, and having a place. The sense of ownership enables individuals to fulfill these three root motives. These motives are, therefore, the causes of psychological ownership. These motives facilitate the development of psychological ownership instead of creating separate states (Pierce et al., 2001). On the other hand, Avey (2009) and Pierce et al. (2001) addressed the concept of psychological ownership in two dimensions: developmental and preventive. Based on the studies of Olckers and Plesis (2012), Avey et al., 2009) introduced the sub-dimensions of autonomy and responsibility into the literature (Akarca, 2021; Akçin, 2018; Avey et al., 2009; Dirgen, 2019; Olckers, 2013; Pierce et al., 2001; Yeşil et al., 2015).

Psychological ownership is addressed in four dimensions at the organizational level. Self-identity is the individual's affinity towards the organization's goals or any phenomenon related to the organization. The organization's goal is embedded in the employee's identity and becomes a part of the self. In the accountability dimension, the employee makes efforts and develops to achieve the goals with the authorities. In the prevention-oriented dimension, the employee wants to protect his/her job and the organization against negativities. Prevention-

oriented is related to cognition and emotions rather than behavioral dimensions (Avey et al., 2009). The belongingness dimension is the behavior or feeling resulting from the employee's ownership of a goal or organization (Uçar, 2018).

Work Engagement

Work engagement is the employee's physical, cognitive, and emotional dedication to his/her job. How much the employee values his/her job, and his/her relationship with the work environment are essential in terms of the concept of work engagement (Kahn, 1990). Engagement refers to an individual's willing and strong participation in work (Maslach et al., 2001). Work engagement is analyzed in three dimensions: vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2001, pp. 71-74). The vigor dimension includes the desire to continue without giving up in the face of any challenge and the ability not to get tired. Generating new ideas depends on a high level of vigor. It is defined as the dimension with the highest effectiveness in dedication to work. Vigor is defined as the employee's mental recovery power in the work environment or during work (Kaplanseren & Örücü, 2018; Maslach et al., 2001; Özkalp & Meydan, 2015; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Şen, 2019; Turgut, 2011; Yavan, 2016). The dedication dimension deals with the employee's love for his/her job. Employees who dedicate themselves to their work do it with enthusiasm and desire; they attach meaning to it. The absorption dimension refers to the fact that the employee does not understand how the working time passes and gives all his/her focus to his/her work. The employee who devotes himself/herself to his/her job does not realize when it is time for a break and loses the concept of time (Maslach et al., 2001; Özkalp & Meydan, 2015; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Şen, 2019; Turgut, 2011).

Empowering Leadership, Psychological Ownership and Work Engagement

Leaders play an essential role in creating the work environment, enabling employees to take ownership of their tasks and environment. According to Stander and Rothmann (2009), organizations can enable employees to maximize their potential and add value. Employees need leaders who understand their needs and support their emotional and intellectual growth (Bhatnagar, 2005; Nykodym et al., 1995).

Empowerment promotes trust or self-efficacy, enabling employees to take effective action without uncertainty or need for approval (Nykodym et al., 1995). Empowering leaders inspires employees to develop self-management and self-leadership skills (Pearce & Sims, 2002). Empowered employees will feel more competent and in control and take ownership of their work (Stander & Coxen, 2017).

Empowering leadership not only helps to increase employees' self-efficacy, but it can also help employees to develop. It also regulates psychological feelings of ownership, characterized by belonging, self-identity, and accountability to the organization (Avey et al., 2009). Empowering leaders listen to the voices of their followers and encourage them. They make their employees feel listened to and contribute to their work. Through participatory goal setting and discussions, employees can strengthen their sense of belonging to their organizational role (Kim & Beehr, 2017).

Employees' psychological ownership emerges when they have more trust in and control over their work and organization (Pierce et al., 2003). Finally, empowering leaders provides their followers with excellent job autonomy. Job autonomy indicates that employees control their work, increasing their psychological ownership experience (Pierce et al., 2001; O'Driscoll et

al., 2006; Mayhew et al., 2007). For all the above reasons, empowering leadership will likely increase employees' psychological ownership. Studies in the related literature show that there is a relationship between empowering leadership and psychological ownership (Jiang et al., 2019; Kim & Beehr, 2017); empowering leadership affects psychological ownership (Cheng et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2019; Kim & Beehr, 2017).

Recent research shows that different leadership styles are associated with work engagement (Anwar, 2021). Empowering leadership is a leadership style that can play an important role in encouraging employees to work and increasing employees' motivation for commitment (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2016; Hao et al., 2017). Empowering leadership increases employees' motivation and commitment to work by providing shared authority and autonomy (Cai et al., 2018). Employees with high job engagement are passionate about fulfilling their assigned tasks (Bilal, 2018); they transfer high energy to their work and maintain a strong desire for it (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Related literature also shows that there is a significant relationship between empowering leadership and work engagement (Amor et al., 2021; Alotaibi et al., 2020; Cai et al., 2018; Helland et al., 2020; Khan, 2018; Empowerment, Yassine, Masa'deh, 2018; De Klerk & Stander, 2014; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Stander & Rothmann, 2010; Bhatnagar, 2012; Tuckey et al., 2012) and that empowering leadership affects employees' work engagement (Cziraki & Laschinger, 2015; Öztürk Çiftçi, 2019: 182; Şen, 2019: 279). Prior empirical evidence (Laschinger et al., 2001; Saks & Gruman, 2014; Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2018; Schaufeli et al., 2002; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009) demonstrated that the factors that form structural empowerment such as performance feedback, opportunities for development, organizational and social support cultivate work engagement. Macsinga et al. (2015) highlighted the incremental value of psychological empowerment, extraversion, and conscientiousness in explaining work engagement.

Purpose of the Study

This study examines the effect of school principals' empowering leadership on teachers' psychological ownership and work engagement according to teachers' perceptions. In addition, within the scope of the study, the differentiation of teachers' psychological ownership levels according to age, seniority, and education level were also examined.

Method

Research Model

The research was designed using the relational survey model, one of the quantitative research methods. This model determines the relationship between two or more variables and the degree of this relationship. In relational research, the degree of relationship between variables can also be found (Büyüköztürk et al., 2020).

Working Group and Data Collection Method

The study group comprised 463 teachers, 376 of whom worked in public and 87 in private schools. The study group was determined by a simple random sampling method. In a simple random sampling method, each sampling unit is sampled with an equal probability of selection (Büyüköztürk et al., 2020). Demographic information of the study group is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of the Study Group

Variables	Groups	*f*	%
School Type	State	376	81,21
	Private	87	18,79
Gender	Female	236	50,97
	Male	227	49,02
Age	20-30	171	36,93
	31-40	177	38,23
	41+	115	24,84
Graduation Status	Undergraduate	327	70,62
	Graduate	136	29,37
School Type	Kindergarten	47	10,15
	Primary School	78	16,84
	Secondary School	131	28,29
	High School	207	44,71
Seniorty	1-10 years	271	58,53
	11-20 years	117	25,27
	21+ years	75	16,20
Service Year at School	1-10 years	422	91,14
	11+ years	41	8,86
Duration of Working with the School Principal	1-5 years	421	90,93
	5+ years	42	9,07
Number of Teachers in School	1-50	368	79,48
	51+	95	20,52
	Total	**463**	**100**

When Table 1 is analyzed, it is seen that 81% of the participants work in public schools, 51% are women, and 75% are between the ages of 20-40. It is seen that 71% of the participants are undergraduate graduates, 45% of them work in high schools, 58% of them have 1-10 years of experience, and 91% of them have worked with school principals for 1-5 years.

In order to use the scales and conduct the research, permission to use the scales was obtained from the scale owners (Aras, 2013; Uçar, 2018; Turgut, 2011), the approval of the Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University Rectorate Ethics Committee dated 24.02.2022 and numbered 2022/02, and the permission to conduct the survey and research was obtained from the Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education dated 03.03.2022 and numbered 44/44854086. In order to reach a sufficient number and scope of research data, data were collected both face-to-face and online.

Data Collection Tools

Three different scales were used to collect the research data. Following an informative form is added a section including questions about the gender, age, graduation level, and tenure of the participants. Detailed information regarding the scales is presented below.

Empowering Leadership Scale: Konczak et al. (2000) developed the scale and adapted it to Turkish by Aras (2013). The scale consists of 18 questions and five dimensions. Information about the adapted scale and dimensions, Cronbach's alpha values (Aras, 2013, p. 65), and

Cronbach's alpha values of this study are shown in Table 2.

Table 1 Information on the Empowering Leadership Scale

Dimensions	Items	Adaptation Alpha Value	Cronbach's	Cronbach's Alpha Value
Authorization and Responsibility	1-4	0,67		0,82
Self-Decision	5-7	0,64		0,92
Knowledge Sharing	8-10	0,71		0,94
Skill Development	11-13	0,77		0,95
Coaching for Innovative Performance	14-18	0,73		0,95
Scale Total		0,89		0, 98

The scale's reliability is high (Cronbach's Alpha= .94) in this study. The reliability values of the sub-dimensions of the scale vary between .82 and .95 (Table 2).

Psychological Ownership Scale: The scale was developed by Uçar (2018) and consists of 15 items and four dimensions. Information about the scale and dimensions, Cronbach's alpha values (Uçar, 2018, p. 647), and Cronbach's alpha values of this study are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Information on the Psychological Ownership Scale

Dimensions	Items	Adaptation Cronbach's Alpha Value	Cronbach's Alpha Value
Self-Identity	1-6	0,91	0,96
Efficacy	7-8	0,82	0,88
Protective Focus	9-11	0,85	0,92
Internal Responsibility	12-15	0,88	0,96
Scale Total		0,88	0,97

The scale's reliability is high (Cronbach's Alpha= .97) in this study. The reliability values of the sub-dimensions of the scale vary between .88 and .96 (Table 3).

Work Engagement Scale: Schaufeli et al. (2002) developed the scale and adapted it to Turkish by Turgut (2011). The scale consists of 17 items and three dimensions. Information about the scale and dimensions, Cronbach's alpha values (Turgut, 2011, p. 163), and Cronbach's alpha values of this study are shown in Table 4.

Table 2 Information on the Work Engagement Scale

Dimensions	Items	Adaptation Cronbach's Alpha Value	Cronbach's Alpha Value
Vigor	1-6	0,81	0,94
Dedication	7-11	0,87	0,96
Absorption	12-17	0,86	0,94
Scale Total		0,89	0,97

The scale's reliability is high (Cronbach's Alpha= .97) in this study. The reliability values of the sub-dimensions of the scale ranged between .94 and .97 (Table 4).

"Tukey's Addivity" test was applied to measure the additivity values of the scales, and the non-additivity values were found as; "F=223,86, p<0,05" for the Empowering Leadership Scale and its sub-dimensions, "F=24,12, p<0,05" for the Psychological Ownership Scale and its sub-dimensions, "F=9,83, p<0,05" for the Work Engagement Scale and its sub-dimensions.

Since the significance value of non-summability is less than 0.05, the scale and sub-dimensions used in the research are summable (Bilgin et al., 2019).

Data Analysis

In this study, the IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Statistics 26.0 program was used to analyze the data. A normality test was applied to determine the analyses to be used in the research. Arithmetic means standard deviation, ANOVA, and t-tests were used to analyze the data. The normality test results of the Empowering Leadership Scale, Psychological Ownership Scale, and Work Commitment Scale are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Normality Test Results

Scale	Dimensions	N	Kurtosis	Skewness
Empowering Leadership	Authorization and Responsibility	463	3,23	-1,45
	Self-Decision	463	0,03	-0,73
	Knowledge Sharing	463	-0,15	-0,78
	Skill Development	463	-0,27	-0,62
	Coaching for Innovative Performance	463	-0,32	-0,55
	Empowering Leadership	463	0,42	-0,79
Psychological Ownership	Self-Identity	463	-0,18	-0,62
	Efficacy	463	0,62	-1,02
	Protective Focus	463	0,74	-0,90
	Internal Responsibility	463	4,32	-1,97
	Psychological Ownership	463	1,81	-1,13
Work Engagement	Vigour	463	0,69	-0,84
	Dedication	463	0,79	-1,20
	Absorption	463	-0,05	-0,58
	Work Engagement	463	0,89	-0,59

In the studies conducted in the relevant literature, skewness, and kurtosis values of ±3.0 values (De Carlo, 1997 as cited in Büyükbeşe & Gökaslan, 2018) and ±1.5 values and being close to zero are shown as evidence of normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2020 as cited in Epli et al., 2021). When the skewness and kurtosis results of the scales used in the study were examined, it was determined that the dimensions other than the empowerment and responsibility dimension of the Empowering Leadership Scale and the intrinsic responsibility dimension of the Psychological Ownership Scale and the Work Commitment Scale showed a normal distribution. Parametric tests were applied for the sub-dimensions of the scales that showed normal distribution, and nonparametric tests were applied for the dimensions that did not show normal distribution.

Results

According to the results of the study, according to teachers' perceptions, the empowering leadership characteristics of school principals and teachers' psychological ownership and job commitment levels were found to be high, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6 School Principals' Empowering Leadership Characteristics According to Teachers' Perceptions, Psychological Ownership, and Work Engagement Levels of Teacher

Variables	N	M	SD	Level
Empowering Leadership	463	3,68	0,97	High
Psychological Ownership	463	3,88	0,91	High
Work Engagement	463	4,48	1,19	Very High

When the change in teachers' psychological ownership levels according to age variable was analyzed ($F(2, 460) = 13,50$; $p=0,00<0,05$), a significant difference was found according to age ($p<0,05$). Teachers in the 31-40 ($p=0,00<0,05$) and 41+ ($p=0,00<0,05$) age groups felt higher ($p<0,05$) psychological ownership than teachers in the 20-30 age group (Table 7).

Table 7 Variation of Teachers' Level of Psychological Ownership According to Age

	Age	N	Mean	SD		SS	df	MS	F	p
					ANOVA Results					
Psychological Ownership	20-30	171	3,61	1,09	G. Bet.	21,26	2	10,63		
	31-40	177	3,97	0,80	G. Inside	362,22	460	0,79	13,50	0,00
	41+	115	4,13	0,65	Total	383,49	462			

When the variation of teachers' psychological ownership levels according to the level of education is examined, psychological ownership shows a significant difference ($t(461)= -3,00$; $p=0,00$) according to the level of education ($p<0,05$). Teachers with postgraduate education ($p=0,00$) feel higher ($p<0,05$) psychological ownership than those with undergraduate education (Table 8).

Table 8 Variation of Teachers' Level of Psychological Ownership According to Educational Background

	Educational Background	N	Mean	SD	t	df	P
Psychological Ownership	Undergraduate	327	3,79	0,95	-3,00	461	0,00
	Postgraduate	136	4,07	0,76			

Teachers' psychological ownership levels vary significantly according to seniority ($F(2, 460) = 9,02$; $p=0,00$). It was found that teachers with a seniority of 11-20 years ($p=0,00$) and 21 years and above ($p=0,00$) felt higher psychological ownership than teachers with a seniority of 1-10 years ($p<0,05$) (Table 9).

Table 9 Variation of Teachers' Psychological Ownership Levels According to Teachers' Seniority

	Seniority	N	Mean	SD		KT	df	KO	F	P
					ANOVA Results					
Psychological Ownership	1-10	271	3,73	1,01	G. Bet	14,46	2	7,23		
	11-20	117	4,05	0,74	G. Insi.	369,03	460	0,80	9,02	0,00
	21+	75	4,14	0,66	Total	383,48	462			

The findings of the ANOVA test conducted to determine the differentiation of teachers' level of work engagement according to age variable are given in Table 10. As a result of the analysis, it was found that teachers between the ages of 31-40 (p=0,00) and over 41 (p=0,00<0,05) felt more engagement than teachers between the ages of 20-30 (F (2, 460) = 13,26; p=0,00).

Table 10 Variation of Teachers' Work Engagement Levels According to Age

	Group	N	Mean	SD		SS	df	MS	F	p
					ANOVA Results					
Work Engagement	20-30	171	4,13	1,41	G. Bet	35,33	2	17,67		
	31-40	177	4,61	1,03	G. Insi.	613,16	460	1,33	13,26	**0,00**
	41+	115	4,80	0,88	Total	648,50	462			

The findings of the t-test to determine the differentiation of teachers' work engagement levels according to their educational status are given in Table 11. As a result of the analysis, the level of work engagement of teachers with postgraduate education was found to be higher than that of undergraduate students (t (461) = -2,69; p=0,01<0,05).

Table 11 Variation of Teachers' Work Engagement Levels According to Educational Status

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t-Testi		
					T	df	P
Work Engagement	Undergraduate	327	4,38	1,22	-2,69	461	**0,01**
	Postgraduate	136	4,71	1,05			

ANOVA test was applied to determine the differentiation of teachers' work engagement levels according to the seniority variable, and the results are given in Table 12. Teachers with 11-20 years of seniority (p=0.02) and over 21 years of seniority (p=0.02) had higher levels of work engagement than teachers with 1-10 years of seniority (p<0,05).

Table 12 Variation of Teachers' Work Engagement Levels According to Seniority

	Group	N	Mean	SD		SS	df	MS	F	p
					ANOVA Results					
Work Engagement	1-10	271	4,30	1,31	G. Bet	23,13	2	11,56		
	11-20	117	4,65	0,96	G. Insi.	625,37	460	1,36	8,50	**0,00**
	21+	75	4,86	0,85	Total	648,50	462			

Correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the empowering leadership characteristics of school principals according to teachers' perceptions and teachers' psychological ownership and work engagement. As a result of the analysis, a highly positive and significant (r=0.80, p<0.05) relationship was found between school principals' empowering leadership according to teachers' perceptions and teachers' psychological ownership levels. There was a moderate positive significant relationship (r=0.65, p<0.05) between the empowering leadership characteristics of school principals and teachers' work engagement (Table 13).

Table 13 Analysis of the Relationship between School Principals' Empowering Leadership Characteristics and Teachers' Psychological Ownership and Work Engagement

		Empowering Leadership	Psychological Ownership	Work Engagement
Empowering Leadership	Pearson Correlation	1	0,80**	0,65**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,00	0,00
Psychological Ownership	Pearson Correlation		1	0,86**
	Sig. (2-tailed)			0,00
Work Engagement	Pearson Correlation			1

In the analysis, the independent variable is represented by "empowering leadership," while the dependent variables are represented by the concepts of "psychological ownership" and "work engagement." Since the study has two dependent variables, a simple regression analysis was conducted. The results of the regression analysis conducted to examine the effect of empowering leadership characteristics of school principals according to teachers' perceptions of teachers' psychological ownership levels are given in Table 14.

Table 14 The Effect of School Principals' Empowering Leadership on Teachers' Psychological Ownership Level

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t	Sig.	R	R^2
(Constant)	1,10	0,09	-	11,16	0,00	-	-
Empowering Leadership	0,75	0,03	0,80	29,04	0,00	0,80	0,65

As a result of the analysis, in a significant regression model ($F_{(1,461)} = 843,20$, $p<0,001$), it was found that empowering leadership characteristics of school principals explained 65% ($R^2=0.65$) of teachers' psychological ownership levels ($\beta=0,80$, $t_{(461)} = 29,04$).

The results of the regression analysis conducted to examine the effect of empowering leadership characteristics of school principals on teachers' level of job work engagement according to teachers' perceptions are given in Table 15.

Table 15 The Effect of School Principals' Empowering Leadership on Teachers' Level of Work Engagement

	Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t	Sig.	R	R^2
1	(Constant)	1,58	0,17	-	9,59	0,00	-	-
	Empowering Leadership	0,79	0,04	0,65	18,19	0,00	0,65	0.42

As a result of the analysis, in a significant regression model ($F_{(1,461)} = 330,92$, $p<0,001$), it was found that the empowering leadership characteristics of school principals explained 42% ($R^2=0.42$) of teachers' work engagement levels ($\beta=0,65$, $t_{(461)} = 18,19$).

Discussion and Conclusion

As a result of the research, empowering leadership characteristics of school principals were found to be high according to teachers' perceptions. Aras (2013) found the empowering leadership levels of tourism managers at a "high" level. Koçak (2016) found the empowering leadership levels of school principals at the "medium" level in the dimensions of skill

development, innovative performance, and coaching and at the "high" level in other dimensions. Koçak's (2013) and Aras's (2016) findings overlap with this study's findings. Teachers' psychological ownership was found to be at a high level. Uçar (2016) also found that employees' psychological ownership was at a high level, which is parallel with the findings of this study. In this study, teachers' level of work engagement was found to be very high. Turgut (2011), on the other hand, found that employees' level of work engagement was at a medium level. This finding is inconsistent with the results of the study. It may be explained by Turgut's (2011) participants being from different occupational groups.

As a result of the research, it was found that the psychological ownership levels of teachers with postgraduate education were higher than those with undergraduate education. This finding can be explained by the fact that the transition to higher education makes people open to development. The fact that graduate graduates feel more psychological ownership than undergraduate graduates can be explained by the fact that graduate graduates receive a difference in additional course payments, are reflected as additional points in administrative assignments, and are exempted from the specialist teaching written exam in the Teaching Career Exams. In the literature, some studies found that psychological ownership differs significantly on educational status (Akarca, 2021: 80; Demirkaya & Şimşek Kandemir, 2014; Ekinci, 2018). The studies of Şenol and Üzüm (2020) and Dirgen (2019) found that psychological ownership did not differ according to the level of education. Teachers with a seniority of 11-20 years and 21 years or more felt higher psychological ownership than teachers with a seniority of 1-10 years. This finding coincides with the literature (Demirkaya & Şimşek Kandemir, 2014; Ekber & Memmedova, 2017). Based on the results of the research, it can be said that teachers' feelings of psychological ownership increase with increasing seniority. It can be explained by the fact that the development of professional competencies and experiences of teachers with increasing tenure is effective in the formation of this situation, and especially the teachers working in the same institution see the institution as their home due to working in a particular institution for many years due to the lack of rotation. Ekinci (2018) stated that the seniority variable did not differ significantly in terms of the concept of psychological ownership.

In the study, it was determined that teachers' work engagement differed significantly according to age. When the related literature is reviewed, it is seen that there are studies in which work engagement differs significantly according to age (Öztürk et al., 2020; Tokmak, 2019). The study found that teachers between the ages of 31-40 and over 41 felt more commitment than teachers between the ages of 20-30. It is thought that the increase in professional experience is effective in forming this significant differentiation. On the other hand, there are studies in the literature that found that work engagement does not differ according to age variable (Asmadili, 2020; Atalık, 2021; Bostancı & Ekiyor, 2015; Güneş, 2022; Turgut, 2011). In the study, the work engagement levels of teachers with postgraduate education were found to be higher than those of teachers with undergraduate degrees. When the related literature is reviewed, there are findings indicating that work engagement levels differ significantly according to teachers' level of education (Atalık, 2021; Gökaslan, 2018; Meriç et al., 2019; Öztürk et al., 2020; Tokmak, 2019). It is thought that the change in teachers' perspective and understanding of the work as the level of education increases, their ability to approach events more scientifically, and their ability to analyze the dynamics of education better are effective in this differentiation. On the other hand, according to Bostancı and Ekiyor (2015), work engagement levels do not differ according to teachers' education level.

As a result of the study, the level of work engagement of teachers with a seniority of 11-20 years and over 21 years was found to be higher than that of teachers with a seniority of 1-10 years. It is thought that the increase in the professional experience of teachers with seniority, the fact that teachers with a seniority of 1-10 years serve as contracted teachers for three years, the fact that their rights are different from those of permanent teachers, and the fact that school principals impose much work on first-appointment teachers during their probationary education are effective in this differentiation. When the related literature is reviewed, job commitment levels differ significantly according to seniority (Atalık, 2021). On the other hand, there are also research results where work engagement levels do not differ significantly according to teachers' seniority (Güneş, 2022; Öztürk et al., 2020)

As a result of the research, it was found that there was a significant positive relationship between the empowering leadership characteristics of school principals according to the perceptions of teachers and the psychological ownership levels of teachers and that the empowering leadership characteristics of school principals affected the psychological ownership levels of teachers. It is thought that the delegation of authority transferred to the employee with the effect of empowering leadership, giving responsibility to the employee, and providing guidance in the work to be done cause the employee to own the institution psychologically. Studies in the related literature show that there is a high level of relationship between empowering leadership and psychological ownership (Jiang et al., 2019; Kim & Beehr, 2017); empowering leadership affects psychological ownership (Cheng et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2019; Kim & Beehr, 2017). As a result of the study, according to teachers' perceptions, there was a moderately significant relationship between empowering leadership characteristics of school principals and their commitment to work. Based on the research results, it was determined that the results were similar to the literature. By using empowering leadership sub-dimensions effectively, school principals have an effect on teachers' ownership of the school. With the effect of this ownership, teachers integrate with the school and concentrate on their work. In the related literature, some studies have found that there is a significant relationship between empowering leadership and work engagement (Alotaibi et al., 2020; Cai et al., 2018; Helland et al., 2020; Khan, 2018) and that empowering leadership affects employees' work engagement (Öztürk Çiftçi, 2019; Şen, 2019). On the other hand, some studies found no statistically significant relationship between empowering leadership and work engagement (Lee et al., 2017; Tiganj, 2019).

In today's educational policies, the multidimensional development of school principals is essential. In ensuring this development, school principals' acquisition of empowering leadership characteristics will make their development and the development of teachers dynamic. School principals' guidance of teachers by using their empowering leadership qualities and training teachers by sharing the information they need will increase the effectiveness of teachers. Thus, teachers can be supported to internalize their school, integrate with the work environment, and dedicate themselves to their school and students. In order to increase teachers' levels of psychological ownership and dedication to work, it is recommended that postgraduate education should be encouraged, and adaptation and guidance studies should be carried out for teachers in the first ten years of teaching.

Note

This study is derived from the master's thesis titled "The Effect of School Principals' Empowering Leadership According to Teachers' Perceptions on Teachers' Psychological Ownership and Work Engagement ".

References

Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To empower or not to empower your sales force? An empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on customer satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology. 90*(5), 945–955. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.945

Akçin, K. (2018). *Çalışanların örgütsel destek algısı ve psikolojik sahiplenmelerinin, sessizlik davranışlarına ve görev performansına etkisi: Eğitim sektöründe bir araştırma [Effect of employees' perceived organizational support and psychological ownership on silence behaviors and task performance. A research in the education sector]* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Uludağ University, Bursa. http://hdl.handle.net/11452/1485

Alotaibi, S. M., Amin, M., & Winterton, J. (2020). Does emotional intelligence and empowering leadership affect psychological empowerment and work engagement? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 41*(8),971-991. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2020-0313

Amor, A. M., Xanthopoulou, D., Calvo, N., & Vázquez, J. P. A. (2021). Structural empowerment, psychological empowerment, and work engagement: A cross-country study. *European Management Journal, 39*(6), 779-789. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2021.01.005

Anwar, F. F., Luddin, M. R., & Akbar, M. (2021). Empowering leadership's effect to employee task performance: A mediating role of work engagement. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 12*(5).

Aras, G. (2013). *Personel güçlendirme yönetiminde güçlendirici liderlik davranışları uygulaması: Kemer bölgesi beş yıldızlı otel işletmeleri örneği [The application of empowering leadership behaviors in employee empowerment strategy: Sample from five star hotel managements in Kemer district]* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gümüşhane University, Gümüşhane.

Asmadili, İ. (2020). *Turist rehberlerinin iş değerlerinin işe adanmışlık üzerine etkisinin belirlenmesi [Determination of the effect of tourist guides' work values on work engagement]* (Unpublished master's thesis). Balıkesir University, Balıkesir.

Atalık, B. (2021). *Çalışanların esnek çalışma düzenlemelerine karşı tutumlarının işe adanmışlıklarına etkisinde örgütsel adalet algısının aracılık rolü: Ankara'da İHA alanında faaliyet gösteren işletmelerde bir araştırma [Organizational justice in the effect of employees' attitudes towards flexible work arrangements on their engagement to work: A research on businesses operating in the field of UAV in Ankara]* (Unpublished master's thesis). National Defence University. Ankara.

Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Crossley, C. D., & Luthans, F. (2009). Psychological ownership: theoretical extensions, measurement and relation to work outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*(2), 173-191. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.583

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International, 13*(3), 209-223. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430810870476

Bhatnagar, J. (2005). The power of psychological empowerment as an antecedent to organizational commitment in Indian managers. *Human Resource Development International, 8*(4), 419–433. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678860500356101

Bhatnagar, J. (2012). Management of innovation: Role of psychological empowerment,

work engagement and turnover intention in the Indian context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 23*(5), 928-951. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.651313

Bilal, H., Khan, A. A., Ahmad K., & Shah, S. N. U. (2018). The impact of employee engagement on task performance. *Journal of Business and Tourism, 4*(2), 135-142. https://doi.org/10.34260/jbt.v4i2.166

Bilgin, N., Gülşen, M., Kutlu, A., & Çınar Pakyüz, S. (2019). Çalışan sessizlik ve seslilik davranışları ölçeğinin öğretim elemanları üzerinde Türkçe'ye uyarlanması [The Turkish adaptation of employee silence and voice behaviour scale on academicians]. *EGE HFD., 35*(3), 103-114.

Bostancı, H., & Ekiyor, A. (2015). Çalışanların işe adanmasının örgüt içi girişimciliğe etkisinin incelenmesi: Sağlik sektöründe bir uygulama [The impact of job engagement on organizational entrepreneurship: An application in the health sector]. *International Journal of Health Management and Strategies Research, 1*(1), 37-51.

Büyükbeşe, T., & Gökaslan, M. O. (2018). İşe gömülmüşlük, işe adanmışlık ve işten ayrılma niyeti ilişkisi: Bir alan çalışması [The relationship between job embeddedness, job engagement, and intention to quit: A field study]. *Mukaddime, 9*(2), 135-153. https://doi.org/10.19059/mukaddime.376745

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2020). *Eğitimde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri [Scientific research methods in education].* Ankara: Pegem Publ.

Cai D, Cai Y, Sun Y and Ma J (2018) Linking empowering leadership and employee work engagement: The effects of person-job fit, person-group fit, and proactive personality. *Front. Psychol.* 9:1304. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01304

Cheng, Z., Liu, W., Zhou, K., Che, Y., & Han, Y. (2021). Promoting employees' pro-environmental behaviour through empowering leadership: The roles of psychological ownership, empowerment role identity, and environmental self-identity. *Business Ethics, The Enviroment & Responsibility,* 1–15. https://www.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.756570

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 13*(3), 471-482. https://doi.org/10.2307/258093

Cziraki, K., & Laschinger, H. (2015). Leader empowering behaviours and work engagement: the mediating role of structural empowerment. *Nursing leadership (Toronto, Ont.), 28*(3), 10-22. https://doi.org/10.12927/cjnl.2006.18599

Dawkins, S., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., & Martin, A. (2015). Psychological ownership: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Organization Behavior, 38*(2), 163-183. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2057

De Klerk, S., & Stander, M. W. (2014). Leadership empowerment behaviour, work engagement and turnover intention: The role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Positive Management, 5*(3), 28-45. https://doi.org/10.12775/JPM.2014.018

Demirkaya, H., & Şimşek Kandemir, A. (2014). 21. yüzyılın anahtar rekabet faktörü olan psikolojik sahiplenme üzerine bir işletme incelemesi [A plant analysis on psychological ownership which is the key factor of competition in the 21st century]. *ÇSGB Journal of the Working World, 2*(3), 7-21.

Dirgen, N. (2019). *Örgütsel Nepotizm ve psikolojik sahiplenme arasındaki ilişkide örgütsel güvenin aracılık rolü: Bankacılık sektöründe bir araştırma [Mediatory role of organizational trust in relationship between organizational Nepotism and psychological ownership: A case study in banking sector]* (Unpublished master's thesis). Sakarya University, Sakarya. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12619/69154

Ekinci, S. (2018*). Profesyonel öğrenme topluluğu, psikolojik sahiplenme ve bağlamsal performans arasındaki ilişki [The correlation among professional learning community, psychological ownership and contextual performance]* (Unbuplished doctoral thesis). Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.

Ekber, Ş., & Memmedova, M. (2017). Azerbaycan'da bankacılık sektörü çalışanlarının sahiplik duygusu analizine yönelik bir çalışma [A study of the ownership sense of banking sector employees in Azerbaijan]. *MANAS Journal of Social Studies, 6* (2), 97-114.

Empowerment, W. E., Yassine, O., & Masa'deh, R. (2018). A review of literature on the associations among employee empowerment, work engagement and employee performance. *Modern Applied Science, 12*(11), 313-329. https://doi.org/10.5539/mas.v12n11p313

Epli, H., Vural Batık, M., Doğru Çabuker, N., & Balcı Çelik, S. (2021). The relationship between perceived parental rejection and dating anxiety: The mediating role of interpersonal cognitive distortions. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 17*(3), 70-85. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2021.346.5

Erkutlu, Hakan and Jamel Chafra. (2016). Empowering leadership and work engagement: the roles of selfefficacy and identification with leader. *Research Gate Publication*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3311.1125

Gökaslan, M. O. (2018). Öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık, işe gömülmüşlük, işe adanmışlık, ve işten ayrılma niyeti ilişkisi: Bir alan çalışması [The relationship between teachers' organizational commitment, job embeddesness, work engagement and turnover intention: A field study]. Journal of Turkish Social Sciences Research, *3*(2), 25-46.

Güneş, H. N. (2022). *Kariyer tatmini ile işe adanmışlık ilişkisi: Manisa ilindeki kamu çalışanları üzerine bir araştırma [The relationship between career satisfaction and work engagement: A research on public employees in Manisa province]* (Unpublished master's thesis). Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa.

Hao, Po., Wei He, Li-Rong Long. (2017). Why and when empowering leadership has different effects on employee work performance: The pivotal roles of passion for work and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051817707517

Helland, E., et al. (2020). The relationship between empowering leadership, work characteristics, and work engagement among academics: A sem mediation analysis. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*(1): 11, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.16993/sjwop.84

Jiang, M., Wang, H., & Li, M. (2019). Linking empowering leadership and organizational citizenship behavior toward environment: The role of psychological ownership and future time perspective. *Frontier in Psychology. 10.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02612

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management, 33*(4), 692-724. https://doi.org/10.2307/256287

Kaplanseren, S., & Örücü, E. (2018). İşe tutkunluğun örgütsel vatandaşlığa etkisi: Otel çalışanlari üzerine bir araştırma [Effect of job attention to organizational citizenship: A research on hotel employees]. *Journal of Trakya University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 7*(1), 1-19.

Kara, E., & Kaya, A. (2020). Yönetici desteğinin işe adanmışlık üzerindeki etkisinde psikolojik sahiplenmenin aracı rolü [The mediating role of psychological adoption in the influence of executive's support on dedication to work]. *Manas Journal of Social Studies, 9*(4), 2364-2375.

Khan, A. K. (2018). *Impact of empowering leadership and work engagement on employees adaptive behaviors* (Unpublished master's thesis). Kadir Has University, İstanbul.

Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2017). Self-efficacy and psychological ownership mediate the effects of empowering leadership on both good and bad employee behaviors. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 24*(4), 466-478. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051817702078

Koçak, S. (2016). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki psikolojik sözleşme üzerinde güçlendirici liderlik davranışlarının rolü [The role of empowering leadership behaviours on psychological contract in upper secondary schools]* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Konan, N., & Çelik, O. T. (2018). Okul müdürlerinin güçlendirici liderliğine ilişkin öğretmen algısı [Teacher perception on the empowering leadership of school principals]. *Bartin University Journal of Faculty of Education, 6*(1), 322-335. https://doi.org/10.14686/buefad.274186

Konczak, L. J., Stelly, D. J., & Trusty, M. L. (2000). Defining and measuring empowering leader behaviors: Development of an upward feedbak instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60*(2), 301-313. https://doi.org/10.1177/00131640021970420

Laschinger, H. K. S., Finegan, J., Shamian, J., & Wilk, P. (2001). Impact of structural and psychological empowerment on job strain in nursing work settings: Expanding Kanter's model. *The Journal of Nursing Administration, 31*(5), 260-272. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005110-200105000-00006

Lee, M. C. C., Idris, M. A., & Delfabbro, P. H. (2017). The linkages between hierarchical culture and empowering leadership and their effects on employees' work engagement: Work meaningfulness as a mediator. *International Journal of Stress Management, 24*(4), 392–415. https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000043

Macsinga, I., Sulea, C., Sarbescu, P., Fischmann, G., & Dumitru, C. (2015). Engaged, committed and helpful employees: The role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Psychology, 149*(3), 263-276. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2013.874323

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Pscychology, 52*(1), 397-422. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397

Mayhew, M. G., Ashkanasy, N. M., Bramble, T., & Gardner, J. (2007). A study of the antecedents and consequences of psychological ownership in organizational settings. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 147*(5), 477–500. https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.147.5.477-500

Mendes, F., Stander, M.W. (2011). Positive organisation: The role of leader behaviour in work engagement and retention. *South African Journal Of Industrial Psychology, 37*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v37i1.900

Meriç, E., Öztürk Çiftçi, D., & Yurtal, F. (2019). Algılanan örgütsel destek ve işe adanmışlık arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [An analysis of the relationship between perceived organizational support and work engagement]. *Kastamonu Journal of Education, 27*(1), 65-74.

Morewedge, C. K. (2020). Psychological ownership: Implicit and explicit. *Current Opinion In Psychology, 39*, 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.10.003

Nykodym, N., Ariss, S. S., Simonetti, J. L., & Plotner, J. (1995). Empowerment for the year 2000 and beyond. *Empowerment in Organisations, 3*(4), 36–42.

O'driscoll, M. P., Pierce, J. L., and Coghlan, A. M. (2006). The psychology of ownership: Work environment structure, organizational commitment, and citizenship behaviors. *Group & Organization. Management. 31*(3), 388–416. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601104273066

Olckers, C., & Plesis, Y. d. (2012). Psychological ownership: A managerial construct for talent retention and organisational effectiveness. *African Journal of Business Management, 6*(7), 2585-2596. https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM11.1018

Olckers, C. (2013). Psychological ownership: Development of an instrument. *Journal of Industrial Psychology, 39*(2), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v39i2.1105

Ötken, A. B. (2015). Algilanan örgütsel destek ve psikolojik sahiplenme arasındaki ilişki ve bu ilişkide örgütsel adaletin rolü [The relationship between perceived organizational support and psychological ownership the role of organizational justice]. *Hacettepe University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 33*(2), 113-140.

Özkalp, E., & Meydan, B. (2015). Schaufeli ve Bakker tarafından geliştirilmiş olan işe angaje olma ölçeğinin Türkçe'de güvenilirlik ve geçerliliğinin analizi [Analysis of the reliability and validity of the work engagement scale developed by Schaufeli and Bakker in Turkish]. *ISGUC The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources, 17*(3), 4-19.

Öztürk Çiftçi, D. (2019). Lider üye etkileşiminin işe adanmışlık üzerindeki etkisinde psikolojik güçlendirmenin aracı rolü [The mediating role of psychological empowerment in the effect of leader-member exchange on work engagement]. *Business and Economics Research Journal, 10*(1), 167-186.

Öztürk Çiftçi, D., & Erkanlı, H. (2020). Dört ve beş yıldızlı otel işletmeleri çalışanlarının işe adanmışlık düzeylerinin demografik değişkenlere göre incelenmesi: Orta ve Doğu Karadeniz Bölgesi Örneği [Examination of work engagement levels of four and five star hotels employees according to demographic variables: The example of Middle and East Black Sea region]. *Gümüşhane University Institute of Social Sciences Electronic Journal, 11*(2), 336-347.

Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, And Practice, 6*(2), 172–197. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.6.2.172

Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2001). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. *Academy of Management, 26*(2), 298-310. https://doi.org/10.2307/259124

Russ, D. E. (1995). Empowerment: A matter of degree-executive commentary. *Academy Of Management Executive, 9*(3), 21-31.

Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2003). The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and extending a century of research. *Review of General Psychology, 7*(1), 84-107. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.7.1.84

Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What do we really know about employee engagement? *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25*(2), 155-182. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21187

Salmela-Aro, K., & Upadyaya, K. (2018). Role of demands-resources in work engagement and burnout in different career stages. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 108*, 190-200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.08.002

Schaufeli, W. B., Martínez, I. M., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*(5), 464-481. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033005003

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Baker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic

approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3,* 71-92. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326

Sharma, P. N., & Kirkman, B. L. (2015). Leveraging leaders: A literature review and future lines of inquiry for empowering leadership research. *Group & Organization Management, 40*(2), 193-237. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601115574906

Stander, M. W., & Rothmann, S. (2009). Psychological empowerment of employees in selected organisations in South Africa. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 35*(1), 196–203. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v35i1.466

Stander, M.W., Rothmann, S. (2010). Psychological empowerment, job insecurity and employee engagement. *South African Journal Of Industrial Psychology, 36*(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v36i1.849

Stander, M. W., & Coxen, L. (2017). A review of the relationship between positive leadership styles and psychological ownership. *Theoretical Orientations And Practical Applications of Psychological Ownership*, 37-60. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70247-6_3

Şen, N. (2019). Liderlik özelliklerinin işe tutkunluk üzerindeki etkisine yönelik bir araştırma [A study on the effect of leader features on work engagement]. *Bitlis Eren University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal of Academic Projection, 4*(2), 264-282.

Şenol, L., & Üzüm, B. (2020). Demografik özellikler ve psikolojik sahiplenme: Havacılık sektöründe bir araştırma [Demographic features and psychological ownership: A research in the aviation sector]. *Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences, 22*(3), 760-770.

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review, 15*(4), 666-681. https://doi.org/10.2307/258687

Tiganj, M. (2019). *Kişilik özellikleri ile işe adanmışlık arasındaki ilişki ve bu ilişkide güçlendirici liderlik teorisinin rolü: Sağlık sektöründe uygulama [Relationship between personality traits and employee's engagement, and role of the empowering leadership theory in this relationship: With application in the healthcare industry]* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul University, İstanbul.

Tokmak, M. (2019). Algılanan üst yönetim desteğinin işe adanmışlık üzerine etkisi: Bir araştırma [The effect on dedication for work of being perceived senior management support: A research]. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 36*, 273-290.

Tuckey, M. R., Bakker, A. B., & Dollard, M. F. (2012). Empowering leaders optimize working conditions for engagement: A multilevel study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*, 15-27. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025942

Turgut, T. (2011). Çalışmaya Tutkunluk: İş yükü, esnek çalışma saatleri, yönetici desteği ve iş-aile çatışması ile ilişkileri [Passion for work: Workload, flexible working hours, managerial support and relationships with work-family conflict]. *Ataturk University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 25*(3-4), 155-179.

Uçar, Z. (2018). Psikolojik sahiplenme olgusunu örgütsel düzlemde ölçmek için ölçek geliştirme çalışması [Measurement device development study for measuring in organizational plane of psychological ownership phenomenon]. *Journal of Business Research-Turk, 10*(3), 640-654.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74*, 235-244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003

Yavan, Ö. (2016). Örgütsel davranış düzleminde adanmışlık [Engagement in organizational behaviour plane]. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute,* (25), 278-296.

Yavuz, A. (2021). *Birey-örgüt uyumu, psikolojik sahiplenme, işgören sesliliği ve motivasyon araçları ilişkisi üzerine ampirik bir çalışma [An empirical study on the relationship between person-organization fit, psychological ownership, employee voice and motivational tools]* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Selçuk University, Konya.

Yeşil, Ü., Bancar, A., & Budak, G. (2015). Psikolojik sahiplik kavramına ilişkin bir literatür incelemesi [A literature review on the concept of psychological ownership]. *Eskişehir Osmangazi University Journal of Social Sciences, 16*(2), 59-82.

Zhang, X. M., and Bartol, K. M. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *The Academy of Management Journal, 53*(1), 107-128. https://doi.org/10.5465/Amj.2010.48037118

Zhang, X., & Zhou, J. (2014). Empowering leadership, uncertainty avoidance, trust and employee creativity: Interaction effects and a mediating mechanism. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 124*(2), 150-164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.02.002