

The Relationship between School Principals' Power Sources and School Climate

Coskun Bayrak¹, Yahya Altinkurt^{2*} and Kursad Yilmaz^{2#}

¹Faculty of Education, Anadolu University, Eskisehir, 26470, Turkey
E-mail: cbayrak@anadolu.edu.tr

²Faculty of Education, Dumlupinar University, Kutahya, 43100, Turkey
E-mail: *<yaltinkurt@gmail.com>, #<kursadyilmaz@gmail.com>

KEYWORDS Power. Climate. Organizational Power. Organizational Climate

ABSTRACT This study aims to assess the relationship between school principals' power sources and school climate. The sampling of the study, which is in a survey model, consists of 322 teachers working in preschool, primary and secondary school institutions in Kutahya city center. Data were collected through "Organizational Power Scale at Schools" and "Organizational Climate Scale at Schools". t-test, ANOVA and Pearson correlation analysis descriptive statistics were used in the analysis of the data. Findings suggest that school principals use legitimate power the most and coercive power the least. Based on teachers' opinions within the context of organizational climate, principals' display restricting behaviors the most and directive behaviors the least. Teachers, on the other hand, display collegial behaviors the most and disengaged behaviors the least. When relationships between organizational power and organizational climate are examined, the highest straight correlation was found to be between referent, expert and reward power and supportive principal behaviors. The highest inverse correlation was found between restrictive power, supportive principal and collegial behaviors among teachers. It was proposed that for a more positive school climate, school principals must prefer to use reward, expert and referent power rather than legitimate and coercive power.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational climate subject is gaining increasing attention as one of the significant areas in management and organizational behavior. The basic reason behind this is the effect of organizational climate on employees' behaviors since organizational climate refers to a work environment directly or indirectly created by employees in an organization. This environment is affected by various variables within the organization. Among these variables, management style of organizational leaders, that is, power sources they prefer to use when managing the administration come to fore. Assessment of the relationships between leader power sources and organizational climate could contribute to the creation of a healthy organizational climate. This study proposes to assess the relationship between school principals' power preferences and school climate. To achieve this end, first, the

concepts of organizational climate and power sources were reviewed and then, the relationships between those two concepts were explored.

Organizational Climate

Organizational climate is composed of employees' behaviors and relationships and is used in the sense of a general atmosphere and emotions in a given organization. It is also used as a metaphor within the context of organization and refers to psychological climate based on relationships in an organization. In that sense, organizational climate is not tangible but could be felt and indirectly influences employees' inter-organizational attitudes and behaviors.

Organizational climate is considered as aggregated perceptions of employees toward the organization (Schein 1992). That is why organizational climate is what differentiates an organization from other organization and is about inter-organizational environmental features that impact employees' behaviors. In other words, it is, in a sense, the personality of an organization (Hoy and Miskel 2005). Thus, organizational climate is regarded as one of the dimensions (goal, structure, process and climate used to define an organization (Bursalioglu 2000).

Address for correspondence:

Dr. Kursad Yilmaz
Dumlupinar University
Egitim Fakultesi (43100)
Kutahya, Turkey
Telephone: +90 (274) 265 20 31 / 4572
Fax: +90 (274) 265 20 57
E-mail: kursadyilmaz@gmail.com

There are various scales used to assess organizational climate. Since it is almost impossible to fully define what an organizational climate is, the dimensions of these scales may differ. The primary scale used to assess organizational climate is *Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)* developed by Halpin and Croft (1963). Organizational climate was defined in six dimensions (closed, paternal, familiar, controlled, autonomous and open). Afterwards, especially through studies co-authored with Wayne K. Hoy (Hoy and Forsyth 1986; Hoy et al. 1991; Hoy and Tarter 1997), more recent forms of this scale were developed for different school types. In this study, *The Organizational Climate Description for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE)* developed by Hoy and Tarter (1997) was used. There are six dimensions of organizational climate in this scale. Three of these dimensions assess interaction between principals and teachers and the other three assess interactions among teachers based on openness-closedness criterion. These dimensions are briefly summarized below (Hoy and Miskel 2005):

Supportive Principal Behavior: School principal displays democratic behaviors. His/her criticism is constructive; s/he listens to teachers, is open to suggestions and directs frequent realistic compliments to teachers.

Directive Principal Behavior: School principal display autocratic behaviors. He has a strict control over the people. The principal also frequently and closely observes each and every detail about teachers and school events.

Restrictive Principal Behavior: School principal acts as an obstacle rather than being supportive for teachers. He loads teachers with trivial paperwork, committee responsibilities, routine duties and works.

Collegial Teacher Behavior: Teacher support professional behaviors among themselves. They are passionate, collegial and respect their colleagues' professional competencies.

Intimate Teacher Behavior: It reflects a strong and close social support network. Teachers closely know one another, are involved in close relationships and frequently meet.

Disengaged Teacher Behavior: It reflects lack of understanding and focus on professional activities. Teachers just spend time at work. Their behaviors are negative and they criticize their colleagues.

Organizational Power Sources

The nature of organizations necessitates a certain control system. Within that context, as a function of their formal leadership, leaders resort to some power sources in order to reach organizational goals by managing organization members' behaviors because leader is one who has an influence on members of an organization through power and influence (Celik 2003; Basaran 2004). Power is defined as the ability to lead others towards his or her own interest (Salancik and Pfeffer 1977; Pfeffer 1992a, 1992b; Greenberg and Baron 1993; Ward 1998). Thus, just as organizational climate, power is also relationship-based which does not mean anything without relating it to others (Koslowsky et al. 2001; Ozkalp and Kirel 2003).

French and Raven's (1959) study is one of the primary studies on organizational power. French and Raven collected the bases of power under six dimensions; legitimate, coercive, reward, expert and referent power. This is the classification utilized in this study. Power bases based on French and Raven's classification are summarized below (Erchul and Raven 1997; Stevenson 2006; Hoy and Miskel 2005):

Legitimate Power: This is the status power also defined as authority and empowerment. It is the power of influencing employees only through leaders' formal position. When the manager loses his formal position, he loses his power. The use of legitimate power excessively could be regarded as coercive power.

Coercive Power: It is the opposite of reward power and is based on fear. Hoy and Miskel (2005) noted that reward and coercive power could be discerned in this way: If a teacher obeys the principal with the fear of being punished, there is a coercive power use, if he obeys to get a reward, there is a reward power. Coercive power refers to materialistic and spiritual punishments given from manager to employees.

Reward Power: It is the power of the manager to reward the employees in return for displaying desired behaviors. This kind of power gets its strength from the attractiveness of rewards and the equal distribution of these rewards. The perception that rewards are not distributed justly can turn this power into coercive power. However, the effective use of reward power is effective in development of referent power. Effective and just use of this power by

the manager could lead to positive results in an organization.

Expert Power: It is the type of power based on leader's knowledge and skills. Like referent power, it is dependent on personal traits and not only principals but also employees may also possess such a power. The more employees trust principals' knowledge, skills and expert, the more influence principals will have on them. The practical knowledge principals have and share determines the boundaries of expert power.

Referent Power: It is the power based on personal traits. The person with referent power is the one who is liked, appreciated, respected, envied and taken as a role model. When admiration towards principals by employees increases, principals' referent increases. The source of this power is the extraordinary personality of the principal and his communication skills.

Relationship between the Organizational Power and Organizational Climate

Conley (2006) defines organizational climate as shared perceptions about organizational variables that impact organizational processes such as employees' morale and leadership style. One of the basic determiners whether an organizational climate is open or closed, which is defined as aggregated perceptions of employees about organization (Schein 1992) is managers' attitude and behaviors towards employees. The reason is that leadership style, that is leadership behavior, definitely influences perceptions towards organization either in a negative or positive way. Actually, scales to assess organizational climate basically try to explain organizational climate on the basis of the quality of manager-employee relationships and relationships between employees. Many studies in the literature (Pepper and Thomas 2002; Oyetunji 2006; Eshraghi et al. 2011; Tajasom and Ahmad 2011) assessed the relationships between organizational climate and leadership characteristics. However, there is not a single study focusing on the relationships between power sources and organizational climate.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to assess the relationships between power sources and organizational climate. To achieve this end, the following questions were answered:

- ♦ How are teachers' opinions regarding power sources used by school principals?
- ♦ How are teachers' opinions regarding school climate?
- ♦ Do teachers' opinions differ according to gender, subject area and tenure?
- ♦ Is there a relationship between school principals' power sources and school climate?

METHOD

The study is in a survey method. Population of the study consists of 2248 teachers working in preschool, primary and secondary school located in Kutahya city center. Disproportionate sampling technique was used in specifying the sample. Sample size was calculated as 303 for 95 % reliability level. Considering that there could be some problems in return rates of the surveys, 400 teachers were decided to contact. Out of 341 surveys returned, those that were not filled out according to the instructions were not considered. Analyses were carried out with 322 usable surveys collected during data collection. 55.6 % of participants were women (n=179), 44.4 % were male (n=143).

It is observed that 11.8 of participants are preschool teachers (n=38), 40.1 % of them are primary school teachers (n=129) and 48.1 % of them are subject area teachers (n=155). Tenure of teachers participating in the study changes between 1 and 38. 19.3 of participants have 5 and less years of tenure (n=62), 19.9 % of them have tenure between 6 and 10 years (n=64), 25.8 % of them have tenure between 11 and 15 years (n=83), 16.8 % of them have tenure between 16 and 20 years (n=54), 18.3 % of them have 21 and more years of tenure in teaching (n=59).

The first data collection tools used in the study is Organizational Power Scale at Schools developed by Altinkurt and Yilmaz (2013a). The scale includes five sub dimensions; "Legitimate Power, Reward Power, Coercive Power, Expert Power and Referent Power". It consists of 37 likert-type items and all items range from 1-Never, 5-Always. There is not any reverse-scored item in the scale. Total scores are not gathered from the whole scale. That a score taken in any given sub factor is high means that school principals use the power in that specific factor more frequently. Exploratory (EFA) and Confirmatory factor analyses (DFA) were made for structural reliability of the scale. As a result of EFA, factor

loadings for factors in sub dimensions of the scale range from .47 to .84 and item-total correlations are between .43 and .85. The variance explained by five factors together is 67.94 %. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient is between .84 and .94 and McDonald's internal consistency coefficient ranges between .83 and .94. Goodness of fit values of the scale calculated through DFA are: GFI=0.97, AGFI=0.96, RMSEA=0.03, RMR=0.09, SRMR=0.08, CFI=0.99, NFI=0.98, NNFI=0.99 and PGFI=0.85. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients of the scale were recalculated in this study. This coefficient was found to be .76 for legitimate power, .88 for reward power, .91 for coercive and expert power, .95 for referent power.

The other data collection tool used in the study is Organizational Climate Scale at Schools developed by Hoy and Tarter (1997) and adapted to Turkish by Altinkurt and Yilmaz (2013b). The scale includes six sub dimensions; Supportive Principal Behavior, Directive Principal Behavior, Restrictive Principal Behavior, Intimate Teacher Behavior, Collegial Teacher Behavior, Disengaged Teacher Behavior". It consists of 39 four-point likert-type items and all items range from 1-Rarely, 4-Very Frequently. There are two reverse-scored items in the scale. Total scores are not gathered from the whole scale. The fact that scores taken in any given sub factor increases means that behaviors influencing organizational climate in that specific factor are more frequently

As a result of EFA, factor loadings for factors in sub dimensions of the scale range from .46 to .82 and item-total correlations are between .35 and .77. The variance explained by six factors together is 51 %. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient is between .70 and .89. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients of the scale were recalculated in this study. This coefficient was found to be .93 for supportive principal behavior, .85 for directive principal behavior, .73 for restrictive principal behavior, .90 for intimate teacher behavior, .76 for collegial teacher behavior and .72 for disengaged teacher behavior.

In the study descriptive statistics, t-test and ANOVA were used in data analysis. Also Pearson correlation analysis was used to determine correlation between the two points of view. Correlation coefficient as an absolute

value ranging from 0.70 to 1.00 was considered as a high correlation, ranging from 0.69 to 0.30 as a moderate correlation and ranging from 0.29 to 0.00 as a low correlation (Buyukozturk 2002).

RESULTS

This part first focuses on teachers' opinions about power sources school principals use and organizational climate; second, it includes comparisons regarding gender, subject area and tenure variables. Then, the relationships between power sources used by school principals and organizational climate were explored. Table 1 shows mean and standard deviation values pertaining teachers' opinions on organizational power sources and organizational climate.

Table 1: Teachers' opinions on organizational power sources used by school principals and organizational climate (n=322)

Scales	Sub-dimensions	M	S
<i>Organizational</i>			
<i>Power Sources</i>			
	Legitimate power	4.06	0.70
	Reward power	3.51	0.89
	Coercive power	2.61	0.98
	Expert power	3.94	0.96
	Referent power	3.57	1.04
<i>Organizational Climate</i>			
	Supportive principal behavior	2.73	0.75
	Directive principal behavior	2.46	0.71
	Restrictive principal behavior	2.85	0.68
	Intimate teacher behavior	2.64	0.70
	Collegial teacher behavior	2.97	0.51
	Disengaged teacher behavior	1.99	0.69

As illustrated on Table 1, teachers believe that school principals use *legitimate power* the most (M=4.06, S=0.70), and respectively use *expert power* (M=3.94, S=0.96), *referent power* (M=3.57, S=1.04), *reward power* (M=3.51, S=0.89) and *coercive power* (M=2.61, S=0.98). The scale used in the study is a five-point likert-type scale.

The item marked most by participants in the *legitimate power* dimension is "Our school principal is sensitive about following the standard procedure (M=4.27, S=0.88)", and the one least frequently marked is the item: "Our school prin-

principal frequently refers to regulations in his speeches ($M=3.60$, $S=1.06$)”.

The item marked most by participants in the *expert power* dimension is “Our school principal is knowledgeable about regulations to the extent that all can consult him ($M=4.04$, $S=1.04$)”, and the one least frequently marked is the item: “Our school principal cares about teachers’ professional development ($M=3.73$, $S=1.11$)”.

The item marked most by participants in the *referent power* dimension is “Our school principal has a significant influence on employees ($M=3.84$, $S=1.18$)”, and the one least frequently marked is the item: “Our school principal’s empathy skills are highly developed ($M=3.32$, $S=1.24$)”.

The item marked most by participants in the *reward power* dimension is “Our school principal support creative ideas that are good for school interest ($M=3.90$, $S=1.09$)”, and the one least frequently marked is the item: “Our school principal treats employees who voluntarily take part in activities preferentially ($M=2.99$, $S=1.14$)”.

The item marked most by participants in the *coercive power* dimension is “Our school principal warns employees by focusing on their weaknesses ($M=3.31$, $S=1.12$)”, and the one least frequently marked is the item: “Our school principal gives “undesired tasks” to employees who do not follow his requests ($M=2.20$, $S=1.29$)”.

Participants’ opinions regarding power sources used by school principals significantly differ in some dimensions according to *gender*, *subject areas and tenure* variables. Male teachers believe that school principals use *reward power* more frequently [$t_{(320)}=2.55$; $p<.05$], pre-school teachers believe that they use *legitimate power* more frequently [$F_{(2,319)}=8.02$; $p<.05$], teachers with tenure of 5 years and less believe that they use *legitimate power* more frequently [$F_{(4,317)}=2.44$; $p<.05$] than those with 6-10 years of tenure.

Teachers’ opinions regarding organizational climate are: teachers think that school principals display restrictive behaviors the most frequently ($M=2.85$, $S=0.68$). They display supportive ($M=2.73$, $S=0.75$), and directive behaviors ($M=2.46$, $S=0.71$) respectively. The scale used in the study is a likert type scale. The frequency of school principals displaying these behaviors is close to “generally” level. Teachers, on the other hand, mostly display collegial ($M=2.97$, $S=0.51$), intimate ($M=2.65$, $S=0.70$) behaviors,

while disengaged ($M=1.99$, $S=0.69$) behaviors are the least frequently observed teacher behaviors. Based on this, teachers’ collegial behaviors are close to “very frequently”, intimate behaviors close to “generally” and their disengaged behaviors are close to “sometimes” level.

The item marked most by participants in the *restrictive principal behaviors* dimension is “Teachers are fed up with busy work schedule ($M=2.84$, $S=1.00$)”, and the one least frequently marked is the item: “The support given by other public servants at school help alleviate paper work workload experienced by teachers ($M=1.90$, $S=0.72$)”.

The item marked most by participants in the *supportive principal behaviors* dimension is “School principal treats teachers equally ($M=2.95$, $S=0.98$)”, and the one least frequently marked is the item: “School principal says good words to teachers ($M=2.54$, $S=0.93$)”.

The item marked most by participants in the *directive principal behaviors* dimension is “School principal always checks if teachers come to work or not ($M=2.71$, $S=1.07$)”, and the one least frequently marked is the item: “School principal manages the school with an iron fist ($M=2.07$, $S=1.07$)”.

The item marked most by participants in the *collegial teacher behaviors* dimension is “Teachers respect their colleagues’ professional competence ($M=3.08$, $S=0.79$)”, and the one least frequently marked is the item: “teachers are proud of their schools ($M=2.79$, $S=0.86$)”.

The item marked most by participants in the *intimate teacher behaviors* dimension is “Teachers are close friends with other teachers ($M=3.06$, $S=0.84$)”, and the one least frequently marked is the item: “Teachers come together for fun ($M=2.41$, $S=10.91$)”.

The item marked most by participants in the *disengaged teacher behaviors* dimension is “There is always a minority group opposing to majority ($M=2.27$, $S=0.99$)”, and the one least frequently marked is the item: “Teachers put group pressure on colleagues who do not follow the rules ($M=1.71$, $S=0.87$)”.

Participants’ opinions regarding organizational climate significantly differ based on *gender* variable in supportive and directive principal behaviors and collegial teacher behavior dimensions. Male teachers believe that school principals mostly display supportive behaviors [$t_{(320)}=3.29$; $p<.05$]; female teachers believe that

school principals mostly display directive behaviors [$t_{(320)}=2.18$; $p<.05$]. Also, based on participants' opinions, male teachers display more collegial behaviors [$t_{(320)}=2.31$; $p<.05$] than female teachers.

Participants' opinions regarding organizational climate significantly differ based on *subject area* variable in directive and restrictive principal behaviors. Preschool teachers believe that school principals mostly display more directive behaviors [$F_{(2,319)}=6.22$; $p<.05$] than their primary school and subject area teacher counterparts, subject area teachers believe that school principals mostly display restrictive principal behaviors [$F_{(2,319)}=3.72$; $p<.05$] than primary school teachers.

Participants' opinions regarding organizational climate significantly differ based on *tenure* variable in *directive* and *restrictive* principal behaviors and *disengaged* teacher behaviors. Teachers with 5 and less tenure believe that school principals mostly display more *directive* behaviors [$F_{(4,317)}=2.64$; $p<.05$], than other teachers, while teachers with tenure between 16 and 20 years think that school principals mostly display *restrictive* principal behaviors [$F_{(4,317)}=3.47$; $p<.05$]. It is also seen that teachers with 21 years and more display more disengaged teacher behaviors [$F_{(4,317)}=2.83$; $p<.05$] than teachers with 6-15 years of tenure.

Pearson correlations coefficients were calculated to assess the relationships between power sources used by school principals and organizational climate. Results of the analysis are given on Table 2.

There is a linear relationship at medium level between *legitimate power* source used by school principals and directive principals behaviors dimension of organizational climate ($r=0.36$, $p<.01$); and linear but low level relationship between legitimate power and restrictive principal behavior ($r=0.16$, $p<.01$), between collegial teacher behaviors with colleagues ($r=0.16$, $p<.01$).

There is a linear relationship at medium level between *coercive power* source used by school principals and directive principals behaviors dimension of organizational climate ($r=0.47$, $p<.01$), between restrictive principal behavior ($r=0.34$, $p<.01$), disengaged teacher behaviors ($r=0.39$, $p<.01$). There is an inverse relationship at medium level between coercive power source and supportive principals behaviors ($r=-0.52$, $p<.01$) and between collegial teacher behaviors with colleagues ($r=-0.30$, $p<.01$).

There is a linear relationship at medium level between *expert power* source and supportive principal behaviors dimension ($r=0.66$, $p<.01$), between collegial teacher behaviors with colleagues ($r=0.43$, $p<.01$), and a linear relationship at low level with intimate teacher behaviors ($r=0.21$, $p<.01$). The relationship between *expert power* and disengaged teacher behaviors ($r=-0.25$, $p<.01$) is inverse and at low level.

There is a linear high-level relationship between *reward power* source and supportive principal behaviors dimension ($r=0.71$, $p<.01$), a linear medium level relationship with collegial teacher behaviors with colleagues ($r=0.40$, $p<.01$) and a linear relationship at low level with intimate teacher behaviors ($r=0.23$, $p<.01$). The relationship between *reward power* and disengaged teacher behaviors ($r=-0.18$, $p<.01$) is inverse and at low level.

There is a linear high-level relationship between *referent power* source and supportive principal behaviors dimension ($r=0.79$, $p<.01$), a linear medium level relationship with collegial teacher behaviors with colleagues ($r=0.40$, $p<.01$) and a linear relationship at low level with intimate teacher behaviors ($r=-0.25$, $p<.01$). The relationship between *referent power* and restrictive principal behavior ($r=-0.26$, $p<.01$) is inverse and at low level.

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to assess the relationship between the organizational climate and the power

Table 2: Relationships between power sources used by school principals and organizational climate

Climate	Principal behavior			Teacher behavior		
	Supportive	Directive	Restrictive	Intimate	Collegial	Disengaged
Legitimate power	0.10	0.36**	0.16**	0.07	0.16**	0.02
Reward power	0.71**	0.06	0.10	0.23**	0.40**	-0.18**
Coercive power	-0.52**	0.47**	0.34**	0.00	-0.30	0.39**
Expert power	0.66**	0.06	-0.18**	0.21**	0.43**	-0.25**
Referent power	0.79**	0.00	-0.25**	0.14*	0.40**	-0.26**

* $p<0.05$ ** $p<0.01$

sources that the school principals use. In addition, it was studied if the aforementioned variables differed depending on gender, subject area and tenure during this study, and finally, the relationships between the variables were assessed.

According to the teachers, school principals use the legitimate power at a maximum rate, then, respectively use expert power, referent power, reward power, and coercive power. School principals use legitimate power and expert power at a high level and referent power, reward power, and coercive power at a medium level. There are studies in the literature aiming to determine the managers' power preferences. There are differences and similarities between the sub-dimensions of the measuring instruments that were used in this research. Ercetin (1995) pointed out in his survey that school principals use personal power at most and coercive power at the least to influence the teachers. According to Altinkurt and Yilmaz (2012a, 2012b), Yilmaz and Altinkurt (2012a), and Titrek and Zafer (2009), school principals use legitimate power mostly, and the reward power least frequently. According to Aslanargun (2009), teachers believe that school principals use referent power, coercive power, and reward power at the least, and power of commitment, expert power, and mutual power and expert power at most. The school principals pointed out that they resort to referent, and reward power least frequently, and use commitment power and expert power most frequently. When evaluated together with studies in the literature, research results show that managers use their legitimate and expert power at most. Some differences in use of referent power are seen in the studies. The fact that different studies reach different conclusions about the use of referent power can be seen as an acceptable situation, because the referent power is a power more depending on personal characteristics and different conclusions on this issue can be reached in different sample groups.

Participants' views on power sources used by school principals vary significantly only in terms of reward power according to gender variable. Male teachers believe more than female teachers that the school principals use the reward power more frequently. In Altinkurt and Yilmaz (2012a), Titrek and Zafer (2009), Helvacı and Kayalı's (2011) studies carried in primary schools, opinions didn't differ according to gen-

der. Aslanargun (2009) found out in his study on primary and secondary schools that teachers' opinions about reward power, mutual power, expert power, knowledge power and referent power do not change according to gender, but their opinions about coercive power and commitment power do. Female teachers believe more than male teachers that commitment power and coercive power are displayed more. Ozaşlan and Gursel's (2008) research focused on the issue of power sources used by university faculty and department heads, opinions differentiated on the use of legitimate power, compared to over the men faculty members, female faculty members reported that legitimate power was used more. When research results in the literature are evaluated in conjunction with the results of this study, in both studies that found significant differences and studies that found no differences, compared to male teachers, female teachers reported that school principals use hard powers such as legitimate and coercive power more and soft powers like reward and expert powers less. The difference between men and women teachers' opinions can be explained by the characteristics of a patriarchal society.

Participants' views on power sources used by school principals show a statistically significant difference on the subject area variable in the legitimate power level. Pre-school teachers over the class and subject teachers believe that school principals use legitimate power more. In Helvacı and Kayalı's study (2011), differences were found between opinions of class and subject area teachers. In Altinkurt and Yilmaz (2012a), subject area teachers over class teachers believe school principals use legitimate, coercive, referent and reward power more. Aslanargun (2009) determined in his research that the classroom teachers have higher averages over other branches.

Participants' views on power sources used by school principals differ significantly according to tenure variable at the level of legitimate power. Teachers with 5 years or less tenure over the teachers with tenure of 6-10 years believe that school principals use legitimate power more. Altinkurt and Yilmaz (2012a), determined that more experienced teachers over less experienced ones believe that the school principals use legitimate, coercive, referent, expert and reward powers more. Titrek and Zafer (2009), found out that more experienced teachers over less experi-

enced ones believe that the school principals use referent, expert, and reward power more. In Helvacı and Kayalı's study (2011), there is a difference between the views of teachers.

Another aim of the study is to assess the views on organizational climate. According to the teachers, school principals display restrictive behaviors at most. Then, come supportive and directive behaviors, respectively. Teachers display collegial and intimate behaviors at most, disengaged behaviors at the least. The fact that both restrictive and directive behaviors of school principals are high level is important. There is a very big difference between school principals' perception of restrictive and directive leadership behaviors and supportive leadership behaviors. This finding is line with the results of a previous research (Cankaya and Akuzum 2010; Yilmaz 2002; Yilmaz and Altinkurt 2012a). The social structure of Turkish society can be shown as the cause of this finding. Turkish society is patriarchal, collectivistic (Arat 1996; Kagıtcıbası 1999), it shows feminine characteristics yet with a high distance power (Hofstede 2005), and a high tendency to paternalism (Sakallı and Beydoğan 2002). A phenomenon often found in collectivistic and hierarchical cultures paternalism is based on obedience and dependence. The high distance power and high values of paternalism being together creates expectations of a leadership which is humane, friendly, tolerant and intimate, caring and protecting, supporting, but also, a leadership that is having an authority to put things under control, setting up a disciplinary atmosphere (Altinkurt and Yilmaz 2012c).

Participants' views on organizational climate differ significantly according to gender, expert, and tenure variables at some levels. According to male teachers, school principals display more supportive behaviors, whereas they show more directive behaviors according to female teachers. Besides, male teachers show more co-operative behaviors than female teachers. According to the branch variable, pre-school teachers over the class and subject teachers believe that school principals display more directive behaviors, yet, the subject area teachers over class teachers believe that more restrictive behaviors are displayed by the school principals. According to tenure variable, teachers with 5 years or less tenure and the other teachers believe that principals display more directive behaviors, and the teachers with 16-20 years experience rather

than 5 year or less tenure teachers believe that principals display more restrictive behaviors. Teachers with over 21 years of tenure rather than teachers with 6-15 years experience displays disengaged behavior. According to a study of Sezgin and Kilinc (2011), teachers' perceptions of school climate according to gender, expert and tenure variables showed no significant differences. The difference between views of teachers who are at the beginning and at the end of their career is especially noteworthy. According to Bakioglu (1996), teachers go through five-stages in their careers. These include: introduction, settling, activism, expert, and calmness phases. Introduction and settling stages are the process in which teachers develop their own personal vision criticizing the work of their job and their own social reality. Calmness stage is the last stage of the career. At this stage, the energy and enthusiasm is lost, a comfort is felt with self-confidence and self-acceptance. When research findings are evaluated in this respect, teachers in calmness phase, with this feeling of comfort, are more sensitive and display disengaged behavior to school principals' restrictive behavior.

Of the power sources that school principals use, legitimate power has linear and medium level relationship with principal's directive behavior in organizational climate, and linear and low level relationship with principal's restrictive behavior and teachers' collegial behavior among colleagues. There is a linear and medium level relationship between directive power and principals' directive behavior, principal's restrictive behavior, and teachers' disengaged behavior. There is reverse and medium level relationship between coercive power and principal's supportive behavior and teachers' collegial behavior among colleagues. There is linear and medium level relationship between expert power and principal's supportive behavior with teachers' collegial behavior among colleagues, linear low-level relationship with intimate teacher behavior and reverse low-level relationship with the disengaged teachers' behavior. There is linear and high level relationship between reward power and principal's supportive behavior, medium level relationship with teachers' collegial behavior among colleagues, low level relationship with intimate teacher behavior. There is reverse and high level relationship between reward power

and disengaged teachers' behavior. There is linear and high level relationship between referent power and supportive behavior of managers, linear and medium level relationship with teachers' collegial behavior among colleagues, linear and low level relationship with teachers' intimate behavior. There is reverse and high level relationship between referent power and restrictive behavior of managers with disengaged teachers' behavior.

According to the research findings, the relationships between legitimate power and the restrictive and directive behavior of the managers' show that school principals use legitimate power to put pressure and restrictions on employees. In addition, restrictive and directive behavior of the managers influence school climate negatively based on research results. However, educational institutions, by their nature, have employees with high education level, are loosely structured and value-based organizations. In this structure, the basic function of principal for the success of the organization is not, giving specific orders to employees, but to support them in a way they can maximize their creativity (Aydin 2000). Appropriate leadership behavior for employees with higher education is supporting leadership. In these organizations, restrictive and directive leadership behavior is unlikely to be effective (Celik 2003). Effective leaders must demonstrate informal influence skills more than formal power, improved social skills, participatory, and collaborative skills (Yukl 1989; Schein 1992). Therefore, in order to create an open organizational climate school principals must prefer soft powers rather than hard powers. Research findings confirm this review, too. Studies in literature (Eshraghi et al. 2011; Oyetunji 2006; Pepper and Thomas 2002; Tajasom and Ahmad 2011) emphasize the relationships between organizational climate and leadership qualities. In addition, there are such studies (Benis 1999; Yilmaz and Altinkurt 2012b) in which the supportive leadership behaviors increase the employees' confidence in the organization; positive perception of justice and commitment is studied. Particularly school principals must display leadership qualities such as appreciating things done, helping teachers, explaining the reasons, giving constructive criticism in order to create an open and a positive organizational climate (Yilmaz 2002). In Eshraghi et al. (2011) study, too, it was found out that behavior of the

democratic leadership add organizational climate a positive and authoritarian leadership behaviors add a negative effect. In addition, commitment of teachers in schools with positive climatic characteristics is higher (Collie et al. 2011; Dorgham 2012; Korkmaz 2011), and students may be more successful (Hoy et al. 1998). According to Parker et al. (2003) meta-analysis study, too, there is a relationship between organizational climate and employees' job satisfaction, job-related attitudes, psychological well-being, motivation, and performance.

CONCLUSION

According to the research results, school principals use legitimate power and expert power at a high level and referent power, reward power, and coercive power at a medium level. Participants' views on power sources used by school principals vary significantly only in terms of reward power according to gender variable.

Based on teachers' opinions within the context of organizational climate, school principals display restrictive behaviors at most. Then, supportive and directive behaviors come, respectively. Teachers display collegial and intimate behaviors at most, disengaged behaviors at the least. The fact that both restrictive and directive behaviors of school principals are high level is important. There is a very big difference between school principals' perception of restrictive and directive leadership behaviors and supportive leadership behaviors. Participants' views on organizational climate and power sources used by school principals differ significantly according to gender, expert, and tenure variables at some levels. When relationships between organizational power and organizational climate are examined, the highest straight relationship was found to be between referent, expert and reward power and supportive principal behaviors. The highest inverse relationship was found between restrictive power, supportive principal and collegial behaviors among teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order for the research results to be generalized, it can be suggested that research is repeated in different countries, cities and regions. In that case, the findings provided can be compared with the results of this research. Especial-

ly in terms of the organizational climate, it is an interesting finding that teachers believe that the school principals display both supportive and directive and restrictive behaviors, as well. This finding is tried to be explained by cultural characteristics. However, new studies are required in this regard. For this reason, further research, which aims to determine the relationship between organization climate and cultural values, is recommended.

REFERENCES

- Altinkurt Y, Yilmaz K 2012a. Relationship between school administrators' organizational power sources and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(3): 1833-1852.
- Altinkurt Y, Yilmaz K 2012b. Relationship between the school administrators' power sources and teachers' organizational trust levels in Turkey. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(1): 58-70.
- Altinkurt Y, Yilmaz K 2012c. Being a female school administrator in Turkey: Views of teachers and administrators. *Energy Education Science and Technology Part B: Social and Educational Studies*, 4(4): 2227-2238.
- Altinkurt Y, Yilmaz K 2013a. *Development of Organizational Power Scale at Schools: A Reliability and Validity Study*. Research Report Unpublished. Kütahya: Dumlupınar University.
- Altinkurt Y, Yilmaz K 2013b. Adaptation of organizational climate scale into Turkish: The validity and reliability study. *Trakya University Journal of Education*, 3(1): 1-11.
- Arat N 1996. Women's studies in Turkey. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 24(1-2): 400-411.
- Aslanargun E 2009. *The Power Sources that Principals Handle in Turkish Public Elementary and Secondary School Administration*. Ph D Thesis, Unpublished. Ankara: Ankara University.
- Aydin M 2000. *Eğitim yönetimi*. Ankara: Hatipoğlu.
- Bakıoğlu A 1996. Teachers' Career Phases. *Paper presented at II Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Sempozyumu*, University of Marmara, 18-20 September.
- Basaran IE 2004. *Yönetimde insan ilişkileri*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Bennis W 1999. *Bir lider olabilmek*. (Trans: U. Teksoz). Istanbul: Sistem.
- Bursalioglu Z 2000. *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Buyukozturk S 2002. *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Cankaya IH, Akuzum C 2010. The relationship between teachers' communication competence and managers' supportive leadership roles in primary school. *Dicle University Journal of Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education*, 1: 49-57.
- Celik V 2003. *Eğitimsel liderlik*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Collie RJ, Shapka JD, Perry NE 2011. Predicting teacher commitment: The impact of school climate and social-emotional learning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 48: 1034-1048.
- Conley S 2006. Climate school. In: FW English (Ed.): *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration*. California: Sage, pp. 153-155.
- Dorgham SR 2012. Relationship between organization work climate and staff nurses organizational commitment. *Nature and Science*, 10(5): 80-91.
- Ercetin SS 1995. *Ast-ust ilişkileri*. Ankara: Safak.
- Erchul WP, Raven BH 1997. Social power in school consultation: A contemporary view of French and Raven's bases of power model. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35(2): 137-171.
- Eshraghi H, Harati SH, Ebrahimi K, Nasiri M 2011. The relationship between organizational climate and leadership styles of the managers of physical education offices in Isfahan province. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(12): 1985-1990.
- French, JRP Jr, Raven BH 1959. The bases of social power. In: D Cartwright (Ed.): *Studies in Social Power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, pp. 150-167.
- Greenberg J, Baron RA 1993. *Behavior in Organizations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Halpin AW, Croft DB 1963. *The Organizational Climate of Schools*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.
- Helvacı MA, Kayalı M 2011. Investigation the sources of organizational power which school's managers use in terms of some variables. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty*, 11(22): 271-296.
- Hofstede G 2005. National Culture - Turkey. From <<http://geert-hofstede.com/turkey.html>> (Retrieved on January 5, 2013).
- Hoy WK, Forsyth P 1986. *Effective Supervision: Theory into Practice*. New York: Random House.
- Hoy WK, Hannum J, Tschannen-Moran M 1998. Organizational climate and student achievement: A parsimonious and longitudinal view. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8(4): 336-359.
- Hoy WK, Miskel CG 2005. *Educational Administration. Theory, Research, and Practice*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy WK, Tarter CJ 1997. *The Road to Open and Healthy Schools: A Handbook for Change*. Elementary Edition. CA: Thousand Oaks.
- Hoy WK, Tarter CJ, Kottkamp RB 1991. *Open Schools/Healthy Schools: Measuring Organizational Climate*. CA: Sage.
- Kagıtcıbası C 1999. *Yeni insan ve insanlar*. Istanbul: Evrim.
- Korkmaz M 2011. The effects of organizational climate and organizational health on organizational commitment in primary schools. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 17(1): 117-139.
- Koslowsky M, Schwarrwald J, Ashuri S 2001. On the relationship between subordinates' compliance to power sources and organisational attitudes. *Applied Psychology*, 50(3): 455-476.
- Oyetunji CO 2006. *The Relationship Between Leadership Style and School Climate in Botswana Secondary Schools*. Ph D Thesis, Unpublished. South Africa University, UNISA.
- Ozaslan G, Gursel M 2008. Evaluation of the power type preferences of educational administrators. *Self-*

- cuk University Journal of Ahmet Kelesoglu Education Faculty*, 2: 351-370.
- Ozkalp E, Kirel C 2003. *Orgutsel Davranis*. Eskisehir: Anadolu University Press.
- Parker CP, Baltes BB, Young SA, Huff JW, Altmann RA, Lacost HA, Roberts JE 2003. Relationships between psychological climate perceptions and work outcomes: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24: 389-416.
- Pepper K, Thomas LH 2002. Making a change: The effects of the leadership role on school climate. *Learning Environments Research*, 5: 155-166.
- Pfeffer J 1992a. *Managing with Power: Politics and Influence in Organizations*. USA: Harvard Business School.
- Pfeffer J 1992b. Understanding power in organizations. *California Management Review*, 34(2): 29-50.
- Sakalli UN, Beydogan B. 2002. Turkish college students' attitudes toward women managers: The effects of patriarchy, sexism, and gender differences. *Journal of Psychology*, 136: 647-656.
- Salancik CR, Pfeffer J 1977. Who gets power-and how they hold on to it: A strategic contingency model of power. *Organizational Dynamics*, 5: 3-21.
- Schein EH 1992. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sezgin F, Kilinc AC 2011. Examining primary school teachers' perceptions of organizational climate. *Gazi University Journal of Gazi Education Faculty*, 31(3): 743-757.
- Stevenson C 2006. Expert power. In: FW English (Ed.): *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration*. California: Sage, pp. 370-371.
- Tajasom A, Ahmad ZA 2011. Principals' leadership style and school climate: Teachers' perspectives from Malaysia. *International Journal of Leadership in Public Services*, 7(4): 314 -333.
- Titrek O, Zafer D 2009. Elementary teachers' opinions about organizational power sources used by school administrators. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 15(60): 657-667.
- Ward EW 1998. Managerial power bases and subordinates' manifest needs as influences on psychological climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12(3): 361-378.
- Yilmaz K 2002. *A Study of Leadership Behaviors of Primary School'S Administrators, the Pupil Control Ideology as Perceived by Teachers and the Quality of School Life as Perceived by Students*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. Eskisehir: Eskisehir Osmangazi University.
- Yilmaz K, Altinkurt Y 2012a. Relationship between school administrators' power sources and teachers' job satisfaction. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 20(2): 385-402.
- Yilmaz K, Altinkurt Y 2012b. Relationship between the leadership behaviors, organizational justice and organizational trust. *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 41(1): 12-24.
- Yukl GA 1989. *Leadership in Organization*. NJ: Prentice-Hall