

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
of
CONTEMPORARY
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

JCER


International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research (IJCER)


www.ijcer.net

The Relationship between Teachers' Perceptions of Compliance with the Psychological Contract and School Administrators' Empowering Leadership Behaviors

Necmi Gökyer¹, İlkay Okay², Berkay Okay³, Umran
Gökyer⁴

¹Firat University,  0000-0001-8107-2388

²Mustafa Kemal Secondary School,  0000-0003-1968-7132

³Mustafa Kemal Secondary School,  0000-0003-4323-2576

⁴Kaya Karakaya Science High School,  0009-0004-2223-
1341

Article History

Received: 01.12.2022

Received in revised form: 13.05.2023

Accepted: 26.05.2023

Article Type: Research Article



To cite this article:

Gökyer, N., Okay, İ., Okay, B. & Gökyer, Ü. (2023). The relationship between teachers' perceptions of compliance with the psychological contract and school administrators' empowering leadership behaviors. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 10(2), 395-410. <https://doi.org/10.52380/ijcer.2023.10.2.319>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes.

According to open access policy of our journal, all readers are permitted to read, download, copy, distribute, print, link and search our article with no charge.

Authors alone are responsible for the contents of their articles. The journal owns the copyright of the articles.

The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of the research material.

The Relationship between Teachers' Perceptions of Compliance with the Psychological Contract and School Administrators' Empowering Leadership Behaviors

Necmi Gökyer^{1*}, İlkay Okay², Berkay Okay², Umran Gökyer³

¹Fırat University

²Mustafa Kemal Secondary School

³Kaya Karakaya Science High School

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between school administrators' empowering leadership behaviors and secondary education (high school) teachers' perceptions of compliance with the psychological contract. The population of the study consists of 2,878 teachers who were working at 47 high schools located in central Elazığ during the 2019–2020 school year. The sample for the study consisted of 470 teachers selected from 12 schools using the stratified sampling method. Data were collected using the "Scale for School Administrator Compliance with Psychological Contract" developed by Koçak (2016) and the "Scale for Teacher Compliance with Psychological Contract". Teacher perceptions of the level to which school administrators displayed empowering leadership behaviors were measured using the Empowering Leadership Behaviors Scale developed by Konczak, Stelly, and Trusty (2000) and adapted to Turkish by Aras (2013). It was found that teachers had high perceptions of school administrator compliance with the psychological contract (SACPC) and that they also had a high level of compliance with the psychological contract (STCPC). Additionally, it was found that teacher perceptions of school administrators displaying empowering leadership behaviors (OYGLD) were also high. Perceptions of teachers who had been working for 7–11 years in the same school regarding school administrator compliance with the psychological contract were higher than those of teachers who had been working in the same institution for 2–6 years. A moderately positive and significant relationship was found between school administrators' and teachers' compliance with the psychological contract and administrators' empowering leadership behaviors. Reinforcing the leadership behaviors of school administrators; does not have a significant effect on coaching sub-dimensions for decision-making, knowledge sharing, and innovative performance on its own.

Keywords: Psychological contract, Compliance with psychological contract, Employee empowerment, Empowering leadership behaviors.

Introduction

The foundations of the psychological contract, which is unwritten and refers to the perceptions of employers and employees regarding their mutual obligations, were laid with job analysis studies conducted by management scientists between 1910 and 1930, human relations studies between 1930 and 1950, and behavioral science studies in the period after the 1950s (Campbell, Bridges, Corbally, Nystrand, & Ramseyer, 1971, p. 112). Argyris (1960, p. 96), who first addressed the concept as a psychological employment contract, studied factory workers and concluded that employees display high performance when the employer respects them and gives them autonomy in the workplace. After this study, the concept was further crystallized in field studies by Levinson, Price, Munden, Mandl, and Soley (1962). Later, Schein (1965) and Kotter (1973) followed the definition made by Levinson et al. and defined it on the basis of an incentive pattern between the employer and employee. In the 1980s, global economic integration and the transformations in the economic structures of states made radical change necessary in the management philosophies of organizations and their functioning (Capelli, Bassi, Katz, Knoke, Osterman, & Oseem, 1997; Özdemir, 2011). Institutional mergers, changes in employee

* Corresponding Author: *Necmi Gökyer, ngokyer@firat.edu.tr*

roles, and the initiation of new management practices gave a new dimension to the relationship between the organization and employees and human behaviors (Mao, Liu, & Ge, 2008; Özdemir, 2014). Accordingly, it has been reported since the 1980s that organizational and employee needs and mutual obligations have developed significantly (Baker, 2009) and that important changes have occurred in the nature of employment relations (Capelli, Bassi, Katz, Knoke, Osterman, & Oseem, 1997, p. 209). Along with these changes in employment relations that mainly concern the individual, the psychological contract has taken on a different meaning from its early definitions. The concept, which was initially based on the totality of mutual expectations, evolved into an understanding of individual perceptions of mutual expectations under Rousseau's influence (1995). After this period, the psychological contract has become the basis for subjective definitions concerning the individual.

Rousseau and Schalk (2000, p. 1) suggest that the psychological contract is a belief system regarding the obligations between the organization and the employee. According to Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1998), psychological contracts appear when employees believe that a promise has been made and agree to fulfill the obligations that fall upon them in return for this promise.

Sometimes defined as the totality of unwritten obligations based on subjective beliefs, the concept (Robbins and Judge, 2013, p. 312) is based on promises that are believed to have been given and the perceptions of whether these promises are fulfilled (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Based on this, teachers may be said to have a set of beliefs regarding the material and moral opportunities and managerial behaviors that the school will provide in return for the instructional and administrative services they provide. In this sense, there is a sense of reciprocal, unwritten, psychological obligation in the relations between teachers and school administrations.

Konczak, Stelly, and Trusty (2000) define empowering leadership behaviors as coaching for giving authority, responsibility, self-determination, knowledge sharing, skill development, and innovative performance. On the school administration's part, it is necessary to (1) ensure that teachers are given authority and responsibility in matters related to instructional activities; (2) create a safe environment in which they can take initiative in educational activities; and (3) openly share the information required for the academic and administrative functioning of the school so that living schools can be created. In addition, it is also necessary to offer development opportunities that will allow teachers to respond to new approaches in education and the evolving performance demands of the profession (Koçak, 2016).

Pont, Nusche, and Hopkins (2012, pp.136-137) found in their study that effective leadership in schools can happen through sharing leadership roles and responsibilities with teachers. They also emphasized that such leaders value development and empowerment. In addition, they stated that leaders in successful schools devote most of their time and energy to the development of teachers, delegate authority to them, and coach them by providing feedback. In the literature, there are theoretical studies dealing with the empowerment of employees in organizations, leadership behaviors related to this, and how these behaviors are reflected on employees, the organization, and the quality of work life (Öztürk and Özdemir, 2003; Yüksel and Erkutlu, 2003; Dogan and Kılıç, 2007; Çavuş, 2008; Demirbilek, 2008; Özel, 2013; Karakaş, 2014), as well as studies on employee empowerment methods and problems experienced in these (Çuhadar, 2005; Akçakaya, 2010; Yukl & Becker, 2012). In addition, there are also studies in the literature on how empowering leadership behaviors affect psychological empowerment (Arslantaş, 2007; Altındaş and Özutku, 2011). These studies argue that empowering leadership behaviors increase organizational effectiveness by empowering employees and emphasize that such behaviors are a necessity for today's organizations.

In studies on teacher empowerment in schools, the focus has been to investigate how these behaviors of school administrators are reflected on teachers. Cerit (2007), in a study that determined the levels of school principals' empowering leadership behavior towards teachers, concluded that according to teacher perceptions, empowering leadership behaviors occurred at a moderate level. Parlar (2012), on the other hand, reached the conclusion that teacher empowerment is an issue neglected or not understood by school administrators. However, a qualitative study found that supportive and empowering leadership behaviors are important in helping teachers develop positive attitudes and feelings about their school relations and the profession (Argon, 2014).

Özdemir (2014, p. 6) argues that effective human resources management in school organizations can only be possible if the expectations of the employees are met at the highest level. Rong (2009) states that these expectations are not only economic but are also socially based. In this sense, in return for the fulfillment of expectations such as career opportunities, material and moral awards, status, and development opportunities, the individual will also make a true effort for the institution, display their talents and skills, and show loyalty and commitment to the organization (Griffin and Moorhead, 2014, p. 64). Kotter (1973), on the other hand, presents a broader perspective and lists employee expectations from the institution as opportunities for personal development, job enrichment, opportunities for diversification of skills, status, and prestige, a collaborative environment, a disciplined, fair, and orderly work environment, the ability for promotion, and an effective feedback system. He lists the expectations of the organization from the individual as reaching results by

working effectively and efficiently, continuous knowledge and skill development, effective time management, benefiting the institution, adopting its aims, working effectively with subordinates and superiors, showing loyalty, and being committed to the institution.

In this study, the psychological contract in schools included the mutual expectations of school administration and teachers. The expectations of teachers from the school included care for their personal happiness, understanding and fairness, fulfillment of their education and development demands, guidance in the school, recognition and rewarding of their efforts, and inclusion in decision processes. On the other hand, the expectations of the school from the teachers were investigated in terms of "effort for institutional development", "loyalty" and "extra performance". Of these, effort for institutional development is related to teachers' use of their professional knowledge and skills to improve school success and prestige. The loyalty dimension is evaluated within the framework of feelings such as continuing to work at school until the retirement of teachers, seeing school problems as their own problems, and owning the school by defending it against others. Until their retirement, they saw school problems as their own and owned the school by defending it against others. Extra performance, on the other hand, was explained as teacher behaviors showing a will to work extra hours outside of expected or legally assigned duties (Koçak ve Burgaz, 2017).

Empowering Leadership Behaviors

The concept of personnel empowerment, which refers to the support provided to employees by management, was first introduced by Block (1986). Personnel empowerment is broadly defined as allowing an employee the authority to make decisions on issues within their work area without orders or approval from a superior (Bowen and Lawler, 1992; Luthans, 2011). In another definition, it refers to providing employees with powers that will motivate them to work most effectively for their organization (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990).

Dogan (2003) lists some of the factors that can be taken into account in the empowerment of employees as participation in management and decision-making, delegation of authority and responsibility, information sharing, innovation, education, and training. Participation in management is defined as employees taking part in determining the actions that need to be taken in line with organizational purposes, in determining the way forward, and in various managerial actions (Rodrigues, 1994). In different definitions in the literature, it is associated with the active role of the employees in the decision-making process, their contribution to this process, and being responsible for the decisions taken (Eren, 2008; Koçel, 2007). The organizational benefits of employee participation in decisions are embracing the decisions taken and ensuring compliance, reinforcing a sense of entrepreneurship, preventing unnecessary conflicts, instilling self-respect and self-confidence in employees, and making full use of potential (Mihçioğlu, 1983). Delegation of authority is the transfer of a manager's rights to employees while still holding the manager responsible for results (Yüksel and Erkutlu, 2003)

Information sharing, which is another empowering factor, refers to results achieved being in line with predetermined objectives. In other words, it refers to the gap between output and criteria not being large and employees having access to all necessary information about their jobs. If managers share the necessary information openly with their subordinates, it will be possible to create an environment of trust within the organization, and in this way, employees will be able to take responsibility and be innovative (Rothstein, 1995). Encouraging innovation is another important empowerment element through which managers can use the talents, skills, and perspectives of their employees and their entrepreneurial potential and turn this into a benefit for the organization (Gebert, Boerner, & Kearney, 2006). Another important factor to be considered in the empowerment of employees is the provision of educational opportunities that will help individuals carry out their duties effectively. Lincoln, Travers, Ackers, and Wilkinson (2002) see education and training as one of the most powerful elements in employee empowerment.

Even though no studies seem to exist that examine the relationships between the psychological contract and empowering leadership in schools (with the exception of the doctoral thesis by Koçak and Burgaz in 2016), the literature includes two studies investigating the relationship between empowering leadership behaviors perceived by employees in different private sectors and showing extra performance (a dimension of the psychological contract). These studies (Raub, 2012; Humborstad, Nerstad, & Dysvik, 2014) have found that empowering leadership behaviors affect employees' extra-performance levels (Koçak & Burgaz, 2017).

All the studies examined show how important the psychological contract and empowering leadership behaviors are for organizations. On the other hand, they also reveal problems in the perceptions of teachers towards the psychological contract and that their expectations are not sufficiently met (Güneş, 2007; Güzelce, 2009; Yılmaz and Altınkurt, 2012; Özdemir and Demircioğlu, 2015; Koçak and Burgaz, 2017). This situation brings to mind the question of what needs to be done in order to improve teachers' perceptions of the psychological contract. At

this point, it is a matter of curiosity whether empowering leadership behaviors are effective in teachers' perceptions of psychological contract. Although there are studies in the literature that explore the relationships between employee empowerment and the psychological contract (Paul, Niehoff, & Turnley, 2000; Kun, Hai - yan & Lin-li, 2007), there is only one empirical study on empowering leadership behaviors and teacher perceptions of the level of compliance with the psychological contract (Koçak and Burgaz, 2017).

For this reason, it is necessary to examine the empowering leadership behaviors that may affect the perceptions of psychological contracts in schools in a positive way.

Purpose

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between the empowering leadership behaviors of school administrators and the perceptions of teachers working in secondary education institutions (high schools) to comply with the psychological contract. For this purpose, answers were sought to the following questions regarding the perceptions of school administrators and teachers regarding the level of compliance with the psychological contract and the empowering leadership behaviors of school administrators:

1. a. Teachers' and school administrators' compliance with the psychological contract,
 - b. Showing the empowering leadership behaviors of teachers and school administrators,
 - c. What are the perceptions of teachers regarding their own psychological contract compliance levels?
2. Do teachers' perceptions of school administrators' level of compliance with the psychological contracts differ significantly according to their tenure at the school?
3. According to teachers' perceptions, is there a significant relationship between school administrators' level of compliance with the psychological contract and their level of compliance with the psychological contract?
4. According to teachers' perceptions, are school administrators' levels of compliance with the psychological contract and their empowering leadership behaviors significant predictors of teachers' levels of compliance with the psychological contract?

Method

As this study focused on the relationships between teacher perceptions of psychological contract and empowering leadership behaviors, a relational survey model was used. Within the framework of this model, quantitative techniques were used in the analysis of the obtained data.

Population and Sample

The population of the study comprised 2878 teachers working at 47 public high schools in the center of Elazığ during the 2019-2020 school year. The sample included 470 teachers selected via stratified sampling from 12 schools. The scales were distributed to the teachers working at the selected schools, and volunteer teachers were asked to fill in the scales with the knowledge of the school administration. Of the 470 data collection tools distributed by the researcher, 359 were returned, and 352 were included in the evaluation as the rest were excluded due to incomplete data. The sample size was calculated based on the 95% confidence interval, and the result showed that the sample size should be at least 341 (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970). Stratified sampling was used as the sampling method, and data were collected from all 12 of the selected schools. The number of teachers to be included in the sample was calculated based on the ratio of the teachers working in the selected high schools to the entire population. Personal information about the 352 teachers included in the sample is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Personal information of the teachers in the sample

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	225	63.9
Female	127	36.1

Years of experience		
1-5 years	67	19.0
6-10 years	61	17.3
11-15 years	52	14.8
16-20 years	72	20.5
21 years and more	one hundred	28.4
Educational Status		
University graduate	281	79.8
Postgraduate	71	20.2
Branch		
Social studies	169	48.0
Science	117	33.2
Special Ability	66	18.8
Duration of service at the school of study		
0-1 year	50	14.2
2-6 years	158	44.9
7-11 years	78	22.2
12-16 years	34	9.7
17-35 years	32	9.1

As shown in Table 1, 63.9% of the 352 teachers included in the study were male and 36.1% were female. Of the teachers, 19.0% had 1–5 years of teaching experience, 17.3% had 6–10 years, 14.8% had 11–15 years, 20.58% had 16–20 years, and 28.4% had 21 years or more. 79.89% of the teachers were university graduates, and 20.2% were postgraduates. 48.0% were teaching social sciences, 33.2% science, and 18.8% special ability. The duration of service at the school was 0–1 year for 14.2% of the teachers, 2–6 years for 44.9%, 7–11 years for 22.2%, 12–16 years for 9.7%, and 17–35 years for 9.1%.

Data Collection Tool

The Psychological Contract Perceptions of School Administrators were determined by the School Administrators' Level of Compliance with the Psychological Contract Scale developed by Koçak (2016). As a result of the reliability analysis, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the single factor scale was calculated at .96. The factor patterns of the scale varied between .66 and .82, and it had a 25-item, single-factor structure. It was seen that the scale explained 57% of the total variance. Validity and reliability studies of the scale were carried out. The Goodness-of-fit results in the DFA conducted for structural validity were [$\chi^2 = 1187.65$; $Sd = 274$; $\chi^2 / Sd = 4.33$; $AGFI = 0.79$; $GFI = 0.83$; $NFI = 0.98$; $CFI = 0.98$; $IFI = 0.98$; $RMR = 0.034$; $RMSEA = 0.08$]. The Cronbach's Alpha (α) value of the scale was calculated as .97. Considering the results of goodness of fit and reliability coefficients, it was concluded that the School Administrators' Level of Compliance with the Psychological Contract Level Scale is a valid and reliable tool for the study (Çelik and Yılmaz, 2013). In this study, as a result of the reliability analysis, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the single-factor scale was calculated at 0.98. The factor loads of the scale vary between .57 and .78 and it has a single factorial structure with 25 items. The scale explained 58% of the total variance.

Teacher perceptions of psychological contract at the school were determined by Koçak's "Teachers' Level of Compliance with the Psychological Contract Scale" (2016). A 26-item, 3-factor scale was obtained, with factor sizes varying between .47 and .72, which explained 53% of the total variance. As a result of the reliability

analysis, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the three-factor scale were as follows: .89 for the "effort for institutional development" factor (11 items); .84 for the "extra performance" factor (9 items); and .80 for the "loyalty" factor (6 items). The value for the total scale was .93. The goodness of fit values as a result of the CFA conducted to test the structural validity of the Teachers' Level of Compliance with the Psychological Contract Scale were $\chi^2 = 788.44$; $Sd = 295$; $\chi^2 / Sd = 2.67$; AGFI=0.80; GFI=0.82; NFI=0.98; CFI=0.99; IFI=0.99; RMR=0.037; RMSEA=0.07]. When the obtained goodness of fit results and reliability coefficients were evaluated, the relevant scale emerged as a valid and reliable tool for this research (Çelik and Yılmaz, 2013). In this study, as a result of the reliability analysis, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the total scale was .92. A 26-item, 3-factor scale was obtained with factor loads ranging between .54 and .74, accounting for 56 % of the total variance of the scale. The Cronbach Alpha reliability value of the first factor of the scale was .93, the second factor was .78 and the third factor was .74. Factors were named parallel to the original scale.

The Empowering Leadership Behaviors Scale used to measure teachers' perceptions of empowering leadership behaviors was adapted to Turkish by Aras (2013). The scale with 18 items has the following dimensions: "authorization and responsibility", "decision-making", "knowledge sharing", "skills development" and "coaching for innovative performance". The necessary analyses were performed while adapting the tool, and the scale was found to be valid and reliable ($\chi^2 / df = 2.710$ ($p > 0.05$); CFI = .908 ; TLI =.885; RMSEA = 0.068). The reliability coefficients for the dimensions were .67, .64, .71, .77 and .73, respectively, and the reliability coefficient for the total scale was calculated as .89. In the present study, the reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions were .86, .89, .92, .94 and .95, respectively. For the total scale, it was .97.

Procedures and Data Analysis

The necessary permissions were obtained from the researchers for all the scales used before the data were collected. The data were analyzed using the SPSS for Windows 21 package. Frequencies and percentages were used to determine the demographic characteristics (gender, branch, years of experience, educational status, years of service at the school, school, and place of work) in the school administrators' level of compliance with the psychological contract scale, teachers' level of compliance with the psychological contract scale, and the empowering leadership behaviors scale. In order to prepare the data for analysis, single-variable and multi-variable analyses were performed, and whether the data showed a normal distribution was examined. Scatter plots, kurtosis, and skewness coefficients showed that the data had a normal distribution and were suitable for multivariate analysis. As the mean of skewness and kurtosis values were in the range of -1.96- + 1.96, this means that the skewness or kurtosis have a value that includes 95% of total values. In other words, this means that they are not among the 5% of extreme values. Therefore, the distribution was accepted to be normal (Morgan, Leech, Gloeckner, & Barret, 2004, p. 49; Can, 2014, p. 85). The simple and dual correlation coefficients between the independent variables were examined, and it was seen that there was a low relationship between 0.00 and .30. Gujarati (1995) states that a CI (condition index) value between 0.00 and .30 is an indicator of a low-level multilinear connection problem (Can, 2014, p. 85; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007, p. 253). Mean and standard deviation values were used in the descriptive analysis of the data, and multi-correlation analysis was used to reveal the relationships between the variables. Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the predictors of teachers' psychological contract compliance levels. In the hierarchical method, predictive variables are analyzed according to an order previously determined by the researcher, and each variable is evaluated in terms of its contribution to the variance of the dependent variable. In this method, independent variables are analyzed block by block, and each one contains one or more independent variables (Green, Salkind, and Akey 1997). Data analysis with this method has been explained in Table 4.

When interpreting arithmetic averages, 1.00-1.79 was considered very low, 1.80-2.59 was considered low, 2.60-3.39 was considered medium, 3.40-4.19 was considered high, and 4.20-5.00 was considered very high. Correlation coefficients between variables were considered high if they were between 0.71-1.00, moderate if between 0.70-0.31, and low if between 0.30-0.00 (Büyüköztürk, 2007, p. 32). The independent group t-test was performed in order to determine whether there was a significant difference between the views expressed based on the variables of gender and education level. Also, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine whether there was a significant difference between the means of the groups in terms of the variables of branch, seniority, and duration of service at the school. The significance level of the tests was taken as .05.

Findings

1. Findings Regarding the Levels of Administrator Compliance with the Psychological Contract, Demonstrating Empowering Leadership Behaviors, and Teacher Compliance with the Psychological Contract According to Teacher Perceptions

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics on psychological contracts and empowering leadership behaviors according to teacher perceptions.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics on variables

Dimensions and Sub-Dimensions	n	\bar{X}	SS
1. SACPC (School Administrators' Level of Compliance with the Psychological Contract)	352	3.64	.98
2. STCPC (School Teachers' Level of Compliance with the Psychological Contract)	352	3.77	.66
Effort for Institutional Development	352	3.70	.93
Loyalty	352	4.05	.75
Extra Performance	352	3.64	.82
3. ELB (Empowering Leadership Behaviors)	352	3,51	.72
Delegation and Responsibility	352	3.75	.84
Decision-Making	352	3.69	1.08
Information Sharing	352	3.77	1.01
Skills Development	352	3.67	1.07
Coaching for Innovative Performance	352	3.64	1.06

As seen in Table 2, teacher perceptions of administrators' level of compliance with the psychological contract (SACPC) ($\bar{X} = 3.64$) and teachers' level of compliance with the psychological contract (STCPC) were at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.77$). In addition, it was found that the teachers' perceptions of school administrators' level of showing empowering leadership behaviors (GLD) were at a high level ($\bar{X} = 3.51$). Although the averages of the teachers' behaviors related to the level of compliance with the psychological contract were high in all sub-dimensions, the highest average was in loyalty ($\bar{X} = 4.05$), the lowest average was in extra performance ($\bar{X} = 3.64$), and the median was in effort for institutional development ($\bar{X} = 3.70$). In addition, according to the teachers, the empowering leadership behaviors of school administrators were ordered as follows from the highest to the lowest: information sharing ($\bar{X} = 3.77$), empowerment and responsibility ($\bar{X} = 3.75$), decision-making ($\bar{X} = 3.69$), skills development ($\bar{X} = 3.67$) and coaching for innovative performance ($\bar{X} = 3.64$).

2. Do teachers' perceptions of their own level of compliance with the psychological contract differ significantly based on their years of service at the school? The results of the ANOVA conducted for this question can be seen below.

Table 3. Teacher perceptions of the level of compliance with the psychological contract based on their duration of service at the school

Variables	N	\bar{X}	Source of Variance	Sum of squares	sd	Mean Squares	F	P	Difference	
Term of Service at School										
Ö PSUD SCALE	0-1 years (1)	50	3.69	Between groups	4,273	4	1,068	2,489	,043	2-3
	2-6 years (2)	156	3.70	Within groups	148,048	345	,429			
	7-11 years (3)	78	3.97	Total	152,321	349				
	12-16 years (4)	34	3.74							
	17 years and above (5)	32	3.77							

As can be seen in Table 3, as the condition for equal group variances was satisfied (the significance of the Levene test was $p = 0.640 > 0.05$) and as the number of groups was high, the Tukey test was performed. According to the results of the significance test of the f value, the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the means of the groups because the p value was less than 0.05 was rejected. According to the results of the Tukey test, the groups with a significant difference were teachers with 7–11 years and 2–6 years of service in the same school. The perceptions of teachers with a service period of 7–11 years in the same school regarding school administrators' level of compliance with the psychological contract were higher than those with 2–6 years of service.

Table 4. Teacher perceptions of the level of compliance with the psychological contract in the performance subdimension based on their duration of service at the school

Variables	N	\bar{X}	Source of variance	Sum of squares	sd	Mean squares	F	P	Difference	
Term of Service at School										
Performanc e Sub- Dimension	0-1 years (1)	50	3.42	between groups	5,494	4	1,374	2,693	,031	2-3
	2-6 years (2)	158	3.45	within groups	176,984	347	,510			
	7-11 years (3)	78	3.74	Total	182,478	351				
	12-16 years (4)	34	3,54							
	17 years and above (5)	32	3.44							

As can be seen in Table 4, the Tukey test was conducted following a significant Anova test result, and a significant difference was found to exist between the teachers with 2–6 years and 7–11 years of service. The perceptions of teachers with a service period of 7–11 years in the same school regarding the level of compliance with the psychological contract by school administrators were higher than those with 2–6 years of service.

3. According to teachers' perceptions, is there a significant relationship between school administrators' and their own levels of compliance with the psychological contract? Findings for this sub-question are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Pearson correlation matrix for the relationship between variables

Variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5	6.	
1. OYSUD SCALE	1						
	352						
2. ÖPSUD SCALE	,654**	1					
	,000						
	350	350					
3. GLD SCALE	,863**	,666**	1				
	,000	,000					
	352	350	352				
ÖPSUD Scale Sub - Dimensions	4. Effort for Institutional Development	,627**	,910**	,632**	1		
		,000	,000	,000			
		351	350	351	351		
	5. Loyalty	,676**	,880**	,692**	,771**	1	
		,000	,000	,000	,000		
		351	350	351	350	351	
6. Extra Performance	,408**	,803**	,420**	,532**	,572**	1	
	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		
	352	350	352	351	351	352	

**The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation coefficients displayed in Table 5 mean that positive and significant relationships exist between school administrators' level of compliance with the psychological contract scale (SACPC), teachers' level of compliance with the psychological contract scale and its subdimensions, and the school administrators' empowered leadership behaviors scale (ELBS). A moderate, significant, and positive relationship was also detected between the SACPC and the STCPC scores ($r = 0.654$, $p < 0.01$). Accordingly, it can be said that as SACPC increases, so does STCPC. When the correlation coefficient ($r^2 = 0.42$) is taken into account, it can be seen that 42% of the total variance in teachers' compliance with the psychological contract levels originates from school administrators' compliance levels with the psychological contract.

There is a strong, significant, and positive relationship between school administrators' empowered leadership behaviors (OYGLD) and psychological contract compliance scores ($r = 0.863$, $p < 0.01$). It can therefore be said that as OYGLD increases, so does SACPC. When the correlation coefficient ($r^2 = 0.74$) is taken into account, 74% of the total variance in school administrators' levels of compliance with the psychological contract originates from their own empowering leadership behaviors.

There is a moderate, significant, and positive relationship between school administrators' empowered leadership behaviors (OYGLD) and teachers' scores for compliance with the psychological contract ($r = 0.666$, $p < 0.01$). Once again, it can be said that as OYGLD increases, so does STCPC. When the correlation coefficient ($r^2 = 0.44$) is taken into account, 44% of the total variance in the levels of teacher compliance with the psychological contract stems from the administrators' empowering leadership behaviors.

On the other hand, a moderate, positive, and significant relationship was found between the following sub-dimensions of SACPC and LPSUD: effort for institutional development ($r = 0.627$, $p < 0.01$), loyalty ($r = 0.676$, $p < 0.01$) and extra performance ($r = 0.408$, $p < 0.01$). As can be understood, as SACPC increases, so does teacher compliance in the sub-dimensions of the scale (STCPC).

4. According to teacher perceptions, are school administrators' compliance levels with the psychological contract and their empowering leadership behaviors significant predictors of teacher compliance levels with the psychological contract? Findings regarding this question are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Hierarchical regression results about the prediction of SACPC, GLD, and certain variables by SPSUD Teachers' Levels of Compliance with the Psychological Contract

Predictive Variables	B	Standard Error B	β	T	p	paired r	partial r
Constant	1,862	.119	-	15,672	,000	-	-
SACPC	,214	,051	,321	4,190	,000	,654	,161
Delegation and responsibility	,175	,050	,225	3,524	,000	,621	,135
Decision-making	,034	,061	,052	,555	,579	,604	,021
Sharing information	-,011	,064	-,016	-,166	,869	,611	-,006
Skills development	,227	,066	,369	3,448	,001	,657	,132
Coaching for innovative performance	-.121	,067	-,195	-1,795	,074	,609	-,069

R=0.703 R²=0.494 F_(6, 343)=55.993 p=.000

When the paired and partial correlations between the predictors and the dependent variable in Table 6 were examined, a positive and moderate relationship ($r = 0.65$) could be seen between the SACPC and the teachers' level of compliance with the psychological contract (STCPC). However, when the other variables were checked, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .16$. Similarly, a positive and moderate relationship ($r = 0.62$) existed between delegation and responsibility and LPSUD, but when other variables were considered, the correlation between the two variables was $r = .13$. It was found that there was a positive and moderate relationship ($r = 0.60$) between decision-making and LPSUD, but when other variables were added, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = 0.02$. A positive and moderate relationship ($r = 0.61$) was detected between information sharing and LPSUD, but with the other variables, the correlation was $r = -.006$. A positive and moderate relationship ($r = 0.65$) existed between skills development and LPSUD, but when the other variables were checked, the correlation was calculated as $r = .13$. In innovative performance, there was a positive and moderate relationship ($r = 0.60$) between coaching and LPSUD, but when other variables were considered, the correlation between the variables was calculated as $r = -.06$. $R = 0.703$, $R^2 = 0.494$, $P < .01$. These six variables together explained approximately 49% of the total variance in teacher levels of compliance with the psychological contract.

According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the order of relative importance of the predictor variables on teachers' levels of compliance with the psychological contract was as follows: skills development, SACPC, delegation and responsibility, coaching for innovative performance, decision-making, and knowledge sharing. When the t-test results related to the significance of the regression coefficients were examined, it was found that the variables of SACPC, delegation and responsibility, and skills development were significant predictors of teacher compliance with the psychological contract. It is seen that it is a significant predictor of the level of fit to function (STCPC). Decision-making, information sharing, and coaching for innovative performance did not seem to have a significant effect. Based on the results of the regression analysis, the equation related to the prediction of the teachers' level of compliance with the psychological contract is given below.

STCPC = 1,862 + ,214 SACPC + ,175 Delegation And Responsibility + ,034 Decision-Making, 011b Sharing Information + ,0227 Skills Development - ,121 Coaching For Innovative Performance

Results and Discussion

This study, which focused on the role of empowering leadership behaviors on teacher perceptions towards the psychological contract in schools, first examined the level of teacher perceptions regarding the psychological contract and empowering leadership behaviors. It was found that when teachers have a high perception of school administrators' level of compliance with the psychological contract, they also have a high level of compliance with it. In a study by Yılmaz and Altinkurt (2012), private tutoring teachers stated that their institutions only fulfilled their obligations towards their employees at a moderate level. At the same time, they stated that they

fulfilled their own obligations towards their institutions at a very high level in all dimensions. In another study conducted by Çildir (2008), it was found that teachers felt a high level of responsibility towards their schools, but the administration responded to their services at a moderate level. According to the findings of another research conducted by Koçak and Burgaz (2017), although teachers had a high general level of compliance with the psychological contract, their perceptions in the dimensions of "extra performance" and "loyalty" were at a moderate level. It was found that the dimension of "effort for institutional development" increased the overall average, which means that the teachers were most active in the dimension of effort for institutional development consisting of behaviors for increased student development and success. On the other hand, they were less inclined to put in more effort than expected and be loyal to the school. This may be viewed as a reaction from teachers to school administrators' inability to comply with the psychological contract. In the present study, on the other hand, the sub-dimensions of loyalty, extra performance, and effort for institutional development all had high levels of compliance with the psychological contract. Our findings therefore do not corroborate those of the previous study.

According to Gouldner's (1960) reciprocity norm and Blau's (1964) social exchange theory, individuals are more giving when they get something they expect to receive in return. In addition, the ability of employees to perform their duties effectively is associated with the provision of the conditions or incentives they expect (Huffington, Cole, and Brunning, 1997). This may be why teachers put a high level of effort into institutional development, which is closely related to student success; however, they may have a decreased tendency to show extra performance and loyalty as they think that school administrators fulfill their responsibilities only at a moderate level (Koçak and Burgaz, 2017).

According to the variable of seniority, teachers' perceptions of school administrators' level of compliance with the psychological contract did not reveal a significant difference. Likewise, in a previous study conducted by Yılmaz and Altınkurt (2012), no difference was found according to seniority in the opinions of the teachers in the subdimensions of institutional obligations (working conditions, job characteristics, justice) and employee obligations (being a member of the institution, basic professional standards, and relational contract).

In the present study, it was found that the teachers had high perceptions of school administrators' empowering leadership behaviors (GLD). According to the perceptions of the teachers, the empowering leadership behaviors of school administrators were at a high level in all sub-dimensions as well. In a study by Cerit (2007), however, it was concluded that, according to the perceptions of the teachers, school administrators showed only moderately empowering leadership behaviors. The findings therefore diverge from each other.

The present study thirdly studied the relationship between teachers' and school administrators' levels of compliance with the psychological contract and found a moderate, significant, and positive relationship. However, there was a high, significant, and positive relationship between school administrators' empowering leadership behaviors (OYGLD) and psychological contract compliance scores. At the same time, a moderate, positive, and significant relationship was spotted between SACPC and the following sub-dimensions of SACPC: effort for institutional development, loyalty, and extra performance. The concept of the psychological contract was built on the basis of mutual satisfaction of obligations between employees and the employer (Rousseau, 1989, 1995). The theoretical basis of the concept is the expectation theory (Vroom, 1964), which states that individuals believe they will receive a valuable reward in return for their efforts. According to this theory, teachers expect a management approach that will respond to their material and moral needs from the school administration in return for the services they provide. The same is true for the school administration. Otherwise, if either side perceives their expectations as not being met and not likely to be met in the future either, they may tend to decrease or withdraw their efforts (Koçak & Burgaz, 2017). In this study, the fact that there is a positive and significant relationship between the levels of compliance with the psychological contract by both sides confirms the basic principles of the psychological contract.

Fourth, the study questioned the extent to which certain variables, SACPC and GLD, respectively, predicted OPSUD.

It was found that the six variables together explained approximately 49% of the total variance in the levels of teachers' compliance with the psychological contract. The fact that the relevant variables significantly predicted LPSUD shows that individual perceptions of psychological contracts may be moderately affected by these variables. Therefore, the findings obtained from this study are moderately supported by the theoretical explanations in the literature. However, the highest predictor of teacher perceptions related to STCPC was found to be teacher perceptions of SACPC. This may be attributed to social exchange theory. According to the findings of a study conducted by Koçak and Burgaz (2017), gender, seniority, educational status, school type, and school staff affected teachers' perceptions of the psychological contract. Research findings by Guest (2004) state that individual variables such as age, gender, education level, seniority, status, and ethnicity play a role in the formation of the psychological contract. It was concluded in this study that the variables of gender, seniority,

branch, and educational status did not affect teachers' psychological contract perceptions. The findings, therefore, do not corroborate each other.

The findings pertaining to the fourth research question revealed that delegation and responsibility, decision-making, knowledge sharing, skills development, and coaching for innovative performance were all intermediate-level predictors. According to the findings of a study by Koçak and Burgaz (2017), the empowering leadership dimensions of coaching for innovative performance and skills development were the highest predictors. These results also do not overlap. Indeed, De Vos, Buyens, and Schalk (2003) state that it is important to provide education and development opportunities for a positive psychological contract. Guest (2006) also stated that skills development via enriching job and career development opportunities creates a positive atmosphere in the psychological contract.

According to findings by Koçak and Burgaz (2017), delegation and responsibility were the least effective components in dictating teacher compliance with the psychological contract. This may be a result of Turkey's centralized education system, which bars teachers from taking authority or responsibility at school. This was confirmed by another study, which showed that the centralized structure of the Turkish National Education System is an obstacle for teachers to take authority and responsibility within the school (Özdemir & Demircioğlu, 2014). Contrary to this finding, in this study, it was concluded that the sub-dimensions of delegation and responsibility and skill development had moderate predictive value.

Koçak and Burgaz (2017) concluded that the decision-making dimension of empowering leadership behaviors does not explain teacher levels of compliance with the psychological contract. In this study, too, decision-making, knowledge sharing, and coaching for innovative performance did not have a significant effect. The autonomy of teachers in their classroom practices is seen as an inherent part of the profession itself, naturally making the teacher the only authorized person in the classroom (Öztürk, 2011).

Conclusion

The perceptions of the teachers regarding their own level of compliance with the psychological contract were higher than their perceptions of the school administrator's level of compliance with the psychological contract. In other words, teachers believed that school administrators had a low level of care for the personal happiness of teachers, ensuring long-term teacher satisfaction, considering how teachers will be affected by decisions, looking out for teachers, appreciating extra efforts, and providing an environment and opportunity to maintain social interactions with colleagues. School administrators rewarded teacher achievements (via written or spoken thank-you notes, certificates of achievement, material and moral rewards) and involved them in the decision-making processes at school (regarding schedules, shifts, free hours, etc.) at a moderate level. On the other hand, school administrators complied with the psychological contract at a high level in the following situations: in extraordinary cases (such as illness or being late), showing understanding, meeting teacher demands for effective teaching, and organizing activities for professional development, providing opportunities for promotion, providing an environment where teachers can express their ideas freely, informing teachers about matters related to the general functioning of the school, providing the training that teachers need in order to adapt to professional demands and changes in the education system, avoiding favoritism, being clear in expectations, facilitating legally required trainings, providing feedback, giving the necessary financial support for extracurricular activities, sharing their thoughts on issues that closely concern teachers, providing a healthy environment, sharing the reasons for the decisions taken at school, and demonstrating objective communication behaviors.

The general averages of teachers' levels of compliance with the psychological contract were high on the total scale and in all sub-dimensions. Teachers' level of compliance with the "loyalty" sub-dimension was higher than their level of compliance with "effort for institutional development" and "extra performance" behaviors.

When teachers think that school administrators fulfill their psychological contract obligations, they also fulfill their own obligations. The findings of the study show that the level of teacher compliance with the psychological contract was explained to a large extent by the level of compliance of the school administration with the psychological contract. It was concluded that the variables of gender, branch, seniority, educational status, and length of service at the school (except for one group) were not effective on teachers' perceptions of the psychological contract.

Recommendations

The following recommendations may be made based on the results obtained in the study: School administrators may be given in-service training in supporting the personal happiness of teachers, ensuring continued teacher satisfaction in the long term, gaining empathic thinking skills, increasing teacher commitment to the school, rewarding personal and professional efforts, and ensuring reward justice. On the other hand, in order to increase their efforts for institutional development and extra performance, in-service training can be given to teachers by making plans and conducting needs analyses at the district, provincial, and central levels. In order to provide professional development for teachers, to support them, to help them develop their skills, and to provide coaching for innovative performance and knowledge sharing, seminars can be given to ensure the personal and professional development of administrators to display empowering leadership behaviors, and they can be directed to graduate programs. They may also be encouraged to participate in new activities and projects.

The limitations of the research are as follows: The research covers only one province in Turkey. Including data from other regions will provide a more comprehensive picture of the impact of school administrators' empowering leadership behaviors on teacher perceptions. Second, it does not explain in detail the specific behaviors of school administrators that are perceived as empowering. Therefore, qualitative research can be done. Third, only the perceptions of teachers were investigated, not their actual behavior. Research can be conducted to provide data on how school administrators' behaviors affect teachers' professional performance and satisfaction.

Acknowledgements or Notes

Thank you to all the authors who contributed to the study.

Author (s) Contribution Rate

All authors contributed equally to the study.

Conflicts of Interest

There is no disagreement between the authors regarding the study.

Ethical Approval

Since the data of this research were collected before 2020, ethical approval was not obtained. However legal permission was obtained from the Ministry of National Education to conduct the study.

References

- Altındaş, S. ve Özutku, H. (2011). Psychological empowerment and factors affecting empowerment: A study in state hospitals in Turkey. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(1), pp. 162-191.
- Akçakaya, M. (2010). Personnel Empowerment Methods Applied in Organizations: Personnel Empowerment in Turkish Public Administration. *Black Sea Studies*, 25, pp. 145-174.
- Aras, G. (2013). *Implementation of empowering leadership behaviors in personnel empowerment management: An example of five-star hotels in Kemer region* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gümüşhane University, Institute of Social Sciences, Gümüşhane.
- Argon, T. (2014). Supporting human resources in educational institutions: Teachers' views on managerial support. *International Journal of Human Science*, 11(2), pp. 691-729.
- Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behavior*. Dorsey Press: Homewood, IL.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2009). *Scientific Research Methods* (10th Edition). Pegem Akademi.
- Arslandaş, C. (2007). An empirical study to determine the effect of empowering leader behavior on psychological empowerment. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences* 7(2), pp. 227-240.
- Baker, T. (2009). Towards a new employment relationship model: Aligning the changing needs of individual and organization. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30(3), pp. 197-223.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New Jersey: John & Wiley Sons, Inc.
- Block, P. (1986). *Empowered manager. Positive political skills at work*. Jossey Bass Publishers: London.
- Bowen, D.E. & Lawler, E.E. (1992). The empowerment of service workers: what, why, how and when. *Sloan Management Review*, 33(3), pp. 31-39.
- Campbell, R.F., Bridges, E. M., Corbally, J. E., Nystrand, R. O., & Ramseyer, J. A. (1971). *Introduction to educational administration*. Allyn and Bacon: Boston.
- Can, A. (2014). *Quantitative Data Analysis in Scientific Research Process with SPSS* (2nd Edition). PEGEM AKADEMİ.
- Cappelli, P., Bassi, L., Katz, H., Knoke, D., Osterman, P., Useem, M. (1997). *Change at Work*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Cerit, Y. (2007). Levels of primary school principals performing their service-oriented leadership roles. *Hacettepe University Faculty of Education Journal*, 33, pp. 88-98.

- Çavuş, M. F. (2008). Personnel empowerment: A research in manufacturing industry enterprises. *Journal of Yasar University*, 3(10), pp. 1287-1300.
- Çelik, H. E. ve Yılmaz, V. (2013). *Structural equation modeling*. Anı Publishing.
- Çildir, T. K. (2008). *Perceptions of administrators and teachers working in Ankara primary schools on the perception of exchange theory* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Çuhadar, M. T. (2005). Staff empowerment in Turkish public administration: Problems and solutions. *Journal of Erciyes University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences* 25, pp. 1-23.
- De Vos, A., Buyens, D. ve Schalk, R. (2003). Psychological contract development during organizational socialization: Adaptation to reality and the role of reciprocity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, pp. 537-559.
- Demirbilek, S. (2008). The role of staff empowerment in improving the quality of working life. *Journal of Business, Power, Industrial Relations and Human Resources*, 10(1), pp. 47-67.
- Doğan, S. (2003). *Staff Empowerment (1st Edition)*. Human Resources Series. System Publishing
- Doğan, S. ve Kılıç, S. (2007). The place and importance of staff empowerment in ensuring organizational commitment. *Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences of Erciyes University*, 29, pp. 37-61.
- Eren, E. (2008). *Organizational behavior and management psychology*. Beta Publishing.
- Gebert, D., Boerner, S. , & Kearney, E. (2006). Cross functionality and innovation in new product development teams: A dilemmatic structure and its consequences for the management of diversity. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15, pp. 431-458.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2), pp. 161-178.
- Green, S. B., Salkind, N. J. & Akey, T. M. (1997). *Using SPSS for Windows: Analyzing and Understanding Data*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Griffin, R. W., & Moorhead, G. (2014), *Organizational behavior managing people and organizations* (11th Edition). Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, USA.
- Guest, D. (2004). The psychology of the employment relationship: An analysis based on the psychological contract. *Applied Psychology*, 53, pp. 541-555.
- Guest, D. (2006). How an evolving-psychological contract is changing workforce flexibility. R. Gandossy, E. Tucker ve N. Verma (Ed.), *Workforce wake-up call: Your workforce is changing, are you?* içinde (s. 87-94). USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Güneş, K. (2007). *Perceptions and expectations of primary school teachers about the communication and motivation skills of school principals (The example of the European Side of Istanbul)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Güzelce, A. (2009). *Perceptions and expectations of teachers and administrators regarding decision-making processes in primary schools* (Unpublished master's thesis). Maltepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Huffington, C., Cole, S. ve Brunning, H. (1997). *A manual of organizational development: The psychology of change*. London: Karnac Books.
- Humborstad, S. I. W., Nerstad, C. G. L., & Dysvik, A. (2014). Empowering leadership, employee goal orientations and work performance: A competing hypothesis approach. *Personnel Review*, 43(2), pp. 246-271.
- Karakaş, A. (2014). Employee empowerment, one of the ways of empowering personnel in enterprises. *Dicle University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 6 (11), pp. 89-105.
- Koçak, S. (2016). *The Role of empowering leadership behaviors on the psychological contract in secondary Education Institutions* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Koçak, S. ve Burgaz, B. (2017). The Role of empowering leadership behaviors on the psychological contract in secondary Education Institutions. *Education and Science*, 42 (191), pp. 351-369.
- Koçel, T. (2007). *Business management*. Arikan Publishing.
- Konczak, L. J., Stelly, D. J. and Trusty, M. L. (2000). Defining and measuring empowering leader behaviors: Development of an upward feedback instrument. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 60(2), pp. 301-313.
- Kotter, J. (1973). The psychological contract: managing the joining-up process. *California Management Review*, 15(9), pp. 91- 99.
- Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement*. 30, pp. 607-610.

- Kun, Q., Hai-yan, S. ve Lin-li, L. (2007). *The effect of empowerment on employees' organizational commitment: Psychological contract as mediator*. International Conference on Management Science & Engineering, China.
- Levinson, H., Price, C., Munden, K., Mandl, H. & Solley, C. (1962). *Men, management and mental health*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, M.A.
- Lincoln, N., D., Travers, C., Ackers, P. & Wilkinson, A. (2002). The meaning of empowerment: The interdisciplinary etymology of a new management concept. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, (4)3, pp. 271-290.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior*. McGraw-Hill Irwin: New York.
- Mao, H., Liu, X., Ge, H. (2008). Evading tactics of psychological contract violations. *Asian Social Science*, 4 (11), pp. 26-29.
- Mihçioğlu, C. (1983). Participation in management in Turkey. <http://www.politics.ankara.edu.tr>. Erişim tarihi: 23.04.2020
- Özdemir, M. (2011). A science at the intersection of public administration and business administration: Educational administration. *Journal of Public Administration*, 44(2), pp. 29-42.
- Özdemir, M. (2014). *Human resource management in educational organizations: Theory, application, technique*. Anı Publishing.
- Özdemir, M. ve Demircioğlu, E. (2015). The relationship between counterproductive work behaviours and psychological contracts in public high schools. *Journal of Çukurova University Faculty of Education*, 45(1), pp. 41-60.
- Özel, N. (2013). A meta-theoretical approach to employee empowerment in the context of multidimensional theory searches: Conditionality approach to empowerment. *International Journal of Management, Economics and Business*, 9(18), pp. 215-238.
- Öztürk, A., ve Özdemir, F. (2003). Increasing job satisfaction based on employee empowerment in enterprises. *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 17(1-2), pp. 189-202.
- Öztürk, İ. H. (2011). A theoretical study on the subject of teacher autonomy. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 10 (35), 82-99.
- Parlar, H. (2012). A study on the determination of how willing and ready private school owners and senior managers are to create an empowered business environment in private schools. *Istanbul Commerce University Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(1).127-146.
- Paul, R. J., Niehoff, B. R. ve Turnley, W. H. (2000). Empowerment, expectations, and the psychological contract—managing the dilemmas and gaining the advantages. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 29, pp. 471-485.
- Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Hopkins, D. (2012). *Improving school leadership. Volume 2: Case Studies on Systems Leadership*. OECD: Paris.
- Raub, S., & Robert, C. (2012). Empowerment, organizational commitment, and voice behavior in the hospitality industry: Evidence from a multinational sample. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 54(2), pp. 136-148.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior*. Pearson Education Limited: England.
- Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, pp. 245-259.
- Rodrigues, C.A. (1994). Employee participation and empowerment programs. *Empowerment in Organizations*, 2(2), 29 – 40.
- Rong, W. (2009). Management of College and University Teachers Based on Psychological Contract. Erişim tarihi: <http://www.seiofbluemountain.com/upload/product/200909/2009jyhy04a49.pdf>, Erişim Tarihi: 23.04.2020.
- Rothstein, L. R. (1995). The empowerment effort that came undone. *Harvard Business Review*, 73 (1). <https://hbr.org/1995/01/the-empowerment-effort-that-came-undone#>, Erişim Tarihi: 23.04.2020.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organisations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2 (2), pp. 121-139.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rousseau, D. M. ve Schalk, R. (2000). *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross national perspectives*. Sage Publications, Inc.: USA.
- Rousseau, D. M., Tijoriwala, S. A. (1998). Assessing psychological contract: Issues, alternatives and measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, pp. 679-695.
- Schein, E. H. (1965). *Organizational psychology*. Printice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
- Tabachnick, B. G. ve Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Pearson.
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An 'interpretive' model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, pp. 666–681.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Yılmaz, K. ve Altınkurt, Y. (2012). Psychological contracts of private tutoring teachers. *Electronic Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1 (2), pp. 11-22.
- Yukl, G. A., & Becker, W. S. (2006). Effective empowerment in organizations. *Organization Management Journal*, 3(3), 210-231.
- Yüksel, Ö. ve Erkutlu, E. (2003) Empowering staff. *Journal of Gazi University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 5(1), pp. 131-142.