The Relationship Between Teachers' Perceived Power Distance and Organizational Silence in School Management

Hüseyin ASLAN[1]

[1] Faculty of Education, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun, Turkey   0000-0003-2724-0445

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Within an organizational structure, there are many sources of power that feed and run the influence action of the manager. The source and use of power in the hands of the manager has significant effects on employees' attitudes and behaviors such as morale, motivation, loyalty, trust, organizational citizenship, job satisfaction, job stress, alienation from work and organization and organizational silence. Organizational silence behaviors are considered to be one of the employee behaviors in which the effects of power use and power distance will be felt the most. In this study, it is aimed to determine the perceptions of teachers about the relationship between power distance and organizational silence behaviors. The research was carried out by using the correlational survey model. The sample of this research was determined by simple random sampling method and it consisted of 552 teachers working in primary, secondary and high schools in central districts of Samsun during the 2019-2020 academic year. As data collection tools, "Power Distance Scale" developed by Dorfman and Howell (1988) and adapted to Turkish by Akyol (2009), and the "Organizational Silence Scale" developed by Dyne, Ang and Botero (2003) were used. As a result of the research, it was determined that there is a significant relationship between the general power distance total score variable and the teachers' organizational silence scores. And power distance variable is a significant predictor on the organizational silence variable. In that regard, it can be argued that one of the reasons for silence in the organization is the perceived power distance perception of the behavior of the manager.

© 20222 IJPES. All rights reserved

Keywords:
Power distance, organizational silence, teacher, school management, principal.

1. Introduction

Subordinate-superior relations in organizations and the factors affecting these relationships constitute one of the focus topics of management and organizational behavior science. The essence of management is based on influencing employees in the process of achieving goals. Within an organizational structure, there are many sources of power that feed and run the influence action of the manager. Power constitutes a distance among the individuals in the society in line with social values. It gives information about the process of using and distancing power, the nature, characteristics, structure of the organization and the prevailing cultural background because organizations are affected by the cultural values of the society inwhich they exist (Hofstede, 2001; Terzi, 2004).The distance created could be interiorized in time as it's accepted by the society. In different countries, coming from specific families or having education from specific schools add distinction to the individual regardless oftheir ability and experience. Distribution of power in different cultures and societies occursin regard to different criterias. In these circumstances, the manager is expected to behave in line with the power distance perception of the culture he/she comes from (Varoğlu, Basım and Ercil, 2000). Many sorts of power are used in organisations such as physical, economic, knowledge, performance, personality, position and ideological. Since the power comprises when the individual has relations with other people,the distant use of power is

also affected by the personal qualities of those in managerial positions The source and use of power in the hands of the manager has significant effects on employees' attitudes and behaviors such as morale, motivation, loyalty, trust, organizational citizenship, job satisfaction, job stress, alienation from work and organization. Organizational silence behaviors are considered to be one of the employee behaviors in which the effects of power use and power distance will be felt the most(Bayrak, 2000; Hicks and Gullet,1981) In this study, the relationship between power distance and organizational silence was examined.

1.1. Power Distance

Power is the capacity and potential found in every person (Robbins and Judge, 2013).In this sense, power is related to the individual's influence on other entities other than himself. Since power is realized through economic superiority or force, it is realized by material means (Eren, 2006).The distribution of power is realized by different criteria in different cultures and societies (Varoğlu, Basım and Ercil, 2000). On the other hand, power creates a distance between individuals in the society, in proportion to the values of the society.According to Ertürk (2014), power distance is defined as the degree to which people perceive whether they are mutually equal or not. Power distance refers to a relative distance that occurs when individuals who seem relatively weak in a work environment believe that power is not distributed equally (Altay, 2004; Çakıcı, 2007). Hofstede (2001) conceptualized power distance as the degree to which members of a society who see themselves as relatively less powerful accept power that is unequally distributed and regard it as normal. In other words, power distance refers to the extent to which inequalities in society are adopted by relatively less powerful segments as well as by the powerful (Hofstede, 2011). In short, power distance is the perception of the members of an organization that the power is not equally distributed. Power distance is a situation that occurs with the power relationship.There are many studies revealing that the power relationship differs in social and cultural aspects (Hofstede, Hofstede and Kinkov, 2010; Brockner et al., 2001; Akyol, 2009).

Power distance consists of two dimensions as high and low power distance.In societies with high power distance, the value given to the status and title is high, the equality of opportunity and power distribution is unbalanced, and the distance between superior and subordinate is visibly high. In societies with low power distance, responsibility is distributed to all units, equal opportunities and distribution of power are balanced, the value given to status and title, and the distance between superior and subordinate is less (Akyol, 2009). In cultures with low power distance, subordinates' participation levels in the decision-making process are high, whereas in cultures with high power distance, subordinates have less participation in the decision process with their voices (Brockner et al., 2001).

Within the power range, unlike many forms of organizational behavior, it does not differ according to the leader, and individuals have fixed beliefs on any subject. Employees think that if they have a perception of high power distance, managers have a great influence on them and they will not be able to express their problems comfortably. Employees who perceive the power distance as low, on the other hand, think that they can easily express their problems and that they are at a certain level with the managers (Botero and Van Dyne, 2009). It can be said that individuals who are thought to have low power levels will generally be dependent on individuals with high power levels (Magee and Smith, 2013).

In an organization, in order to speak of low power distance, the hierarchical power must be equal or meet the expectation of being equal.However, there is a belief that there should be a visible difference between individuals in organizations with high power distance (Durak, 2012). In organizations where high power distance prevails, superiors and subordinates are in an unequal position against each other. In this context, it is possible to say that hierarchical structures are built on this positioning. In these structures created with a centralist understanding, it is known who has authority over whom, and subordinates expect their superiors to be told when and what to do. In these structures, the direction of communication follows a top-down path (Acaray and Şevik, 2016).

In cultures with high power distance, decision-making power of superiors is adopted more easily than subordinates.On the other hand, in low power distance cultures, norms reduce the power differences between individuals due to status. While multiplism is emphasized in the regulations bytaking democracy concept as a basis in societies with low power distance, approaches highlighting the elite group are emphasized taking the control concept as a basis because of the centralised structure in societies with high power distance. Since managers are believed to be powerful ones in high power distance cases, subordinates do not see themselves

equal to the superiors and carry out the instructions they receive without questioning (Dörtyol, 2012). Powerful people are trusted regarless of the legality of the power and power ensures the individuals to be in a better position in societies with high power distance (Yalçın and Erçen, 2004). In low-power distance societies, superiors with decision-making power are more likely to share power with subordinates with less power (Brockner et al., 2001).

In societies where the power distance is high, each individual has a legally determined place in the hierarchical structure. The statuses attained in these structures are formed in a way that the relatively weak show respect to the strong (De Mooji and Hofstede, 2010). In high power distant societies where the centralization of power is accepted, employees act in the structure created by the administration and fulfill the orders of the managers without questioning (Altay, 2004).

The concept of power distance changes the social structure of the society, with equality and power sharing on one side and the desire to be seen as superior and an effort to retain power on the other.

While in societies which the power distance is low, the concept of democracy is based on the concept of pluralism, in societies which it is high, the concept of control is based on the centralist structure and the approaches that highlight the elite class are highlighted (Dörtyol, 2012).In societies which power distance is high, it ensures that power is trusted to powerful people and power individuals are in a better position, regardless of whether power is legal or not. Therefore, individuals in the society want to have power (Yalçın and Erçen, 2004).

Inequality is accepted by individuals and society has been formed according to this order. The vast majority of people depends on a small number of individuals who hold power.Power holders pose a danger to others, as the legality of power is disregarded.In organizations with low power distance, by minimizing the inequality between subordinate and superior. It shares the opportunities of the subordinate and the upper organization equally. Efforts are made to reduce the factors that cause power (Köksal, 2007; Turan, Durceylan and Şişman, 2005). The high distance of power also causes silence to occur and develop in organizations.Since inequality is at the forefront in such cultures, individuals avoid speaking publicly in order to get away from the conflict situation, even if they are encouraged by the administration and an environment of participation is created (Çakıcı, 2007).

The superiors in such organizations will not want subordinates to think independently and critically, as the high distance of power leads to obedience and dependency behaviors. Subordinates are asked to act in accordance with the instructions given to them rather than take the initiative. Due to the obvious hierarchical structure, those who have power tend to mobbing others. Rather than share their power, superiors put pressure on subordinates (Özen, 2009; Sevi and Karanfil, 2016). A similar situation shows itself in educational organizations. In schools, the type of power that administrators use to influence employees and the way it is used can positively or negatively affect employees' perception and success of the school (Altınkurt, Yılmaz, Erol and Salalı, 2014).It can be said that in school organizations where traditional management approach is dominant, administrators mostly use the high power distance.This situation may naturally lead to a culture and climate that reduces teachers' commitment to the school and the sense of belonging to the school.

By taking it naturally, poor school culture may negatively affect teachers' performance and motivation, and communication between students and teachers may weaken. High power distance at school causes the relationship between school administrators and teachers to become formal and weaken communication. This causes unhealthy and unreliable relationships at school, lowering morale and motivation, and weakening the sense of unity. As a result, love, respect and acceptance among school stakeholders are also weakened.The use of high power distance in schools may also cause a decrease in the sense of belonging of teachers and other employees and alienation (Çavdar, 2021). In addition, the way school principals use power and the power distance they use can prepare the environment for teachers' organizational silence behaviors.

1.2. Organizational Silence

Organizational silence means employees' reluctance to contribute to their organization; It refers to the deliberate tendency to keep their thoughts, ideas and information about their duties and organizations (Morrison and Milliken, 2000: 707; Pinder and Harlos, 2001: 334; Tangirala and Ramanujam, 2008: 38).Many factors are determinant in the formation of employees' silence behavior in the organization.

Managerial understanding in the organization, subordinate-superior relations, cooperation between employees, solidarity and trust can be counted among the foremost factors. In general, as we move away from democracy within the organization in management, employee reactions, which have negative consequences for institutions such as organizational silence, may emerge.The negative situation and conditions within the organization cause the employees to remain indifferent and silent towards their organizations (Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Edmonson, 2003; Ruçlar, 2013). This behavior prevents the emergence of new ideas and thoughts, creativity and organizational synergy within the organization (Gül and Özcan, 2011: 114).

The concept of organizational silence has an important place in terms of educational organizations.Creating an environment with a sincere and democratic atmosphere in which teachers who take charge and take responsibility for the realization of these goals can feel comfortable and safe in schools established to achieve the goals of education contributes to the increase of their performance levels (Şişman, 2012).In institutions where employees are subjected to repressive attitudes and mobbing behaviors, employees show self-protection and fear-based silence behaviors.This causes the organizational performance to be negatively affected (Gül and Özcan, 2011; Özcan, 2011; Sarıoğlu, 2013; Yüceler, Şahin, Şahin, and Demirsel, 2013).

Employees generally avoid informing the senior management about the problems and wrong practices that arise in the organization or, as Bursalıoğlu (2013) stated, they soften them and try to convey them with explanations that reduce the intensity of the possible manager response. The factors behind the types of behavior of employees also vary. Employees will be perceived as problematic, mediator, gossip and complainant within the organization; Therefore, they exhibit such behaviors with the fear that their relations with the organization will be damaged and that they will get reaction from the senior management (Edmonson, 2003; Morrison and Hewlin, 2003; Bildik, 2009; Brinsfield, Edwards and Greenberg, 2009; Kahveci, 2010; Afşar, 2013; Milliken, Morrison and Hewlin, 2003). Employees who act with such a point of view are faced with the inability to show sufficient performance, to reveal the requirements of open communication, and to express their ideas and thoughts clearly (Scheufele and Moy, 2000; Shoemaker, Breen and Stamper, 2000). This situation faced by the employees creates an effect that reinforces and strengthens the organizational silence. However, managers should create environments where their employees express themselves in order to maintain the existence of the organization, to ensure effectiveness and to adapt to changing environmental conditions (Vakola and Boudoras, 2005; Bildik, 2009).

In organizations which organizational silence prevails, the intellectual contribution of employees to the organization decreases (Bowen and Blackmon, 2003), they adopt a distant stance in demonstrating expected behaviors in contributing to information sharing, being sensitive to organizational problems, supporting innovation and change, and developing creative ideas (Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Bowen and Blackmon, 2003; Huang, Van de Vliert and Van der Vegt, 2005; Tangirala and Ramanujam, 2008; Çakıcı, 2007; Ellis and Dyne, 2009; Perlow and Repenning, 2009; Bayram, 2010; Gül and Özcan, 2011; Yangın and Elma, 2017).

The silence of the individual prevents him from expressing his problems, thoughts and concerns clearly; This situation causes the sense of commitment, trust, appreciation and support to the organization to decrease (Detert and Edmondson, 2005; Çakıcı, 2008;Bayram, 2010). The aforementioned factors damage the individual's job satisfaction, motivation and trust in the organization, causing a decrease in the excitement about the job and the loss of creativity (Afşar, 2013: 172).For this reason, creative ideas and thoughts should be cared for and rewarded in order to eliminate employee silence in organizations. Managers have important responsibilities in this regard (Kahveci and Demirtaş, 2013a: 52). In this context, managers should create environments where employees can easily express their opinions, intensify collaborative work, and raise awareness of employees on organizational learning.This study was conducted to determine the effect of the power distance school administrators use in the school administration process on teachers' organizational silence. Power distance of the manager is considered to be effective on the silence behaviours of the employees. Acquiescent, prosocial and quisecent silence behaviours of the employees are affected in a negative way as the power distance increases. High power distance causes silence to comprise in organisations. Even if the individuals are encouraged and participation environments are created in high power distance cultures, since inequality is in the foreground, they avoid from public speaking to stand aside conflict situation. Cultural norms like education and gender also affect the individuals' expressing their opinions and thoughts about the organisation (Çakıcı, 2007). As high power distance elicits subservience and dependence behaviours, superiors will not want subordinates to think independently and critically in those societies. Subordinates are desired

to act in line with the instructions given them more than acting by taking initiative from superiors. Due to the evident hierarchical structure, power holders' tendency to impose mobbing to others is pretty much. Superiors generate pressure on subordinates instead of sharing their power. There exists an autocratic management in such organisations and surplus status difference causes mobbing behaviour to come into existence (Özen, 2009; Aktaş and Can, 2012; Sevi and Karanfil, 2016). Since the more power distance of the manager the more his tendency to be authoritarian or it's assumed empployees to perceive in this way, their silence behaviours will show an increase. Teachers' perceptions on power distance will reflect on their attitudes and behaviours. Especially in schools whose informal aspects are strong, the communication between the manager and teacher will be adversely affected from this. In this case, the empployees will be less eager to transmit their ideas and remarks and therefore, it will create and effect to strenghten silence behaviour. The findings gained as a result of this study, in which the relations between power distance and organisational silence are examined and the problems it created are discussed, are anticipated to contribute to the body of literature, teachers and managers.

The purpose of this study is to determine the perceptions of teachers about the relationship between power distance and organizational silence behaviors. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

- Which level do teachers perceive power distance and organizational silence in their organizations?
- Do teachers' perceptions regardingpower distance and organizational silence differ significantly in terms of the variables of gender, marital status, professional seniority and subject area?
- Is there a significant relationship between teachers' power distance perceptions and organizational silence behaviors?
- Is teachers 'power distance a significant predictor of teachers' organizational silence behaviors?

2. Method

2.1. Research Model

Correlational survey model is applied in studies with two or more variables. The model is a descriptive one that aims to examine the relationship between the determined variables and, if any, the distribution and change of this relationship (Karasar, 1995). The dependent variable of the study is teachers' organizational silence behavior levels. The independent variable of the research isthe level of power distance perceived by teachers.

2.2. Population and Sample

The research population consists of 9824 teachers working in primary, secondary and high schools in central districts of Samsun such as Atakum, Canik, İlkadım and Tekkeköy during the 2019-2020 academic year. Data on the number of teachers were obtained from Samsun Provincial Directorate of National Education. The sample of this research was determined by simple random sampling method. The sample of the study consists of 552 teachers working in primary, secondary and high schools in the population. Considering the fact that the maximum number of samples to be selected over 25000 populations should be 378 (Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan, 2004), it was seen that the sample determined for the study represented the population and was sufficient.

2.3. Distributions Regarding Demographic Variables

The frequency and percentage distribution of the personal information of the teachers participating in the research is given in the following Table 1.

As seen in Table 1, 61.2% of the sample group is female and 38.8% is male. Considering the distribution of the participants according to their marital status, it is seen that married teachers take the first place (80.4%). In the last place are single teachers with 19.6%. Considering the distribution of professional seniority of the participants, those with a seniority of 16 years or more took the first place (34.4%), followed by those with a seniority of 6-10 years with 31.0%, followed by senior teachers of 11-15 years with 23%. In this study, senior teachers of 1-5 years were represented with 11.6%. 68.1% of the study group is branch teachers. Classroom teachers were represented with 31.9% in this study.

Table 1.*Personal Information of the Teachers Participating in the Research*

Variable		Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	338	61,2
	Male	214	38,8
MaritalStatus	Married	444	80,4
	Single	108	19,6
Subjectarea	Class teacher	176	68,1
	Branchteacher	376	31,9
Professional seniority	1- 5	64	11,6
	6- 10	171	31
	11-15	127	23
	16-20	190	34,4
	Total	552	100

2.4. Data Collection Tools

As data collection tool, two differenttools were used in this study. These are *"Power Distance Scale"* developed by Dorfman and Howell (1988) and adapted to Turkish by Akyol (2009), and the *"Organizational Silence Scale"* developed by Dyne, Ang and Botero (2003) and adapted to Turkish by Taşkıran (2010). In the 5-item *"General Power Distance Scale"*, the range of values has been calculated with the formula of "(Maximum value-Smallest value) / Number of degrees" and found as 0.80. In the evaluation of the findings of the problems, 1.00-1.79: "Very low", 1.80-2.59: "Low", 2.60-3.39: "Medium", 3.40-4.19: "High", 4.20-5.00: "Very high" arithmetic mean ranges are based. High scores demonstrate highness of power distance. The scale is one dimensional. Within the scope of this research, the reliability analyzes of the General Power Distance Scale were repeated. The total internal consistency coefficient of the scale was calculated as .689. Organisational silence scale consists of three dimensions called acquiscent silence, prosocial silence and quisecent silence and 15 items. In Organizational Silence Scale the teachers were asked to answer the statements on a 5-point Likert.When factor loads of the adapted Organisational Silence Scale's determined factors are examined, the factor loads are seen to differ between 0,77-0,88. Total variance that the scale evidences is %68,57. The total cronbach's alpha coeeficient for organisational silence was detected as (α)= 0,850. This rating was formed as Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neither Agree, Neither Disagree (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1). The reliability of these scales was tested. Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α) = 0.748 for organizational silence, and cronbach's alpha coefficient for personality traits was found as α 0.747. As a result of the analysis, the fact that the reliability coefficients are over 0.70 shows that the scale used in the research is reliable. Within the scope of this research, the reliability analyzes of the Organizational Silence Scale were repeated. The total internal consistency coefficient of the scale was calculated as 840. The scale has three dimensions called 'acquiscent silence', 'prosocial silence' and quisecent silence. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the acquiscent silence subscale of the scale was found to be α 0.812, .906 for prosocialsilence and 828 for the quisecent silence subscale.

2.5. Data Collection Process

The scales were implemented by the researcher to the teachers face to face at the schools located in Samsun central district after receiving necessary permissions. After necessary explanations, teachers requested to fill in the scales voluntarily**.**In the first stage, all scales answered were examined one by one by the researcher and the scales that were not filled in were canceled. Later, a code (ID) number was given to the data that was understood to be filled in properly - all measurement tools collected. Data entries were made in the SPSS program, respectively. After all data was entered, it was investigated whether the data was properly entered. After it was understood that there was no problem in data entry, data analysis processes were started.

2.6. Data Analysis

In the data analysis section of the study, the frequency and percentage distributions of the answers given to the questionnaire were found first. Then it was examined whether the data showed normal distribution or not. In the present study, it was determined whether the groups showed normal distribution or not. Skewness and Kurtosis values were checked for normality test. Skewness value was found as .485 in the power distance test and .227 in the organizational silence test. Kurtosis value was -.497 and 1.095, respectively. When Kurtosis and Skewness values are between -1.5 and +1.5, it is accepted to be a normal distribution (Tabachnick and

Fidell, 2013). For this reason, it was understood that the total scores of the two scales showed normal distribution.Descriptive statistical values of general power distance and organizational silence scales were found to answer the first and third research questions of the study. In order to answer the second and fourth research questions, independent group t-test, One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were carried out to test whether there was a significant difference according to the variables of teachers' power distance and organizational silence according to the demographic variables of the research group.When significant differences were obtained with ANOVA, Scheffe test was used as a post-hoc technique for pairwise comparisons. Because the scale distributions were normal, it was decided to use parametric statistical techniques. In cases where the categorical independent variable consists of two categories, the parametric independent group t-test was used when the "n" numbers were above 30. In cases where the categorical independent variable consists of more than two categories, the parametric One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was used when the "n" numbers were above 30. In cases where significant difference was obtained in ANOVA, scheffe test was used as post-hoc technique for paired comparisons. In order to answer the fourth question of the research, Pearson product-moments correlation technique was used to determine the relationship between continuous variables. Finally, simple regression analysis procedures were carried out to test the predictive purpose of the research. The percentage of independent variable affecting the dependent variable was calculated by Cohen's f2. According to Cohen, those f2≥.02 indicate small effect share, those f2≥..15 show medium impact share, and f2≥.35 ones show high effect share.In this study, these values were taken as basis.

$$f^2 = \frac{R^2}{1 - R^2}$$

According to Cohen (1988), f2≥ 0.02, f2≥ 0.15 and f2 ≥ 0.35 represent small, medium and large effect sizes, respectively. In the study, all results were tested bilaterally and the level of significance was accepted as at least 0.05. Significance levels are included in the relevant tables with their exact values. All statistical analyzes of the research were carried out with the SPSS 14.0 program.

2.5. Ethical

In this study, all rules stated to be followed within the scope of "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were followed. Ethical Review Board Name: Ondokuz Mayıs University Ethics Committee. Date of Ethics Evaluation Decision: 30.10.2020 Ethics Assessment Document Issue Number: 2020/676

3. Findings

The findings related to the analysis of the research data are presented below in accordance with the sub-problems of the research.The first sub-problem of the research is expressed as "Which level do teachers perceive power distance and organizational silence in their organizations?The mean and standard deviation values of teachers' perceptions regarding the sub-dimensionsof organizational silence and their perception levels of power distance are given in Table 2.

Table 2.*Descriptive Statistical Values of the Scales Used in the Study*

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	sd
Power Distance total	552	1,00	4,20	2,02	,73
Organizational silence total	552	1,00	4,47	2,60	,55
Acquiscent silence	552	1,00	5,00	2,07	,72
Prosocial Silence	552	1,00	5,00	1,76	,77
Quisecent Silence	552	1,00	5,00	3,96	,85

Once Table 2 is examined, it is revealed that the general power distance perception level of the teachers is X= 2.03and standard deviation is .73. This result (1.80-2.59) is within the limits of the "Low" rating and low power distance means minimizing inequality between people.The teachers' level of perception of organizational silence is X=2.60 and its standard deviation is .55.This result (2.60-3.40) can be explained as teachers perceive organizational silence at a medium level.The average of the "Acquiscent silence " sub-dimension of the Organizational Silence Scale was 2.07 and the average of the "Prosocial Silence " sub-dimension was 1.76.Both

of these averages are within the limits of "I do not agree" and "I do not agree at all".However, the mean of the "Quisecent Silence " sub-dimension of the scale was 3.96 and in the evaluation system of the scale, this value corresponds to "I agree".In other words, teachers stated that organizational silence is at a very high level in the quisecentsilence dimension.

The second sub-problem of the research is expressed as "Do teachers' perceptions regarding power distance and organizational silence differ significantly in terms of the variables of gender, marital status, subject area and professional seniority?" According to the gender variable, the unrelated group t-test was performed to test the significant difference between the teachers' total and sub-dimensions of all scales used in the research, and the results are given in Table 3.

Table 3.*The Differences Between the Overall and Sub-Dimensional Total Scores According to the Marital Status Variable*

The scale	Gender	n	X	ss	t	sd	p
General power distance total	Female	338	1,95	,72	-2,66	550	,008**
	Male	214	2,13	,75			
Organizational silence total	Female	338	2,60	,53	,18	550	,855
	Male	214	2,59	,58			
Acquiscent silence	Female	338	2,05	,70	-,68	550	,493
	Male	214	2,10	,76			
Prosocial Silence	Female	338	1,78	,78	,92	550	,354
	Male	214	1,72	,76			
Quisecent Silence	Female	338	3,97	,81	,10	550	,921
	Male	214	3,96	,91			

*p<.05   **p<.01   ***p<.001

As seen in Table 3, a statistically significant difference was found in the independent group t-test for the Overall Power Distance Scale total scores according to the gender variable (p<.01) and gender variable corresponded %13 of the "Overall Power Distance Scale's" total score variance. It was revealed that male teachers' general power distance perceptions were significantly higher than female teachers. According to the gender variable, no statistically significant difference was found in the independent group t-test for the total and all sub-dimension scores of the organizational silence scale (p>.05). The mean of organizational silence levels of male teachers are similar to female teachers.

According to the marital status variable, the unrelated group t-test was performed to determine the significant difference between the total and sub-dimensions of all scales used in the study of the teachers in the study group, and the results are given in Table 4.

Table 4.*The Differences Between the Overall and Sub-Dimensional Total Scores According to the Marital Status Variable*

Scale	Marital Status	n	X	ss	t	sd	p
General power distance total	Married	444	2,01	,74	-,954	550	,340
	Single	108	2,08	,71			
Organizational silence total	Married	444	2,59	,56	-,473	550	,636
	Single	108	2,62	,52			
Acquiscent silence	Married	444	2,07	,72	-,204	550	,839
	Single	108	2,08	,74			
Prosocial Silence	Married	444	1,76	,78	-,182	550	,856
	Single	108	1,77	,73			
Quisecent Silence	Married	444	3,95	,86	-,583	550	,560
	Single	108	4,01	,80			

*p<.05   **p<.01   ***p<.001

According to the marital status variable, no statistically significant difference was found in the independent group t-test for the total scores of the general power distance scale (p>.05). The general power distance levels of single teachers and the averages of married teachers are at a similar level.

According to the marital status variable, no statistically significant difference was found in the independent group t-test for the total and sub-dimension scores of the organizational silence scale. The characteristics of married and single teachers towards organizational silence are close to each other (p>.05).

According to the subject area variable, the unrelated group t-test was conducted to test the significant difference between the total and sub-dimensions of all scales used in the study by the teachers in the study group, and the results are given in Table 5.

Table 5.*The Differences Between the Overall and Sub-Dimensional Total Scores According to the Subject Area Variable*

Scale	Subject area	n	X	ss	t	sd	p
General power distance total	Class teacher	176	2,11	,78	1,857	550	,064
	Branch teacher	376	1,98	,71			
Organizational silence total	Class teacher	176	2,59	,56	-,149	550	,881
	Branch teacher	376	2,60	,55			
Acquiscent silence	Class teacher	176	1,99	,69	-1,708	550	,088
	Branch teacher	376	2,11	,74			
Prosocial Silence	Class teacher	176	1,77	,75	,242	550	,809
	Branch teacher	376	1,76	,78			
Quisecent Silence	Class teacher	176	4,01	,87	,942	550	,347
	Branch teacher	376	3,94	,84			

*p<.05   **p<.01   ***p<.001

No statistically significant differences were found in the independent group t-test performed for the total power distance scale total, organizational silence scale total and all sub-dimension scores according to the subject area variable (p>.05). General power distance, general characteristics of organizational silence and levels of acquiscent silence, prosocial silence and quisecent silence of classroom and branch teachers are similar to each other.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed in order to test the significant difference between the total and sub-dimensions of all scales used in the study group teachers according to the professional seniority variable, and the results are given in Table 6.

Table 6.*The Differences Between the Overall and Sub-Dimensional Total Scores According to the Professional Seniority Variable (ANOVA)*

Scale	Professional Seniority	n	X	ss	sd	F	p
General power distance total	1-5 years	64	2,12	,64	3-548	1,355	,256
	6-10 years	171	2,07	,77			
	11-15 years	127	2,04	,71			
	16 years +	190	1,94	,74			
	Total	552	2,02	,73			
Organizational Silence	1-5 years	64	2,63	,54	3-548	,818	,484
	6-10 years	171	2,64	,56			
	11-15 years	127	2,60	,54			
	16 years +	190	2,55	,55			
	Total	552	2,60	,55			
Acquiscent silence	1-5 years	64	2,17	,79	3-548	1,150	,328
	6-10 years	171	2,12	,76			
	11-15 years	127	2,01	,69			
	16 years +	190	2,03	,69			
	Total	552	2,07	,72			
Prosocial Silence	1-5 years	64	1,77	,80	3-548	1,146	,330
	6-10 years	171	1,82	,76			
	11-15 years	127	1,80	,77			
	16 years +	190	1,68	,77			
	Total	552	1,76	,77			
Quisecent Silence	1-5 years	64	3,94	,86	3-548	,102	,959
	6-10 years	171	3,98	,78			
	11-15 years	127	3,98	,85			
	16 years +	190	3,94	,91			
	Total	552	3,96	,85			

*p<.05   **p<.01   ***p<.001

According to the variable of seniority, no statistically significant difference was found as a result of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test the significant difference between the total and sub-dimensions of all

scales used in the study group teachers (p>.05). The opinions of teachers with different seniority years on the overall power distance and organizational silence on the total and sub-dimensions are close to each other.

The third sub-problem of the research is expressed as "Is there a significant relationship between teachers' power distance perceptions and organizational silence behaviors?". The relationships between the overall and sub-dimensional total scores of the whole scale applied to the study group is given in the following table 7:

Table 7. *The Relationships Between the Overall and Sub-Dimensional Total Scores of the Whole Scale Applied to the Study Group*

The Scale	General Power Distance Scale	Organizational Silence Scale		
		Total	Acquiscent Silence	Prosocial Silence	Quisecent Silence
General Power Distance Scale	1			
Organizational Silence Scale	.273***	1		
Acquiscent silence	,217***	.787***	1	
Prosocial Silence	,231***	.801***	.710***	1
Quisecent Silence	,136**	.551***	.036	.048	1

*p<.05   **p<.01   ***p<.001

The correlation coefficient calculated between the total scores collected by the "general power distance" scale applied to the teachers and the total scores collected by the "organizational silence" scale is .273.There is a statistically low-level significant positive correlation at the level of .001 between the two scales.Correlation coefficients were calculated between general power distance and organizational silence scale sub-dimensions.

Correlation coefficients of .217 (p<.001) between general power distance total scores and acquiscent silence, .231 (p<.001) between prosocial silence and .136 (p<.01) between quisecentsilence were calculated.All correlation coefficients are positive.Other correlation coefficients are between total and sub-dimensions of organizational silence scale.Asthese are the results related to the construct validity of the aforementioned scale, it has not been interpreted separately here.

In order to identify whether the teachers 'power distance is a significant predictor of teachers' organizational silence behaviors,the simple linear regression analysis was carried out and the results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *Simple Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction of Overall Power Distance Total Scores on Organizational Silence Scale Total Scores*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Content)	2,189	,066		32,986	.000***
General Power Distance Scale	,205	,031	.273	6,647	.000***

R:,273   R²:.074   F: 44,183***

As seen in Table 8, the general power distance variable significantly predicted the total scores of organizational silence; explaining 7.4% of the total variance [R= .273, R2= .074, F= 44,183, p < .001].Considering the significance tests of the regression coefficient, it is revealed that the variable of power distance is a significant predictor oforganizational silence total scores.In addition, Cohen's f2 value was calculated to determine the effect size and f2 = .08 for the total variable of organizational silence.In terms of Cohen (1988) criteria, it can be said that the effect size in the current study is small.

Simple regression analysis results on the prediction of overall power distance total scores on organizational silence scale acquiscent silence sub-dimension total scores are given in the following Table 9.

Tablo 9. *Simple Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction of Overall Power Distance Total Scores on Organizational Silence Scale AcquiscentSilence Sub-Dimension Total Scores*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Content)	1,643	,088		18,600	.000***
General Power Distance	,214	,041	.217	5,218	.000***
R: .217 R²: .047 F:27,228***					

As seen in Table 9, the variable of general power distance significantly predicts organizational silence scale acquiscent silence sub-dimension total scores and explains 4.7% of the total variance [R= .217, R2= .047, F= 27.228, p < .001]

Considering the significance tests of the regression coefficient, the variable of power distance isa significant predictor of acquiscent silence sub-dimension total scores. In addition, Cohen's f2 value was calculated to determine the effect size and f2 = .05 for the total variable of organizational silence.In terms of Cohen (1988) criteria, it can be said that the effect size is low in the current study.

Tablo 10.*Simple Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction of Overall Power Distance Total Scores on Organizational Silence Scale Prosocial Silence Sub-Dimension Total Scores*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Content)	1,274	,094		13,578	.000***
General Power Distance	,243	,043	.231	5,581	.000***
R:,231 R² :.054 F: 31,144***					

As seen in Table 10, the general power distance variable significantly predicted the total scores of the organizational silence scale prosocial silence sub-dimension; [R= .231, R2= .054, F= 31.144, p < .001] explained 5.4% of the total variance.Considering the significance tests of the regression coefficient, the variable of power distance variableis a significant predictor of the organizational silence scale, prosocial silence sub-dimension total scores.In addition, Cohen's f2 value was calculated to determine the effect size and f2 = .057 for the total variable of organizational silence. In terms of Cohen (1988) criteria, it can be said that the effect size in the current study is small.

Table 11.*Simple Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction of Overall Power Distance Total Scores on Organizational Silence Scale Quisecent SilenceSub-Dimension Total Scores*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		StandardizedCoefficients	t	p
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Content)	3,650	,105		34,705	.000***
General Power Distance	,157	,049	.136	3,221	.001***
R:,136 R² :.019 F: 10,376***					

As seen in Table 11, the general power distance variable significantly predicted the total scores of the organizational silence scale's quisecentsilencesub-dimension; [R= .136, R2= .019, F= 10,376, p < .001] explained 5.4% of the total variance.Considering the significance tests of the regression coefficient, the variable of power distanceis a significant predictor of organizational silence scale quisecentsilence sub-dimension total scores.In addition, Cohen's f2 value was calculated to determine the effect size and it was found as f2 = .019 for the total variable of organizational silence. In terms of Cohen (1988) criteria, it can be said that the effect size in the current study is small.

4. Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

As a result of this research, it was revealed that the general power distance perception levels of the teachers were low.This result of the study is similar to the results of different studies on power distance perception levels (Uzun & Tamimi, 2007; Erdoğan et al., 2008). Unlike this research, the researches conducted by Terzi (2004), Çalışkan (2009), Deniz (2013), Gül (2019) and Akyol (2009) found that the power distance perceptions of the participants were at a moderate level. Similarly, the researches carried out by Basım (2000), Gürbüz and Bingöl (2007), Aktaş and Can (2012) and Uslu and Ardıç (2013) revealed that the perceived power distance is

above the medium level. Also, Yaman and Irmak (2010) found a high level of power distance between school principals and teachers in their research.

As a result of this research, it was found that teachers' organizational silence perception levels were medium.This result of the research is in line with the results of different studies on organizational silence (Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Milliken and Morrison, 2003; Tangirala and Ramanujam, 2008; Kahveci, 2010; Batmunkh, 2011; Arılı, 2013; Cemaloğlu et al, 2013; Daşçı, 2014; Dinçer, 2017; Burulday, 2018). They gained the evidence that the teachers experience moderate level organisational silence in these studies. As for some studies which differ from the research results (Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Milliken and Morrison, 2003; Tangirala and Ramanujam, 2008; Kahveci, 2010; Batmunkh, 2011; Cemaloğlu et al, 2013; Arılı, 2013; Daşçı, 2014; Dinçer, 2017; Burulday, 2018) silence levels of the teachers were detected to be high. When sub-dimensions of the silence variable were examined, teachers within the study are seen to internalise prosocial silence by much more staying at prosocial sub-dimension with 3,96 average score. Milliken and Morrison (2000-2003) stated in their research that the ability of the employees of the organization to express their ideas continuously and openly can create an extremely confused environment and stated that the issue of when silence is functional or not should be well determined.It was also emphasized that silence is a beneficial situation for the organization.According to the research, the high level of organizational silence, that is, the silence of teachers, is actually a beneficial situation when it comes before the chaotic environment that Milliken and Morrison (2003) mentioned in their research Milliken and Morrison (2003) stated that individuals are prone to show silence behavior in the face of power, and that the authority and power of the manager is very effective on the subordinate. He stated the authority of the manager to be very effective on the employees working under his power and the individuals to be inclined to exhibit silence behaviour against power. Sınce the authority power of the manager is perceived prominently in the societies with high compliance to the authority, high silence levels of the individuals are considered to be significant in terms of research findings. Owing to the fact that inequality is in the foreground in authocratic cultures, the employees may prefer to stay silent not believing in this situation so much by avoiding public speaking in order not to recounter with the manager even if they are encouraged by the management and participatory work environment is formed (Çakıcı, 2007). Due to the fact that the teachers think the school managers to have mostly authocratic mentality, in other words, since the perception of teachers that managers have high power distance creates the thoughts such as subservience, criticism will harm themselves and also nothing will change at the end, their silence behaviours may come into prominence. The empoyees may asked mostly to act as to the orders given them in this situation. Besides, the power hierarchical structure gives to the manager and the manager's keeping the authocratic power will increase their tendency to apply mobbing on employees and their silence behaviors will also increase (Özen, 2009; Aktaş and Can, 2012; Sevi and Karanfil, 2016). In addition, there exists unity and solidarity thoughts and sustaining the relationships with the other partners belief in collectivistic culture's core (Hofstede, 2001). In school organisations, both the managers and the teachers and also the other employees are in a position to act in interaction, solidarity and as a team in matters such as teachers' board, branch meetings, educational branches, guard duities, recruitment and usage of lesson tools. In this sense, silence might be a significant reason in employees with respect to their not wishing to break down their relations both among themselves and with the managers. Besides, the teachers show silence behaviour in order not to be perceived as troublemaker at school or with the fear of exclusion. Furthermore, beliefs such as decisions are taken by unilateral managers and the result will not change even if they object to may cause silence behaviours among teachers when it's considered that the school managers are selected in regard to an authoritative perspective in educating and election processes in Turkey, in other words when the power distance is considered to be high. This might be commentated as an individual grew up in Turkish culture may choose prosocial silence in order to protect his colleagues and the school organisation he belongs to, not to damage his friend relationships and not to be excluded from the group. High level of prosocial silence found in the study conducted is similar to some reserach results (Eroğlu, Adıgüzel and Öztürk, 2011; Tülibaş and Celep, 2014; Ballı and Çakıcı, 2016). Unlike these studies, Yangın (2015), Dönmez (2016), Karahan-Çidem (2019) and Moçoşoğlu (2019) found that teachers experience moderate organizational silence in their studies.

4.1. Results of Teachers' Power Distance Perceptions on Demographic Variables

As a result of the research, it was found that the power distance perceptions of the teachers according to the gender variable showed a statistically significant difference, and it was determined that the general power

distance characteristics of male teachers were significantly higher than female teachers.This result of the research is similar to the results of different researches on power distance perception levels (Gül, 2019; Karaçelebi, 2016; Ulus, 2018). Unlike this research,Turan, Durceylan and Şişman (2005), Akyol (2009), Macit (2010), Altınkurt and Yılmaz (2012), Jahangirov (2012), Yıldırım and Deniz (2014), Ateş (2019), Ersoy (2019), Can, Kaptanoğlu and Halo (2018), and Zıblım (2020) concluded that the perception of power distance does not differ according to gender.

A great majority of school managers in Turkey consists of males. Social and cultural codes envisage male managers to prefer a politer attitude in communication and interaction with female employees on a basis of courtesy and their attitudes and behaviours to correspond with this code. The managers also may be told to behave accordingly to this code at schools. The managers can be told to make power distance more intensely felt intheir relations with male employees. This may emerge as a stricter, distanced and authoritative behaviour to male employees.

In terms of the teachers' marital status, branch, seniority variables, a significant difference was not found among total scores of Overall Power Distance Scale and remarks of the teachers were similar to each other with regards to these variables. This might be because the effect of manager on these variables are perceived close by the participants. Males teachers perceive the manager to use more power and females less in this situation. This indicates the manager or the administrator to behave more politely to females. Or females may not feel power distance as they are not on management duities much. Power distance is perceived in differently based on intersocial cultural differences. The supreme significant difference between the societies with high and low power distance is about in which level is this power distributed more than unequal distribution of it (Kemikkıran, 2015).

According to the marital status variable, it was found that the power distance perceptions of the teachers did not show a statistically significant difference.The general power distance levels of single teachers and the averages of married teachers are at a similar level.Similar results have revealed as a result of research conducted by Turan, Durceylan, and Şişman (2005), Deniz (2013) and Kocabıyık (2017). As a result of the research, the averages of married teachers were found to be at the same level with the averages of single teachers.As a result of the research, it was found that the power distance perceptions of the teachers did not show a statistically significant difference according to the subject area variable. It was revealed that general power distance, general characteristics of organizational silence and levels of acquiscentsilence, prosocial silence and quisecent silence of class and branch teachers are similar to each other.Similar results have revealed as a result of the researches carried out by Macit (2010), Deniz (2013) and Ateş (2019).

According to the variable of professional seniority, it was found that the power distance perceptions of the teachers did not show a statistically significant difference.The opinions of teachers with different seniority years on the overall power distance and organizational silence on the total and sub-dimensions are close to each other.This result of the study is similar to the results of different studies (Akyol, 2009; Deniz, 2013; Ateş, 2019; Güven, 2018) on power distance perception levels.Unlike these studies, Altınkurt, Yılmaz, Erol and Salalı (2014) and Kocabıyık (2017) concluded in their studies that teachers' opinions differ in all dimensions according to the variable of professional seniority. Kocabıyık (2017) stated that the difference is between teachers with 6-15 years of professional seniority and teachers with more than 26 years of professional seniority, in favor of teachers with more than 26 years of professional seniority; Altınkurt, Yılmaz, Erol and Salalı (2014), on the other hand, found that the difference in question is that teachers with 11-20 years of seniority are of the opinion that school administrators use their power resources more than teachers with 10 years or less of experience.

4.2. Results of Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Silence on Demographic Variables

No statistically significant difference was found for the gender variable. According to the results of the research, female teachers and male teachers exhibit similar silence behaviors.While this result of the study is similar to some research results (Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Ünlü, Hamedoğlu and Yaman, 2015; Dal, 2017; Önder, 2017; Demir and Cömert, 2018), it also differs with some research results (Brisfield, 2009; Çakıcı , 2010; Kahveci and Demirtaş, 2013; Tülibaş and Celep, 2014; Çiçek-Sağlam and Yüksel, 2015; Demirtaş and Nacar, 2018; Tulunay and Önder, 2019). In studies that differed from the results of the research, it was found that

female teachers were more silent than male teachers.The reasons for this situation can be explained as the gender perspective and the fact that the majority of the managers are male.

As a result of the research, it was concluded that the organizational silence perceptions of the teachers did not show a statistically significant difference according to the marital status variable. In other words, it was concluded that teachers' being married or single does not make any difference on silence.This result of the research is similar to the results of different studies on organizational silence (Özdemir, 2015; Sevgin, 2015; Aydın, 2016; Aktaş 2019; Gülenç, 2019; Varol, 2021).Unlike these studies, according to the meta-analysis study conducted by TulunayAteş and Önder (2019), it was concluded that marital status had a weak effect on organizational silence.In some studies, it has been found that married teachers are more silent than single teachers (Tulunay and Önder, 2019). In that regard, it can be argued that the fact that married teachers have more responsibilities than single teachers has an effect on their silence.

As a result of the research, it was found that teachers' perceptions of organizational silence did not show a statistically significant difference according to the subject area variable.The general characteristics of organizational silence and the levels of acquiscent silence, prosocial silence and quisecent silence of classroom and branch teachers are similar to each other.This result of the research is in line with the results of different studies on organizational silence (Alpaslan, 2010; Ruçlar, 2013; Sevgin, 2015; Çavuş, Develi and Sarıoğlu, 2015; Ünlü, Hamedoğlu and Yaman, 2015, Balkan-Akan and Oran, 2017; Uçar, 2017; Bağ and Ekinci, 2018; Dal and Atanur Baskan, 2018). Unlike these studies, in the study conducted by Çiçek-Sağlam and Yüksel (2015), it was concluded that classroom teachers' perceptions of organizational silence were higher than other branches.

As a result of the research, it was found that teachers' perceptions of organizational silence did not show a statistically significant difference according to the variable of professional seniority.The opinions of teachers with different seniority years on the overall power distance and organizational silence on the total and sub-dimensions are close to each other.This result of the research is similar to the results of different studies on organizational silence (Özdemir, 2015, Burulday, 2018; Aktaş, 2019).Unlike these studies, Özdemir and Sarioğlu Uğur (2013), Dal (2017), Doğan (2017) and Uçar (2017) have concluded that the organizational silence scale scores of teachers differ according to the variable of professional seniority.While Gülenç (2019) found that teachers with 1-10 years of seniority had higher organizational silence scale scores than teachers with 11-20 years of seniority, Özdemir (2015) and Yüksel (2015) found that younger teachers showed more organizational silence behavior.

4.3. The Relationships Between Teachers' Perceived Power Distance in School Management and Their Organizational Silence Perceptions

As a result of the research, it was found that there is a statistically significant positive relationship between teachers' perception of organizational power distance and their perception of organizational silence.This result can be interpreted as the organizational silence of teachers increases as the power distance of administrators increases. Similar findings were reported by Yalçınsoy (2017) and Sarı-Aytekin, et al. (2017). According to their findings, employees feel themselves under the pressure of workload and exhibit silence behavior to protect the institution and/or their friends.Alqarni (2020) states in her research that there is a strong relationship between the behavior of school administrators and the silence of teachers. Similarly, Vakola and Bouradas (2005) emphasized that the state of silence is related to the behavior of managers and the opportunities they create in communication. Dankoski, Bickel and Gusic (2014) argued that communication disorders that cause silence in the organization can stop the progress in organizations, and that it is essential for managers to communicate correctly with employees in order to prevent this. In this sense, it can be asserted that administrators with high power distance generally maintain communication in an official dimension, while teachers react to this situation by being silent.

Once the results of the research are compared with other studies, the effects of managerial behaviors on silence are supported by many studies. Accordingly, Sargut (2010) argued in his research that silence can be prevented as a result of the transformational leadership supporting and listening to the employee, while in interactional leadership, the punishment-reward method silences the employee, Güçlü, Çoban, and Atasoy (2017) identified the positive effect of strategic leadership on organizational silence,Işık and Paşa (2017) found the positive effect of ethical leadership on silence, Demirtaş and Küçük (2019) investigated the negative effect of toxic leadership

on employee silence and they drew attention to what positive or negative the power distances used by the administrators can cause on the teachers with their researches. These studies show that the power distance that administrators use in the school management process has a very important effect on organizational silence.Teachers who perceive that the power distance is highcan retreat into silence in order not to get negative reactions from the administrators despite knowing the deficiencies of the administrators (Bildik, 2009), to be alienated from the work environment by receiving negative feedback from their administrators and colleagues (Afşar, 2013; Üçok and Torun, 2015; Aydın, 2016) with the perceptions that something will not change even if I say it (Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Arlı, 2013; Tülibaş and Celep, 2014; Idowu, 2019). In conclusion, it is determined that there is a significant relationship between the general power distance total score variable and the teachers' organizational silence scores. It is identified that power distance variableis a significant predictor on the organizational silence variable.This means that one of the reasons for silence in the organization is the perceived power distance perception of the behavior of the manager. The general power distance variable significantly predicts the total scores of the prosocial silence sub-dimension of the organizational silence scale and explains 5.4% of the total variance.

Consequently, a significant relation is seen between Overal Power Distance total score variable and organisational silence scores of the teachers. Power distance variable is seen to be a significant precursor on organisational silence variable. Overall Power Distance variable significantly predicts organisational silence scale prosocial silence sub-dimension's total scores and clarifies %5.4 of total variance. This consequence shows that one of the main reasons of the silence perceived by the teachers is the way of manager's to use power. The schools are the leading organisations where communication and interaction is the most intense. If the school managers wish to effect the teachers, increase their productivity and performances, they are in a position to create a more participatory and transparent environment which supports creativity. Undoubtedly, there may be lots of underlying psychosocial factors in teachers' organisational silence. Most especially, qualitative or mixed studies will reveal the depth of these factors and implementation of these studies will clarify the confusion in the aspects of perception and action in the field.

5. References

Acaray, A., & Şevik, N. (2016). Kültürel boyutların örgütsel sessizliğe etkisi üzerine bir araştırma, *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34(4),1-18.

Afşar, L. (2013). *Örgütsel sessizlik ve örgütsel güven ilişkisi: Konuya ilişkin bir araştırma* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Aktaş, E. (2019). *İlkokul öğretmenlerinin okul kültürü algı düzeylerinin incelenmesi* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Aktaş, M. & Can, A. (2012). Yöneticilerin kültürel değerleri ve izleyici davranışı tercihleri. *Ege Akademik Bakış*,12(2), 239-249.

Akyol, Ş. (2009). *Örgüt kültüründe güç mesafesi ve liderlik ilişkisi* [Doktora Tezi]. Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Alqarni, S. A. Y. (2020). How school climate predicts teachers' organizational silence. *Academic Jurnals.* 12(1), 12-27.

Alparslan, A. M. (2010). *Örgütsel sessizlik iklimi ve iş gören sessizlik davranışları arasındaki etkileşim* [Yüksek Lisans Tez]. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi, Burdur.

Altay, H. (2004). Güç mesafesi, erkeklik-dişilik ve belirsizlikten kaçınma özellikleri ile başarı arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(1), 301-321.

Altınkurt, Y., Yılmaz, K., Erol, E., & Salalı, E. T. (2014). Okul müdürlerinin kullandığı güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm algıları arasındaki ilişki. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 3(1), 25-52.

Arılı, D. (2013). İlkokul müdürlerinin örgütsel sessizlik ile ilgili görüşleri. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(2), 69-84.

Ateş, A. (2019). *Öğretmenlerin mizaçları ile güç mesafesi algıları arasındaki ilişki* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Aydın, F. (2016). *Ortaokul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları örgütsel güç türleri ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik davranışları* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Denizli.

Bağ, D., & Ekinci, C. E. (2018). Öğretim elemanlarında örgütsel sessizlik davranışı, nedenleri ve sonuçları. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 15 (1), 567-580.

Ballı, E., & Çakıcı, A. (2016).Otel işletmelerinde çalışanların örgütsel bağlılığının örgütsel sessizlikleri üzerindeki etkisi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi.20(2),79-98.*

Balkan-Akan, B. & Oran, Ç. (2017). Akademisyenlerin örgütsel sessizlik algıları: Konuya ilişkin bir uygulama. *Kırklareli Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6 (5), 72-90.

Basım, N. (2000). Belirsizlikten kaçınma ve güç mesafesi kültürel boyutları bağlamında asker yöneticiler üzerine görgül bir araştırma. *Kara Harp Okulu Bilim Dergisi, 2,* 33-53.

Batmunkh, M. (2011). *Liderlik tarzları ile örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişki ve bir araştırma* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Bayrak, S. (2000). Yönetimde Bir İhmal Konusu Olarak Güç ve Güç Yönetimi. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi 5(2), 21-34.

Bayram, T. Y. (2010). *Üniversitelerde örgütsel sessizlik* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.

Bildik, B. (2009). *Liderlik tarzları, örgütsel sessizlik ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Gebze.

Botero, I. C., & Van Dyne, L. (2009). Employee voice behavior interactive effects of lmx and power distance in the united states and colombia. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 23(1), 84-104.

Bowen, F., & Blackmon, K. (2003). Spirals of silence: The dynamic effects of diversity on organizational voice. *Journal Of Management Studies, 40*(6), 1393-1417.

Brinsfield, C. T., Edwards, M. S., & Greenberg, J. (2009). Voice and silence in organizations: Historical review and current conceptualizations. In J. Greenberg, and M. S. Edwards (Eds.), *Voice and silence in organizations* (pp. 3-37). Emerald.

Brockner, J. , Ackerman, G. , Greenberg, J. , Gelfand, M. J. , Francesco, A. M. , Chen, Z. X. , Leung, K. , Bierbrauer, G. , Gomez, C. , Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. (2001). Culture and procedural justice: the influence of powerdistance on reactions to voice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(4), 300-315.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2003). *Eğitim yönetiminde teori ve uygulama.* Pegem.

Burulday, V. (2018). *Ortaokullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık, örgütsel sessizlik ve örgütsel tükenmişlik davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Fırat Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Elazığ.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2005). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* (5.baskı). Pegem.

Can, E., Kaptanoğlu, S., & Halo, L. M. (2018). Akademisyenlerde cam tavan sendromunun güç mesafesi ile ilişkisi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Öneri Dergisi*, *13*(50), 52-64.

Cemaloğlu, N., Daşçı E., & Şahin, F. (2013). İlköğretim kurumlarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik yaşama nedenleri: Nitel bir çalışma. *TheJournal of AcademicSocialScience*, *1*(1), 112-124.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical poweranalysisforthebehavioralsciences*. Lawrance Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Çakıcı, A. (2010). *Örgütlerde işgören sessizliği, neden sessiz kalmayı tercih ediyoruz?* Detay.

Çakıcı, A. (2007). Örgütlerde sessizlik: sessizliğin teorik temelleri ve dinamikleri. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *16*(1), 145-162.

Çalışkan, S. C. (2009). Turizm işletmelerinde liderlik tarzları ve lider-üye etkileşimi kalitesi üzerine bir çalışma. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *11*(2), 219-241.

Çavdar, M. (2021). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel güç mesafesi algılarının incelenmesi (Diyarbakır İli Örneği), *Uluslararası Akademik Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*,*7* (10), 107-136.

Çavuş, M. F., Develi, A., & Sarıoğlu, G. S. (2015). Mobbing ve örgütsel sessizlik: Enerji sektörü çalışanları üzerine bir araştırma. *İşletme ve İktisat Çalışmaları Dergisi, 3*(1), 10-20.

Çiçek-Sağlam, A., & Yüksel, A. (2015). Liselerde görev yapan öğretmen ve yöneticilerin örgütsel sessizliğe ilişkin görüşleri. *TurkishStudies-International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkishor Turkic, 10* (7) , 317-332.

Dal, H. (2017). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarında örgütsel sessizliğe ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Dal, H., & Atanur Baskan, G. (2018). Ortaöğretim kurumlarında örgütsel sessizliğe ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *24*(1), 45-91.

Demirtaş, Z., & Nacar, D. (2018). Öğretmenlerin iş doyumu ve örgütsel sessizlik algıları arasındaki ilişki. *Educational Reflections*, *2*(1), 13-23.

Dankoski, M. E., Bickel, J., & Gusic, M. E. (2014). Discussing the undiscussable with the powerful: Why and how faculty must learn to counteract organizational silence. *Academic Medicine, 89*(12), 1610-1613.

Daşcı, E. (2014). *İlköğretim kurumu yöneticilerinin liderlik tarzları ile öğretmenlerin yaşadıkları yıldırma (mobbing) ve örgütsel sessizlik davranışları arasındaki ilişki* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

De Mooij, M., & Hofstede, G. (2010). The Hofstede model: Applications to global branding and advertising strategy and research. *International Journal of advertising*, *29*(1), 85-110.

Demirtaş, Z., & Küçük, Ö. (2019). Okul müdürlerinin toksik liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizliği arasındaki ilişki. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1-18.

Deniz, A. (2013). *Okullarda güç mesafesi ve örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Balıkesir.

Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A.C. (2005). No exit, no voice: The blind of risky voice opportunaties in organizations. *Academy of Managemenet Proceedings*, 1-6.

Dinçer, H. (2017*). İş yerinde yıldırma ve örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişki: Enerji sektörü üzerine bir araştırma* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Doğan, S. (2017). Liselerde çalışan öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık ile örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişkinin saptanması, *Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *3*, (1), 162-206.

Dönmez, E. (2016). *Örgütsel sosyalleşme ile örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişki* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Denizli.

Dörtyol, İ. T. (2012). *Ulusal kültürün algılanan hizmet kalitesi ve algılanan müşteri değeri üzerindeki etkisi: turizm sektöründe bir araştırma* [Doktora Tezi]. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sivas.

Dyne, L. V., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. (2003), Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee Voice as Multidimensional Constructs. *Journal of Management Studies, 40*(6), 1359-1392.

Durak, İ. (2012). *Korku kültürü ve örgütsel sessizlik*. Ekin.

Edmonson, A. C. (2003). Speakingup in theoperatingroom: How team leaders promote learning in ınterdisciplinary action teams. *Journal of Management Studies, 40*(6), 1419-1452.

Ellis, J. B., & Dyne, L. V. (2009). Voice and silence as observers' reactionstodefensivevoice: Predictionbased on communicationcompetencetheory. In J. Greenberg, and M.S. Edwards (Eds.), *Voice and silence in organizations*(pp. 37-61). Emerald.

Elma, C. (2013). The predictive evalue of teachers" perception of organizationaljustice on jobsatisfaction. *Egitim Arastirmalari-EurasianJournal of EducationalResearch*, 51, 157-176.

Erdoğan, Y., Yaman, E., Şentürk, Ö., & Kalyoncu, E. (2008). Web tabanlı eğitimde güç mesafesi: Bilgi üniversitesi örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, *6*(15), 115-137.

Eren, E. (2006). *Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi* (9. Baskı). Beta.

Eroğlu, A. H. Adıgüzel, O., & Öztürk, U. C. (2011). Sessizlik girdabı ve bağlılık ikilemi: İşgören sessizliği ile örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi ve bir araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, *16* (2), 97-124.

Ersoy, E. (2019). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel güç mesafesi ile örgütsel sinerji düzeyi arasındaki ilişki [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Kültür Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Ertürk, E. (2014). *Sosyal mübadele teorisi bağlamında güç mesafesi ve örgütsel adalet algılamalarının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerindeki etkisi* [Doktora Tezi]. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.

Güçlü, N., Çoban, Ö., & Atasoy, R. (2017). Okul yöneticilerinin stratejik liderlik özellikleri ile örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişkinin öğretmen görüşlerine göre incelenmesi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, *46*(215), 167-191.

Gül, Ö. (2019). *Okullardaki güç mesafesinin lider üye etkileşimi üzerine etkisi* [Doktora Tezi]. Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.

Gül, H., & Özcan, N. (2011). Mobbing ve örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişkiler: Karaman İl özel idaresinde görgül bir çalışma. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 2, 80-134.

Gülenç, E. (2019). *Temel eğitim ve orta eğitim kurumlarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin mobbing yaşama düzeyleri ile örgütsel sessizlik, örgütsel sinizm ve örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki ve bunların bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Gürbüz, S., & Bingöl, D. (2007). Çeşitli örgüt yöneticilerinin güç mesafesi, belirsizlikten kaçınma, eril-dişil ve bireyci-toplulukçu kültür boyutlarına yönelik eğilimleri üzerine görgül bir araştırma. *Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi*, *6*(2), 68-87.

Güven, Z. (2018). *Bahçeşehir üniversitesi telekomünikasyon işletmelerinde güç mesafesi algısı (bir araştırma)* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Hicks, H. G., & Gullet, C. R. (1981). *Management.* McGraw Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Cultures consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations acrossnations*. Sage.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. & Minkov, M. (2010).*Culturesandorganizations: Software of The mind*. McGrawHill.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2*(1), 2-26.

Huang, X., Van de Vliert, E., & Van der Vegt, G. (2005). Breaking the silence culture: Stimulation of participation and employee opinion with holding cross-nationally. *Management and Organization Review, 1*(3), 459-482.

Idowu, O. F. (2019). Employees' expectation and organizational silence. Annals of "Dunarea de Jos" University of Galati Fascicle I. *Economics and Applied Informatics*, *25*(1), 93-102.

Jahangirov, N. (2012). *Kültürel bir değişken olarak güç mesafesi ve cam tavan engeli arasındaki ilişkiler üzerine ampirik bir araştırma* [Yüksek Lisans Tez,]. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Kahveci, G. (2010). *İlköğretim okullarında örgütsel sessizlikle örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkiler* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ.

Kahveci, G., & Demirtaş, Z. (2013a). Okul yöneticisi ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik algıları. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *38*(167), 50-64.

Kahveci, G., & Demirtaş, Z. (2013b). Öğretmenler için örgütsel sessizlik ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *12*(43), 167-182.

Karaçelebi, F. (2016). *Algılanan güç mesafesinin işletmenin personel güçlendirme faaliyetlerine etkisi* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

Karahan-Çidem, E. (2019). *Ortaokullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik algılarının değerlendirilmesi* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sivas.

Kemikkıran, N. (2015). Güç mesafesi yüksekse eşitsizlik mi istenir? *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, *70*(2), 317-344.

Karasar, N. (1995). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Anı.

Kocabıyık, M. (2017). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıklarının yordanmasında, okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç mesafesi ve örgütsel adaletin etkisi*[Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. SabahattinZaimÜniversitesi, İstanbul.

Köksal, K. (2007). *Yükseköğretimde örgüt kültürü ve alan araştırması* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Balıkesir.

Macit, G. (2010). *İletişim tarzları üzerinde kültürel değerlerin etkisi: Mehmet Akif Ersoy üniversitesi öğrencileri üzerinde bir araştırma* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta

Magee, J. C., & Smith, P. K. (2013). The social distance theory of power. *Personality and Social Psychology Review,17*(2), 158-186.

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrierto changeand development in a pluralistic world. *The Academy of Management Review*, *25*(4), 706-725.

Milliken F. J., Morrison E. W., & Hewlin P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, *40* (6), 1453-1476.

Moçoşoğlu, B. (2019). *Okullardaki iş yeri ruhsallığı, örgütsel sessizlik ve seslilik arasındaki ilişki* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Harran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Şanlıurfa.

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *The Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 706-725.

Önder, E. (2017). Ortaöğretim okullarında örgütsel sessizliğin yordayıcısı olarak örgütsel adalet ve örgütsel bağlılık. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* (KEFAD). 18(2), 669-686.

Özcan, N. (2011). *Mobbingin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerine etkisi ve örgütsel sessizlik: Karaman il özel idaresinde bir uygulama* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Karaman.

Özdemir, Ş. (2015). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin örgütsel sessizlik ve örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki (İstanbul ili-Ümraniye ilçesi örneği)* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Özdemir, L., & Sarıoğlu Uğur, S. (2013). Çalışanların örgütsel ses ve sessizlik algılamalarının demografik nitelikler açısından değerlendirilmesi: Kamu ve özel sektörde bir araştırma. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, *27* (1), 257-281.

Özen, Ö. (2009). *Örgüt kültürünün mobbing davranışı üzerine etkisi* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Trabzon.

Perlow, L. A., & Repenning, N. P. (2009). The dynamics of silencing conflict. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 29*, 195–223.

Pinder, C. C., & Harlos, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. *Research in Personel and Human Resources Management*, *20*, 331-369.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Örgütsel davranış* (İ. Erdem, Çev.). Nobel.

Ruçlar, K. (2013). *Örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişki-sakarya ili örneği* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Sakarya üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

Sarı-Aytekin, S., Sis-Atanay, E. & Okan, T. (2017). Örgütsel sessizlik kültürel bir sonuç mudur? *International Journal of Academic Value Studies*, *3*(13), 316–327.

Sarıoğlu, G. S. (2013). *Mobbing ve örgütsel sessizlik: Enerji sektörü çalışanları üzerine bir araştırma* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi].Osmaniye Korkut Ata Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Osmaniye.

Sargut, A. S. (2010). *Kültürler arası farklılaşma ve yönetim*. İmge.

Scheufele, D. A., & Moy, P. (2000). Twenty-fiveyears of the spiral of silence: A conceptual review and empirical outlook. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 12*(1), 3-28.

Sevgin, A. (2015). *Liselerde çalışan öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık ile örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişkinin saptanması* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Aydın Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Sevi, Ü. Y., & Karanfil, D. (2016). Kadına yönelik yakın partner şiddeti: Güç mesafesi, bireycilik ve ekonominin etkisi. *International Journal of Human Science*, 13(1), 60-71.

Shoemaker, P. J., Breen, M., & Stamper, M. (2000). Fear of socialisolation: Testing an assumption from the spiral of silence. *Irish Communications Review, 8,* 65-78.

Şişman, M. (2012). *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi.* Pegem.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson.

Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2008). Employee silence on critical work issues: The cross level effects of procedural justice climate, *Personnel Psychology*, *61*, 37-68.

Taşkıran, E. (2010). *Liderlik tarzının örgütsel sessizlik üzerindeki etkisinde örgütsel adaletin rolü ve bir araştırma* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Terzi, A. R. (2004). Üniversite öğrencilerinin güç mesafesi ve belirsizlikten kaçınma algıları üzerine bir araştırma. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* 65-76.

Turan, S., Durceylan, B., & Şişman, M. (2005). Üniversite yöneticilerinin benimsedikleri idari ve kültürel değerler. *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 13*, 181-202.

Tulunay Ateş, Ö., & Önder, E. (2019). Eğitimcilerin örgütsel sessizliklerinde cinsiyetin ve medenî durumun etkisi: bir meta analiz çalışması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *34*(3), 786-803.

Tülibaş, T., & Celep, C. (2014). Öğretim elemanlarının sessiz kalma nedenleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29(1), 280-297.

Uçar, R. (2017). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 10(ERTE Özel Sayısı),* 209-232.

Ulus, A. B. (2018). *Çalışanların güç mesafesi ve örgütsel adalet algılarının politik davranışlar ile ilişkilerinin incelenmesi üzerine bir araştırma*[Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Kastamonu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kastamonu.

Uslu, A., & Ardıç, K. (2013). Güç mesafesi örgütsel güveni etkiler mi. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, *15*(2), 313-338.

Uzun, Ö., & Tamimi, Y. (2007). Örgüt kültüründe güç mesafesi boyutunun metaforlarla analizi (Tekstil sektöründe faaliyet gösteren bir işletme örneği). *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *8*(1), 1-26.

Üçok, D., & Torun, A. (2015). Örgütsel sessizliğin nedenleri üzerine nitel bir araştırma. *İş ve İnsan Dergisi*, 2(1), 27-37.

Ünlü, Y., Hamedoğlu, M. A., & Yaman, E. (2015). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algıları ve örgütsel sessizlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *5*(2), 40-157.

Vakola, M., & Bouradas, D. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of organisational silence: An empirical investigation. *EmployeeRelations*, 27(5), 441-458.

Varoğlu, A. K. Basım, H., & Ercil, Y. (2000). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemlerine farklı bir bakış; analitik düşünce-bütünleşik düşünce modellemeleri ile belirsizlikten kaçınma ve güç mesafesi araştırması, *8. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi*, 25-27 Mayıs 2000, 421-444, Nevşehir.

Yalçın, A., & Erçen, A. E. Y. (2004). Kültür ile şekillenen çatışma tepkileri üzerine bir uygulama. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(2), 201-217.

Yangın, D. (2015). *Etkileşim adaleti ve yöneticiye güven ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik davranışları arasındaki ilişki* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Samsun.

Yalçınsoy, A. (2017). Örgütsel sessizlik ve sonuçları. *TheJournal of SocialScience*, 1(1),1-19.

Yaman, E., & Irmak, Y. (2010). Yöneticiler ve öğretmenler arasındaki güç mesafesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7(13), 164-172.

Yangın, D., & Elma, C. (2017).The relationship among interactional justice, manager trust and teachers' organizational silence behavior. *Universal Journal of EducationalResearch, 5(3), 325-333.*

Yazıcıoğlu, Y., & Erdoğan, S. (2004). *Spss uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* Detay.

Yıldırım, B., & Deniz, A. (2014). The relationship between power distance and organizational commitment in primary schools. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 750-760.

Yüceler, A., Şahin, E., Şahin, İ. E., & Demirsel, M. T. (2013). The relationship between mobbing and organizational silence in establishments. *Humanities and Social Sciences Review, 2*(1), 153-161.

Yüksel, R. F. (2015). *Okul çalışanlarının örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel sessizlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Okan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Zıblım, L. (2020). *Okul yöneticilerinin kullandığı güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin güç mesafesi arasındaki ilişki* [Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Muğla.