Relationship between School Administrators' Organizational Power Sources and Teachers' Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Yahya ALTINKURT[a]
Dumlupınar University

Kürşad YILMAZ
Dumlupınar University

Abstract

The main purpose of the research was to determine correlation between school administrators' organizational power sources and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors in primary schools. The research was a correlational survey model study. 275 participants were randomly chosen for the research. The data were collected by "Administrators' Organizational Power Sources Scale" and "Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale". For data analysis, descriptive statistics, and multiple regression analysis were used. According to the obtained data, the primary school teachers included in the study highly displayed organizational citizenship behaviors. The participants' views on organizational citizenship behaviors did not vary in terms of variables but their views on sources of power in organizations vary in terms of seniority and field of study. The primary school teachers thought school administrators fully used power sources at a high level. According to them, school administrators used legitimate power the most and the following respectively: expert power, coercive power, referent power and reward power the least. When administrators' power sources were collectively considered, there was a moderate positive correlation between the teachers' views about organizational citizenship behaviors and administrators' power sources. However, when the other variables were examined, there was no correlation between the power sources except for coercive power and organizational citizenship behaviors. When the other variables were examined, there was a moderate positive correlation between coercive power and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Key Words

Organizational Power Sources, Organizational Citizenship, Primary Schools.

The key to sustainable organizational efficiency and effectiveness is proper management, which depends on administrators' skills to influence their followers and guide them within the framework of organizational goals. The source of influence is administrators' power (Başaran, 2004). Administrators' power types in organizations are basic determining factors

a Yahya ALTINKURT, Ph.D., is currently an assistant professor at the Department of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics. His research interests include organizational behaviors, strategic planning, and leadership in schools. Correspondence: Dumlupınar University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Kütahya/Turkey. E-mail: yaltinkurt@gmail.com Phone: +90 274 265 2012/4571 Fax: +90 274 265 2057.

of organizational life. They are closely related to the way administrators perceive human relationships because power means influencing and stimulating another person or people, thus making them do what administrators want (Bursalıoğlu, 1997). Power in this process is an administrator's skill to urge his followers to the needed behaviors. Hence, power is a relational term. It does not make sense alone or when it is irrelevant to others (Özkalp & Kırel, 2003).

In the literature, there are numberless power definitions. In psychics, power is a functioning, visible, concrete term whose effect is measurable. However, in human relationships and organizations, power is an indirectly measurable term which could solely be understood with its effects. By simplest defini-

tion, power is the ability to guide others to the needed behaviors (Greenberg & Baron, 1993; Özkalp & Kırel, 2003; Pfeffer, 1992). Power is a capacity or potential. Power might exist but the owner may not use it (Robbins, 1994). Yet, power is the source of manipulation process and the need for power is one of human basic instincts (Zafer, 2008). According to Nietzsche (1963), human beings say they would like to be happy in life, but what they really want is power (cited in Artan, 2000). According to Nietzsche, the highest value is sovereignty and whoever has power he is the good one (Aydın, 2009). Therefore, power should be considered and examined as a main component in human relationships, not as something good or bad (Artan) as it is the basic term of social sciences and management just like the term energy in physics (Koçel, 1998).

The concepts of power and authority are frequently interchanged. Follet (1941) suggests that these two concepts are mistaken for one another; however they are different concepts indeed. According to Follet, "power" is the ability to create or change something while "authority" is the right to develop and use power (cited in Bursalıoğlu, 1997). Weber (1947) acknowledges "authority" as the legitimized form of power which embraces pressure and coercion (cited in Tanrıöğen & Yücel, 2007). This evokes the concept of authority; "authority" is defined as situational or legitimate power created formally (Hales, 1997). In other words, it is a formal power granted to a leader for his leadership post. While the concept of "power" expresses interpersonal relations; "authority" refers to legal power and authorization granted to a manager. The most comprehensive study in the field of authority belongs to Weber (1947) who introduced the tripartite classification of authority; traditional, legal-rational and charismatic (cited in Artan, 2000; Bursalıoğlu, 2003; English, 1992; Hoy & Miskel, 2010).

Since traditional authority stipulates behaviors awaiting absolute obedience (Bursalıoğlu, 1997), leaders in the contemporary organizations should foresee the possible impacts of power they will prefer to exert on their employees and share their power with the others when necessary rather than being classical leaders who just resort to formal power (Özaslan & Gürsel, 2008). For, leadership is the act of leading followers by means of power and influence; however two different types of leadership emerge in terms of the use of power and influence, which are formal and informal leaderships (Çelik, 2003). A formal leader exerts his influence on a group by means of authority. However an informal leader

draws his power from his expertise and charisma and contributes to employees' working harmoniously and cooperatively by endeavoring to develop a strong culture and environment.

The nature and quality of a formal organization requires a control system. In this framework, it is necessary for such an organization to make use of power. Leaders resort to certain sources of power for leading and coordinating behaviors of his organization's members, where the type of power used is important. Power source classifications in the literature are generally similar. One of the leading studies is French and Raven's research (1959). French and Raven grouped power sources under five dimensions: legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, referent (charisma) power and expert power. In the present study, this classification was used.

Power in organizational life is a critical aspect of relationships between administrators and their followers (Ward, 1998). Research has shown that administrators' power preferences influenced employees' organizational behaviors. According to Etzioni (1961), the result of power by force is indifference or alienation, the result of profit-based power is economizing and that of value-based power is commitment (cited in Schein, 1977; Bursalıoğlu, 1997). In a study on primary school administrators by Balderson (1975), it was shown that school administrators with high expert power positively affected teachers' job satisfaction and motivation (cited in Çelik, 2003). In a study by Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2004), it was concluded that administrators' leadership behaviors affected employees' organizational citizenship behaviors. When the fact that leadership behavior is shaped by power preferences is taken into account, it might be suggested that one of the variables which could be affected by administrators' power types is organizational citizenship behavior.

Organizational citizenship behaviors mean employees' voluntary behaviors other than official job requirements, so employees' organizational citizenship behaviors are closely related to administrators' behaviors. The term organizational citizenship was first used by Bateman and Organ (1983) in the literature. According to Bateman and Organ, organizational citizenship behaviors include behaviors such as helping others to solve job-related problems, accepting orders without any objections, carrying out unexpectedly assigned tasks without complaints, helping to keep the working environment clean and well-arranged, speaking about work, organization

and administrators positively to non-organizational individuals and institutions, creating a work climate where conflicts and distracting factors are not included or minimized and protecting organizational sources. In other words, organizational citizenship behaviors are not covered by job definition, but they are extra-role behaviors unexpected from employees' administrators but still performed by employees. Extra role behaviors include informal joint actions to increase and promote organizational productivity, voluntary behaviors and cooperativeness (Çetin, Yeşilbaş, & Akdağ, 2003).

Organizational citizenship behaviors, by a simpler definition, are employees' voluntary behaviors intentionally displayed. They are not based on orders but bring organizations benefits (Yılmaz & Çokluk-Bökeoğlu, 2008). These behaviors strengthen organizational social structure but do not directly influence task performance. For example, supporting coworkers in job-related problems, helping to keep the work place clean and well-arranged, making due, constructive job-related suggestions to seniors and protecting organizational sources might be considered within this framework (Taşçı & Koç, 2005).

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that there has been no consensus on the dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors and that there were different classifications in various studies (DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005; Graham, 1991; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Hui, 1993; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994; Williams & Anderson, 1991). The best-known classification is Organ's classification (1988). Organ examined the dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviors in five categories: altruism, sportsmanship, civic virtue, kindness and conscience. However, in a study by DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) which was the first to examine adaptation of organizational citizenship behaviors into schools, these dimensions were not defined and grouped under a single dimension. According to DiPaola and Hoy (2005), there were two main reasons for this: The first one was the special content of organizational citizenship behaviors and the second one was the different nature of state schools from many private schools. Therefore, in this study, an integrated point of view for organizational citizenship behaviors was preferred.

In Turkey, there are various studies on *organizational citizenship* (Atalay, 2005; Ay, 2007; Buluç, 2008; Celep, Polat, Elbir, & Yapıcı, 2004; Celep, Sarıdede, & Baytekin, 2005; Çelik, 2007; Dönder, 2006; Erdem & Özen, 2002; Karaman, Yücel, & Dönder, 2008; Kaynak-Taşçı, 2007; Keskin, 2005; Mercan, 2006; Özdevecioğlu, 2003; Polat, 2007; Polat & Celep, 2008; Samancı-Kalaycı, 2007; Sezgin, 2005; Taşdan & Yılmaz, 2008; Ünal, 2003; Yaylacı, 2004; Yılmaz, 2009, 2010; Yılmaz & Altınkurt, 2011; Yılmaz & Taşdan, 2009; Yücel, 2006). There are studies on *organizational power* (Altınkurt & Yılmaz, 2011; Aslanargun, 2009; Aydoğan, 2008; Can & Çelikten, 2000; Deniz & Çolak, 2008; İşbilir, 2003; Özaslan & Gürsel, 2008; Turhan, 2008; Yücel, 1999; Zafer, 2008) although the number of the studies is low. However, other is no research to determine correlation between school administrators' power sources and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors in primary schools.

Purpose

The main aim of the research was to determine correlation between school administrators' power sources and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors in primary schools. To this end, the following questions were answered: (*i*) What are primary school teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors? (*ii*) What are primary school teachers' views about administrators' power sources? (*iii*) Do primary school teachers' views vary in terms of gender, area of study and seniority? (*iv*) Is there a correlation between administrators' power sources and primary school teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors and do administrators' power sources significantly predict teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors?

Method

The research was a correlational survey model study because it was attempted to reveal the past and present case of the relationship between school administrators' power sources and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors in primary schools.

Population-Sample

The population of the study consisted of 912 teachers in primary schools in Kütahya, a city in western Turkey, in 2009–2010 academic year. Sample size was calculated that 270 individuals were needed for a 95% trust level. It was decided to include 300 teachers in the study thinking that the scales might not fully return. The participants were randomly chosen and 300 teachers were reached for the study. However, 282 of the questionnaires were

returned. Rate of return was 94%. Analyses were carried out using 275 of the data gathering tools which were eligible. 52.7% of the participants were female (n=145), and 47.3% of them were male (n=130). The ages of the teachers included in the study ranged from 22 to 62. The percentage of those who were in the age range of 30 years old and below was 26.5% (n=73), the percentage of those who were in the age range of 31–35 years old was 24.7% (n=68), the percentage of those who were in the age range of 36–40 years old was 29.8% (n=82) and the percentage of those who were in the age range of 41 years old and above was 18.9% (n=52). 39.6% of the participants were classroom teachers (n=109) and 60.4% of them were branch teachers (n=166). The percentage of those who were in the experience range of 1–10 years was 42.2% (n=116), the percentage of those who were in the experience range of 11–20 years was 40.4% (n=111), and the percentage of those who were in the experience range of 21 years and above was 17.5% (n=48).

Research Instruments

Data was collected by "Administrators' Organizational Power Sources Scale" and "Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale". *Administrators' Organizational Power Sources Scale* (Zafer, 2008) consisted of five sub-dimensions: Expert Power (items 1–13), Referent Power (items 14–28), Reward Power (items 29–40), Legitimate Power (items 41–51), and Coercive Power (items 52–59). These sub-dimensions were independent from one another. The scale which was developed to determine school administrators' power sources consisted of 59 Likert type items and had the following options on the answer sheet: 1-Never, 2-Rarely, 3-Sometimes, 4-Mostly and 5-Always. Factor loadings of the items in the sub-dimension of *Expert Power* ranged from 0.63 to .81 and total item correlations ranged from 0.62 to 0.86. Total variance explained by this sub-dimension was 62% and Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was 0.94. Factor loadings of the 15 items in the sub-dimension of *Referent Power* ranged from 0.48 to 0.76 and total item correlations ranged from 0.57 to 0.81. Total variance explained by this sub-dimension was 60% and Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was .84. Factor loadings of the 12 items in the sub-dimension of *Reward Power* ranged from 0.45 to 0.79 and total item correlations ranged from 0.50 to 0.78. Total variance explained by this sub-dimension was 56% and Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was 0.82. There were 11 items in the sub-dimension of *Legitimate Power* and

factor loadings of the items ranged from .56 to .75 and total item correlations ranged from 0.53 to 0.72. Total variance explained by this sub-dimension was 54% and Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was 0.89. The sub-dimension of *Coercive Power* consisted of 8 items and factor loadings of the items ranged from .55 to .83 and total item correlations ranged from 0.59 to 0.71. Total variance explained by this sub-dimension was 58% and Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was 0.88 (Zafer).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (DiPaola et al., 2005) consisted of 12 Likert type items; 10 positive and 2 negative. The scale items were reversely encoded. Turkish adaptation study of the scale was conducted by Taşdan and Yılmaz (2008). The scale had a single dimension and the answer sheet included the following options: 1-I totally disagree, 2-I disagree, 3-I moderately agree, 4-I agree and 5-I totally agree. Eigenvalue of the factor was 5.48. Factor loadings of the scale items ranged from 0.31 to 0.82. Total variance explained by this scale was 45.66%. According to reliability analysis of Organizational Citizenship Scale, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was α = 0.87 (Taşdan & Yılmaz). High scores showed high organizational citizenship behaviors.

Data Analysis

In the study were used descriptive statistics, t-test, ANOVA and Multiple regression analysis in data analysis. As a result of analysis of variance, "Tukey" was applied in cases where "F test" statistics were significant. Although F tests showed whether the difference between the groups was statistically significant, they did not provide any data on the effect size of correlations between the variables. η^2 (eta-squared) statistics were used to determine the size of the difference between the attitudes in cases where the difference was statistically significant. The following ranges are mostly used for η^2 value interpretation (Pallant, 2003): An η^2 value ranging from 0.01 to 0.05 is considered as a slight effect, an η^2 value ranging from 0.06 to 0.13 as a moderate effect, and η^2 value greater than 0.14 as a strong effect. In the study, Pearson analysis was used to determine correlation between the two points of view. Correlation coefficient as an absolute value ranging from 0.70 to 1.00 was considered as a high correlation, ranging from 0.69 to 0.30 as a moderate correlation and ranging from 0.29 to 0.00 as a low correlation (Büyüköztürk, 2002).

Results

The teachers included in the study displayed organizational citizenship behaviors at a high level because the participants' views (n=275, x=3.92, S=0.59) were close to "I agree". The primary school teachers thought that school administrators used the whole power sources at a high level. According to the teachers, school administrators used legitimate power (x=3.90, S=0.74) the most and the following respectively: expert power (x=3.77, S=0.86), coercive power (x=3.74, S=0.74), referent power (x=3.65, S=0.84) and reward power (x=3.40, S=0.84) the least.

Views of the primary school teachers participating in the survey on organizational citizenship behaviors do not vary with regards to *gender* [$t_{(273)}$=1.54; *p*>.05], *field of study* [$t_{(273)}$=1.30; *p*>.05] and *seniority* [$F_{(2-272)}$=0.74; *p*>0.05]. The participants' views on the sources of power used by school principals vary in terms of their *fields of study* in all dimensions except for expert power. In all dimensions, compared to class teachers, more subject teachers think that school principals make further use of sources of power. There is a "low" level of variation in their views on the use of legal and coercive power and "medium" level of variation in the use of reward power. Teachers' views turn out to change in all dimensions with regards to their *seniority*. According the analysis of these findings, compared to the teachers with 10 years and less seniority, the teachers with 11 to 20 years of seniority are of the view that school principals make further use sources of power. There is a "medium" level variation in their views in the dimension of reward power and "low" level in other dimensions.

Pair wise and partial correlations between administrators' power sources (the predictive variable) and organizational citizenship behaviors (the predicted variable) are presented. There was a low positive correlation between organizational citizenship behaviors and expert power (r=0.256), referent power (r=0.274) and reward power (r=0.226) and a moderate positive correlation between legitimate power (r=0.343) and coercive power (r=0.416). Nevertheless, when the other variables were examined, there was no correlation between organizational citizenship behaviors and the other power sources except for coercive power. When the other variables were examined, it was seen that there was a moderate positive correlation (r=0.268) between coercive power and organizational citizenship behaviors. All the power sources moderately and positively correlated with the teachers' organizational

citizenship behavior scores (R=0.428, *p*< .01). The power sources used by the school administrators explained 18.3% of total variance in the teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. According to standardized regression coefficient (β), relative order of power sources used by administrators is coercive power, legitimate power, reward power, referent power and expert power. When t-test results of significance of regression coefficients were examined, it was seen that only coercive power was a predictor of teachers' organizational citizenship behavior. The other power sources were not significantly influential. According to the obtained findings, regression equation of organizational citizenship behavior was as follows:

Organizational Citizenship Behavior = 2.617 + 0.04 Expert Power + 0.063 Referent Power + 0.092 Reward Power + 0.11 Legitimate Power + 0.298 Coercive Power

Discussion and Suggestions

The main aim of the research was to determine correlation between power sources used by school administrators and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors in primary schools. According to the obtained data, the primary school teachers included in the study highly displayed organizational citizenship behaviors, which are voluntary behaviors intentionally displayed by employees (Yılmaz & Çokluk-Bökeoğlu, 2008). In studies on organizational citizenship in Turkey, it was seen that organizational citizenship behaviors displayed by primary school teachers (Atalay, 2005; Ay, 2007; Buluç, 2008; Dönder, 2006; Kaynak-Taşçı, 2007; Keskin, 2005; Mercan, 2006; Samancı-Kalaycı, 2007; Ünal, 2003; Yaylacı, 2004; Yücel, 2006), secondary school teachers (Celep et al., 2004; Polat, 2007; Polat & Celep, 2008; Yılmaz, 2010; Yılmaz & Altınkurt, 2012) and teachers at private teaching institutions (Yılmaz, 2009) were generally high. In his study on views of the teachers working at private educational institutions on their organizational citizenship behaviors, Yılmaz (2009) concludes that they display high, though not very high, levels of organizational citizenship behaviors. Those private educational institutions are one of the most troubled educational institutions as they do not offer job security to their employees and exploit labor of the newly graduate teachers especially (Gök, 2005). Given these teachers' high levels of organizational citizenship behaviors despite the above mentioned current circumstances, high levels of citizenship behaviors revealed by similar studies conducted

at various public schools make further sense. For, the teachers working at public schools have job securities and their job descriptions, responsibilities, rights and what do when treated unfairly are all secured by legal texts. It is good to see teachers display high level of organizational citizenship behaviors; because today's educational institutions strive for raising future generations in a more uncertain environment than that of the past. Thus, there is a further need for today's members of educational organizations to display high level of organizational citizenship behaviors. Furthermore, certain studies suggest that organizational citizenship behaviors exert important effect on performance. Employees' organizational citizenship behaviors enhance cooperation, aid and support among themselves within an organization. Therefore, employees' high levels of organizational citizenship behaviors contribute to performance, thus success of an organization (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994).

Primary school teachers' views on organizational citizenship behaviors do not vary in terms of gender. Though female teachers' views are more positive, there is not a significant difference. In the relevant literature, there are studies with both matching and non-matching results. Polat's study (2007) does not reveal a significant variation with regards to gender. Celep et al. (2004) analyze organizational citizenship behaviors in four dimensions. They conclude that there is a difference in "supportive participation" in terms of gender; but no difference in "compliance, loyalty and functional participation". Çetin et al. (2003) look into organizational citizenship behaviors in five dimensions. They argue that that there is a difference in "thinking of and helping others and supporting the development of the organization" in terms of gender; but no difference in "advanced sense of mission, informing out of courtesy, volunteering and gentlemanly conduct". Ölçüm-Çetin (2004) and Yılmaz (2010), on the other hands, state that there is a significant difference in teachers' views in terms of gender.

Primary school teachers' views on organizational citizenship behaviors do not vary with regards to their field of study and seniority. Polat's (2007) study also does not reveal any variation in views in terms of field of study and seniority. However, Yılmaz (2010) concludes a difference in terms of *field of study* in his study conducted at secondary schools and Çetin et al. (2003) and Celep et al. (2004) suggest a difference in terms of seniority.

The primary school teachers thought school administrators fully used power sources at a high level.

According to them, school administrators used legitimate power the most and the following respectively: expert power, coercive power, referent power and reward power the least. In a study in primary schools by Zafer (2008), school administrators' power sources were as follows, similar to the present study: legitimate power, coercive power, expert power, referent power and reward power. According to a study by Aslanargun (2009), teachers thought school administrators used referent power, coercive power and reward power the least and used commitment power, expert power, mutual power and knowledge power the most. School teachers thought they used referent power and reward power the least and commitment power and knowledge power the most. School administrators' and teachers' views and results of similar studies on reward power were parallel. In a study by Erçetin (1995), school administrators stated that they used personality power the most to influence teachers and penalty power the least.

In their research on the sources of power used by principals of department at universities, Özaslan and Gürsel (2008) conclude that they use expert, reward, referent (charismatic), coercive and communication powers respectively. In their study conducted at a private institution, Deniz and Çolak (2008) reveal that managers use legitimate, expert, reward, referent (charismatic) and coercive powers respectively. This specific finding suggests that school principals act more as a managers rather than leaders at schools; because legitimate power is a positional power granted to a school principal for his position based on his authority.

Due to their nature, educational organizations are loosely structured organizations. The main role of a manager in such a structure is not to give certain directives to his employees, but to support and encourage them to maximize their creativity (Aydın, 2000). It is not possible to ensure loyalty of those working solely with legitimate power (Katz & Kahn, 1977). An administrator of educational organization has more chance of influencing than his legitimate power, i.e authority (Bursalıoğlu, 2003; Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Influential leaders should have higher informal influential powers than formal ones and be participative and collaborative (Yukl, 1989). In other words, influential leaders should use referent (charismatic) and expert powers more (Çelik, 2003). According to Schein (1992), one of the characteristics that future leaders should have is the willing and ability to share power and control with their employees in terms of their interests and ca-

pabilities; because excessive use of power may have adverse effects on employees' performance, spirits and relations. Atay (2001) states that teachers find the power that school principals have "less important", but supervisors find it "important". The same study concludes that teachers and supervisors think school principals display power related attitudes and behaviors at "medium level". These findings give hints about the use of power in educational organizations.

It is concluded that the legitimate-power-related-behavior which school principals display to the highest level "makes feel that they are legally responsible for carrying out and assessing works at school". One of legitimate-power-related-attitudes they display to the lowest level is "their using legitimate power without making any distinction among teachers when necessary". Of course, school principals should use their legitimate powers in line with their purposes. They should use their legitimate powers not as a means of pressure, but as a fair means to carry out and facilitate works at school. On the other hand, the least frequent use of reward power which is an extent of legitimate power in some way strengthens the idea that school principals act as managers rather than leaders at school. Different researches conclude that school principals use reward power minimally. In their research, Ağaoğlu, Altınkurt, Yılmaz, and Karaköse (2010) conclude that teachers think school principals are not adequately efficient in rewarding their employees. The Turkish Educational System leaves little space for rewarding and does not clearly explain criteria necessary for rewarding; but allows larger space for punishment (Seçkin, 1990).

It is regarded positive to see school principals' use of expert power as the second most frequently used power; because expert power is closely linked with an environment based on confidence (Çelik, 2003). Thus, this finding suggests that teachers trust school principals' levels of expertise. However, an analysis of the responses in this item of the scale reveals that teachers find school principals competent at details and implementation of the relevant legislation. In terms of expert power, our participants think that "school principals are knowledgeable enough about personal rights and benefits of teachers" and "they properly interpret laws or regulations". They do not think that "school principals value teachers' participation in decision making" and "they do conduct enough research for making correct decisions" and "they know how to resolve areas of conflict they confront". Thus, it is concluded that school

principals' expertise is more concentrated in rather technical areas such as legislation. The underlying reason for such an expertise is that educational management has not become a professional field yet (Kaya, 1999; Şimşek, 2002; Şişman & Turan, 2004). To consider school management as being a good teacher or an expert in the relevant legislation does not help use develop a professional point of view. A school principal's ability to use his expert power depends on his experience in educational management (Çelik, 2003).

Our participants' views on school principals' use of sources of power do not vary in terms of *gender*. Female teachers think that school principals use *legitimate* and *coercive* powers more while male teachers think that they use *expert, referent (charismatic)* and *reward* powers more. However, the variation in their views is not significant. In the study conducted by Zafer (2008) in primary schools, the participants' views vary with gender. In the research carried out by Özaslan and Gürsel (2008), there is a variation the participants' views in the use of legitimate power and more female teachers, compared to their male colleagues express further use of legitimate power. In his study, Aslanargun (2009) concludes that the teachers' views on reward power, mutual power, expert power, informational power and referent (charismatic) power do not vary in terms of gender; but their views on coercive power and connection power vary. Compared to male teachers, female teachers think that coercive and connection powers are used more.

Our participants' views on the sources of power used by school principals vary in terms of their *fields of study* in all dimensions apart from expert power. In all dimensions, compared to class teachers, more subject teachers think that school principals make further use of sources of power. Aslanargun (2009), in his study, notes that class teachers have higher averages compared to other subject teachers.

Teachers' views vary in all dimensions in terms of their *seniority*. According the analysis of these findings, compared to the teachers with 10 years and less seniority, the teachers with 11 to 20 years of professional seniority are of the view that school principals make further use sources of power. In his study, Zafer (2008) puts that more teachers with more than 15 years seniority, compared to the less senior ones, think that school principals make further use of referent, expert and reward powers.

When administrators' power sources were collectively considered, there was a moderate positive correlation between the teachers' views about organi-

zational citizenship behaviors and administrators' power sources. However, when the other variables were examined, there was no correlation between the power sources except for coercive power and organizational citizenship behaviors. When the other variables were examined, there was a moderate positive correlation between coercive power and organizational citizenship behaviors. According to t-test results of significance levels of regression coefficients, only coercive power was a predictor of teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. The other power sources were not significantly influential but it is critical to understand coercive power at this point. In the literature, coercive power is generally defined as administrators' influential power when they punish employees for undesired behaviors. Official or verbal scolding by administrators and implications for pay rise or further contract are considered in this context (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). In a study by the authors to reveal working conditions at private teaching institutions, one of the participants stated that "administrators at private teaching institutions force teachers to demand lower wages during contract renewal period or pay rise period by mentioning unemployed teachers". As a result, coercive power corresponds to such a power. On the other hand, the schools included in the study were all state primary schools. Legal instructions define state primary school teachers' salaries, official leaves, appointments, career developments, rights and obligations. In other words, school administrators are not teachers' employers so it is not possible for administrators to use means of pressure mentioned in the literature. Teachers have a right to start legal procedure in such cases. In this context, the type of power defined as coercive power in the study was taken as informal verbal warnings by school administrators because of teachers' mistakes without starting legal procedure. Some of the scale items in the dimension of coercive power were as follows: "School administrators warn teachers when they start lessons late or dismiss classes early", "Teachers are warned by administrators when they do not carry out the task of hall monitoring properly", "Administrators warn teachers when teachers utter rude or negative words". Thus, the study results need to be considered in this context.

Administrators' power sources explained about 1/5 of total variance in the teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors so more than 80% of the factors affecting organizational citizenship behaviors were other than administrators' power sources. In this context, it is advisable to do research using regression analysis to show the extent to which variables

such as justice, trust, commitment, psychological contract and so on scientifically revealed by organizational behavior studies by various researchers explain organizational behaviors. Similarly, studies on correlations between administrators' power sources and organizational justice, trust, commitment, psychological contract and so on may also considerably contribute to the field. Further research to be conducted in private schools and private teaching institutions is recommended.

References/Kaynakça

Ağaoğlu, E., Altınkurt, Y., Yılmaz, K. ve Karaköse, T. (2010, Mayıs). *Okul yöneticilerinin yeterliklerine ilişkin okul yöneticilerinin ve öğretmenlerin görüşleri*. V. Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri. Gazi Üniversitesi & EYEDDER, Antalya.

Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2011). Relationship between the school administrators' power sources and teachers' organizational trust levels in Turkey. *Journal of Management Development*, *31* (1), 58-70.

Artan, İ. (2000). Örgütlerde güç kullanımı ve kaynakları. Z. Aycan (Ed.), *Türkiye'de yönetim, liderlik ve insan kaynakları uygulamaları* (s. 281-308). Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.

Aslanargun, E. (2009). *İlköğretim ve lise müdürlerinin okul yönetiminde kullandığı güç türleri*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Atalay, İ. (2005). *Örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel adalet*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.

Atay, K. (2001). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin genel ve iş tutum ve davranışları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 7* (28), 471–482.

Ay, B. (2007). *Öğretmenlerin öz-yeterlikleri ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.

Aydın, A. (2009). *Felsefe- Düşünce tarihi*. Ankara: Pegem A.

Aydın, M. (2000). *Eğitim yönetimi*. Ankara: Hatipoğlu..

Aydoğan, İ. (2008). Okul yöneticilerinin öğretmenleri etkileme becerileri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 25*, 33–51.

Başaran, İ. E. (2004). *Yönetimde insan ilişkileri*. Ankara: Nobel.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26* (4), 587–595.

Buluç, B. (2008). Ortaöğretim okullarında örgütsel sağlık ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 6* (4), 571–602.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1997). *Eğitim yönetiminde teori ve uygulama*. Ankara: Pegem A.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2003). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*. Ankara: Pegem A.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem A.

Can, N. ve Çelikten, M. (2000). Alt düzey personelin güç kaynakları: Erciyes üniversitesi örneği. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 22* (2), 269–290.

Celep, C., Polat, S., Elbir, N. ve Yapıcı, E. (2004, Temmuz). *Ortaöğretim okullarındaki öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık tutumları.* XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı'nda sunulan bildiri, İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya.

Celep, C., Sarıdede. U. ve Baytekin, F. (2005, Eylül). *Eğitim örgütlerinde örgütsel bağlılık, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ve tükenmişlik arasındaki ilişki.* XIV. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri, Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli.

Çelik, M. (2007). *Örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı.* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.

Çelik, V. (2003). *Eğitimsel liderlik.* Ankara: Pegem A.

Çetin, M., Yeşilbağ, Y. ve Akdağ, B. (2003). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 17,* 39–54.

Deniz, M. ve Çolak, M. (2008). Örgütlerde çatışmanın yönetiminde gücün kullanımı ve bir araştırma. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7* (23), 304–332.

DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal, 88* (3), 35–44.

DiPaola, M. F. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relation to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership, 11* (5), 424–447.

DiPaola, M. F., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Measuring organizational citizenship in schools: The OCB scale. In W. K. Hoy, & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Educational leadership and reform* (pp. 319–342). Greenwich, CN: Information Age.

Dönder, H. H. (2006). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ve bürokrasi.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.

English, F. (1992). *Educational administration: The human science.* New York: Harper Collins.

Erçetin, Ş. Ş. (1995). *Ast-üst ilişkileri.* Ankara: Şafak Matbaası.

Erdem, F. ve Özen, J. (2002, Mayıs). *Akademik örgütlerde rehbere duyulan güvenin bir örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı boyutu olarak sivil erdem davranışını geliştirmeye etkisi.* X. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri, Antalya.

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander, (Eds.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-67). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Pres.

Gök, F. (2005, Eylül). *Üniversiteye girişte umut pazarı.* XIV. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, Denizli.

Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 4* (4), 249–270.

Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (1993). *Behavior in organizations: understanding and managing the human side of work.* Boston : Allyn & Bacon.

Hales, C. (1997). Power, authority and influence. A. Harris, N. Bennett & M. Preedy (Eds.), *Organizational effectiveness and improvement in education* (pp. 22-30). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hoy, W. K. ve Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi: Teori, araştırma uygulama* (çev. ed. S. Turan). Ankara: Nobel.

İşbilir, H. (2003). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin duygusal zekâ yeterlilikleri ile kullandıkları yönetsel güç kaynakları arasındaki ilişkinin öğretmen algılarına dayalı olarak incelenmesi.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gaziantep.

Karaman, K., Yücel, C. ve Dönder, H. (2008). Öğretmen görüşlerine göre, okullardaki bürokrasi ile örgütsel vatandaşlık arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 14* (53), 49–74.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1977). *Örgütlerin toplumsal psikolojisi* (çev. H. Can ve Y. Bayar). Ankara: TODAİE.

Kaya, Y. K. (1999). *Eğitim yönetimi.* Ankara: Bilim.

Kaynak-Taşçı, S. (2007). *Öğretmenlerin kişilik özellikleri ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.

Keskin, S. (2005). *Öğretmenlerde çalışma değerleri ve örgütsel vatandaşlık.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.

Koçel, T. (1998). *İşletme yöneticiliği.* İstanbul: Beta.

Mercan, M. (2006). *Öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık, örgütsel yabancılaşma ve örgütsel vatandaşlık.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Ölçüm-Çetin, M. (2004). *Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı.* Ankara: Nobel.

Özaslan, G. ve Gürsel, M. (2008). Eğitim yöneticilerinin güç tipi tercihlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 25,* 351 -370.

Özdevecioğlu, M. (2003). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ile üniversite öğrencilerinin bazı demografik özellikleri ve akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişkilerin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 20,* 117–135.

Özkalp, E. ve Kırel, Ç. (2003). *Örgütsel davranış.* Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Pallant, J. (2003). *SPSS survival manual.* Berkshire: Open University Press.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations.* Boston: Harvard Business School.

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31* (3), 351-363.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Hui, C. (1993). Organizational citizenship behaviors as determinants of managerial evaluations of employee performance: A review and suggestions for future research. In G. R. Ferris, & K. M. Rowland, (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (pp. 1–40). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Polat, S. (2007). *Örgütsel güven, adalet ve vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin öğretmen algıları.* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.

Polat, S. ve Celep, C. (2008). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet, örgütsel güven, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 14* (54), 307–331.

Robbins, S. P. (1994). *Örgütsel davranışın temelleri* (çev. S. A. Öztürk). Eskişehir: ETAM.

Samancı-Kalaycı, G. (2007). *Örgütsel güven ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.

Schein, E. H. (1977). *Örgüt psikolojisi.* (çev. M. Tosun). Ankara: TODAIE.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Seçkin, N. (1990). Orta dereceli okul öğretmenlerin aldıkları ödüller ve cezalara ilişkin bir çalışma. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 77,* 24–36.

Sezgin, F. (2005). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları: kavramsal bir çözümleme ve okul açısından bazı çıkarımlar. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 25* (1), 317– 339.

Somech, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2004). Exploring organizational citizenship behavior from an organizational perspective: the relationship between organizational learning and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77* (3), 281 - 298.

Şimşek, H. (2002). Türkiye'de eğitim yöneticisi yetiştirilemez! C. Elma ve Ş. Çınkır (Ed.), *21. yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri* içinde (s. 307–312). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.

Şişman, M. ve Turan, S. (2004). Eğitim ve okul yönetimi. Y. Özden (Ed.), *Eğitim ve okul yöneticiliği el kitabı* içinde (s. 99–146). Ankara: Pegem A.

Tanrıöğen, A. ve Yücel, Z. (2007). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yetki kullanımında yaşadıkları sorunlar. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 21,* 55–66.

Taşçı, D. ve Koç, U. (2005, Mayıs). *Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı – örgütsel öğrenme ilişkisi: Akademisyenler üzerinde görgül bir araştırma.* 13. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri, İstanbul.

Taşdan, M. ve Yılmaz, K. (2008). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice scales' adaptation to Turkish. *TED Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi, 33* (150), 87–96.

Turhan, B. (2008). *Yönetici hemşirelerin kullandıkları güç tarzlarının astları tarafından algılanışı ve organizasyona bağlılığın incelenmesi.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler enstitüsü, İzmir.

Ünal, Z. (2003). *Öğretmenlerde iş doyumu ve örgütsel vatandaşlık.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler enstitüsü, Afyon.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship' behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 37* (4), 765–802.

Ward, E. W. (1998). Managerial power bases and subordinates' manifest needs as influences on psychological climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 12* (3), 361-378.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17* (3), 601–617.

Yaylacı, A. F. (2004). *İlköğretim okulları yönetici ve öğretmenlerinin örgütsel yurttaşlık davranışları.* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Yılmaz, K. (2009). Özel dershane öğretmenlerinin örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 15* (59), 471–490.

Yılmaz, K. (2010). Kamu ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ile ilgili görüşleri. *Ondokuz Mayıs üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 29* (1), 1–16.

Yılmaz, K. ve Altınkurt, Y. (2011). Göreve yeni başlayan özel dershane öğretmenlerinin kurumlarındaki çalışma koşullarına ilişkin görüşleri, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 11* (2), 635–650.

Yılmaz, K., & Çokluk-Bökeoğlu, Ö. (2008). Organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment in Turkish primary schools. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 3* (5), 775–780.

Yılmaz, K., & Taşdan, M. (2009). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice in Turkish primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 47* (1), 108–126.

Yılmaz, K., & Altınkurt, Y. (2012). Relationship between organizational justice, organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviors in secondary schools in Turkey. In I. Duyar & A. Normore (Eds.), *Advances in educational administration 13* (pp. 223–248). UK: Emerald Group Publishing.

Yukl, G. A. (1989). *Leadership in organization.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Yücel, C. (1999). *Bureaucracy and teachers' sense of power.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia, USA.

Yücel, G. F. (2006). *Öğretmenlerde mesleki tükenmişlik ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.

Zafer, D. (2008). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin kullandıkları örgütsel güç kaynaklarına ilişkin öğretmen.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.