



[itobiad], 2020, 9 (1): 514/540

**Examining the Relationship between School Principals' Power
Styles and Teacher Alienation ¹**

Okul Müdürlerinin Kullandıkları Güç Stilleri ile Öğretmen
Yabancılaşması Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi ²

Hayriye KUTLU

Öğretmen, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı
Teacher, Ministry of National Education
e-mail: hayriyekutlu14@gmail.com
Orcid ID:0000-0002-6865-3951

Ramazan CANSOY

Doç. Dr. Karabük Üniv., Edebiyat Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü
Assoc. Prof., Karabuk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of
Educational Sciences, Karabuk
e-mail: cansoyramazan@gmail.com
Orcid ID:0000-0003-2768-9939

Makale Bilgisi / Article Information

Makale Türü / Article Type : Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article
Geliş Tarihi / Received : 16.12.2019
Kabul Tarihi / Accepted : 30.03.2020
Yayın Tarihi / Published : 31.03.2020
Yayın Sezonu : Ocak-Şubat-Mart
Pub Date Season : January-February-March

Atıf/Cite as: KUTLU, H, CANSOY, R. (2020). Examining the Relationship between School Principals' Power Styles and Teacher Alienation. İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 9 (1), 514-540. Retrieved from <http://www.itobiad.com/tr/issue/53155/660372>

İntihal /Plagiarism: Bu makale, en az iki hakem tarafından incelenmiş ve intihal içermediği teyit edilmiştir. / This article has been reviewed by at least two referees and confirmed to include no plagiarism. <http://www.itobiad.com/>

Copyright © Published by Mustafa YİĞİTOĞLU Since 2012 - Karabuk University, Faculty of Theology, Karabuk, 78050 Turkey. All rights reserved.

¹ Bu Makale Doç.Dr.Ramazan CANSOY'un danışmanlığında Hayriye KUTLU tarafından hazırlanan Yüksek Lisans Tezinden Üretilmiştir.

² İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü 05.04.2018 Tarih 44653020-20-E 6948694 sayı ile izin alınmıştır.

Examining the Relationship between School Principals' Power Styles and Teacher Alienation

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between school principals' power styles and teacher alienation. The participants were a total of 582 teachers working in elementary, middle and high schools located in Karabuk, Turkey. This study used a correlational survey research design. The data were gathered through the Teacher Alienation Scale and Power Type Scale. The arithmetic mean, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and regression analysis were used for data analysis. The results showed that school principals' reward power and school principals' personality power were negatively correlated with teacher alienation. School principals' coercive power and legitimate power were positively related with teacher alienation. It was found that school principals' reward power predicted teacher alienation negatively and significantly. Also, school principals' coercive power predicted teacher alienation positively and significantly.

Summary

The teacher is the most important agent for the realization of education. Education and training cannot be realized without teachers (Balci, 2002; Bařaran, 2000). Teachers should have high motivation and job satisfaction in order to be successful, productive and effective in their profession. Nowadays, the term "alienation", which is an organizational disease, is frequently encountered in schools. Especially, administrators and teachers in schools face this problem (Polat & Yavař, 2012). Elma (2003) states that alienation occurs when the personnel consider their work meaningless, feel powerless in their work, isolate themselves from the organization and their colleagues, feel alone, and do not consider themselves as a part of the organization.

One of the elements that is considered to be effective in teacher alienation and important for the effectiveness of the school is the school administration. Administrators need to have many effective qualities to maximize student learning and unite employees around the same goal. One of the qualities that they should use effectively is the concept of "power". Power and power sources that shape the effectiveness and behaviors of administrators can also be an important factor in teacher alienation. Karaman (2006) concluded that administrators who take their power from their knowledge create a more effective school environment. When the research studies are examined, it is seen that the behaviors of school principals and the power sources they use have effects on teacher alienation.



It is important to determine the relationship between the power sources used by principals and teacher alienation in terms of teachers finding their jobs more meaningful, not feeling weak and doing their job lovingly. In line with this information, it is thought that the current study will make important contributions to the literature.

This study examined the relationship between school principals' power styles and teacher alienation. The participants were a total of 582 teachers working in elementary, middle and high schools located in Karabuk, Turkey. This study used a correlational survey research design. The data were gathered through the Teacher Alienation Scale and Power Type Scale. The data employed from 582 scales were used to analyze the validity and reliability of the scales. Normality analyses were performed. The average values of the whole power type scale and its sub-dimensions (reward power, legitimate power, coercive power, personality power) were determined, and the average of the teacher alienation scale was also found. Correlation analysis was performed to specify the relationship between the variables. Multiple linear regression analysis was performed to determine the predictive power of power styles on teacher alienation. Teacher alienation was considered as the dependent variable while the independent variables were power styles and the sub-dimensions of power styles (*personality power, reward power, legitimate power and coercive power*).

The results showed that school principals' reward power and school principals' personality power were negatively correlated with teacher alienation. School principals' coercive power and legitimate power were positively related with teacher alienation. It was found that school principals' reward power predicted teacher alienation negatively and significantly. Also, school principals' coercive power predicted teacher alienation positively and significantly.

According to the research, school administrators were found to prefer reward power at the highest level but coercive power at the lowest level. It was observed that teacher alienation decreased with reward power and personality power but increased with coercive power and legitimate power. It can be stated that coercive power and legitimate power have a negative effect while reward power and personality power create a positive effect in terms of teachers' making sense of their profession, not having a sense of weakness, adopting the rules, identifying with their own value judgments, commitment to the school, and seeing themselves as a part of the school. It was noted that reward power interpreted teacher alienation perceptions negatively while coercive power positively made sense of teacher alienation perceptions. It was found that the use of material and moral rewards for creating behavioral change in teachers in schools reduced teacher alienation



significantly but increased significantly with suppression, punishment, threat and coercion.

Some suggestions can be made based on the results of the research. Training programs should be organized for school administrators to use the power sources effectively and efficiently in order to create a democratic environment, a positive school climate, and a collaborative, successful and supportive corporate culture in schools. School administrators and teachers should be informed about teacher alienation and its damage to the education system in order to prevent alienation before it occurs. The central organization of the Ministry should prepare programs for administrators to use reward power more at provincial and district level and ensure that administrators use reward power more. Considering the negative effects of coercive power on teachers, studies involving school administrators and teachers should be carried out. Administrators with effective personality power should be appointed by the help of expert and experienced administrators. Individuals who can communicate effectively and influence other people owing to their personal characteristics should be encouraged to be administrators.

Keywords: Teacher Alienation, Power Styles, Alienation in Education, Alienation, Power

Okul Müdürlerinin Kullandıkları Güç Stilleri ile Öğretmen Yabancılaşması Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

Öz

Bu araştırmada, öğretmen algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin kullandığı güç stilleri ile öğretmen yabancılaşması arasındaki ilişki incelenmiştir. Araştırmaya Karabük ilinde devlet okullarında ki ilkokul, ortaokul ve liselerde görev yapan 582 öğretmen katılmıştır. Araştırmada *Öğretmen Yabancılaşma Ölçeği* ve *Güç Tipi Ölçeği* kullanılmıştır. Araştırma İlişkisel Modelde tasarlanmıştır. Değişkenler arasındaki ilişkiler Korelasyon ve Regresyon analizleri ile incelenmiştir. Araştırmanın bağımlı değişkeni öğretmenlerin yabancılaşma algıları, bağımsız değişkeni okul müdürlerinin kullandıkları güç stilleridir. Araştırma sonucunda ödül ve kişilik gücünün öğretmen yabancılaşması ile negatif yönde, zorlayıcı ve yasal gücün ise öğretmen yabancılaşması ile pozitif yönde ilişkili olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Güç kaynaklarından ödül gücünün öğretmen yabancılaşmasını negatif yönde yordadığı ve zorlayıcı gücün öğretmen yabancılaşmasını pozitif yönde yordadığı bulunmuştur.

Özet

Eğitimin gerçekleşebilmesi için en önemli iş görenlerin başında öğretmen gelir. Öğretmen olmadan eğitim ve öğretim gerçekleşemez (Balci, 2002;



Başaran, 2000). Öğretmenin işinde başarılı, üretken ve etkili olması, motivasyonun yüksek olması işinden doyum alması ile gerçekleşebilir. Günümüzde bir örgüt hastalığı olan “yabancılaşma” kavramı okullarda sıklıkla karşımıza çıkan bir durumdur. Özellikle okullarda bulunan yöneticiler ve öğretmenler bu sorunla karşı karşıyadır (Polat ve Yavaş, 2012). Elma (2003), işgörenin yaptığı işi anlamsız bulması, yaptığı iş içerisinde kendini güçsüz hissetmesi, kendini örgütten ve iş arkadaşlarından soyutlaması, kendini yalnız hissetmesi, kendini örgütün bir parçası olarak görmemesinin yabancılaşmaya neden olduğunu belirtmektedir.

Öğretmen yabancılaşmasında etkili olabileceği düşünülen ve okulun etkililiği için önem arz eden öğelerden biri de okul yönetimleridir. Yöneticilerin öğrenci öğrenmelerini en üst seviyeye çıkarmak, çalışanları aynı amaç etrafında birleştirmek için birçok etkin özelliğe sahip olması gereklidir. Etkin olarak kullanmaları gereken özelliklerden biri de “güç” kavramıdır. Yöneticilerin etkililiği ve davranışlarına yön veren güç ve güç kaynakları öğretmen yabancılaşmasında da önemli bir etken olabilir. Karaman (2006) çalışmasında, gücünü bilgisinden alan yöneticilerin daha etkili bir okul ortamı yarattığı sonucuna varmıştır. Alanyazındaki çalışmalar incelendiğinde, okul müdürlerinin davranışlarının ve kullandıkları güç kaynaklarının öğretmen yabancılaşmasını etkilediği görülmektedir. Müdürlerin kullandığı güç kaynakları ile öğretmen yabancılaşması arasındaki ilişkiyi öğretmenlerin işlerini daha anlamlı bulmaları, güçsüz hissetmeleri ve işlerini sevgiyle yapmaları açısından belirlemek önemlidir. Bu bilgiler doğrultusunda mevcut çalışmanın literatüre önemli katkılar sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Bu araştırma da öğretmen yabancılaşması ile okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç stilleri arasındaki ilişki incelenmektedir. Araştırmaya Karabük ilinde devlet okullarında ki ilkokul, ortaokul ve liselerde görev yapan 582 öğretmen katılmıştır. Araştırmada *Öğretmen Yabancılaşma Ölçeği* ve *Güç Tipi Ölçeği* kullanılmıştır. Araştırma İlişkisel Tarama Modeli ile kurgulanmıştır. Araştırma verileri toplandıktan sonra geçerli olan 582 adet ölçeklerden elde edilen veriler doğrultusunda öncelikle ölçeklerin geçerlilik ve güvenirlik durumları analiz edilmiştir. Normallik analizleri yapılmıştır. Araştırmada güç tipi ölçeğinin tamamının ve alt boyutları olan ödül gücü, yasal güç, zorlayıcı güç, kişilik gücünün ortalama değerleri bulunmuş, öğretmen yabancılaşma ölçeğinin de ortalaması tespit edilmiştir. Elde edilen veriler, değişkenler arasındaki ilişkinin tespiti için Korelasyon analizi yapılmıştır. Güç stillerinin öğretmen yabancılaşması üzerindeki yordayıcılık gücünü belirlemek amacıyla Çoklu Doğrusal Regresyon Analizi yapılmıştır. Yapılan çalışmada öğretmen yabancılaşması bağımlı, güç stilleri ve güç stilleri alt boyutlarından *kişilik gücü*, *ödül gücü*, *yasal güç* ve *zorlayıcı güç*



boyutları bağımsız değişken olarak ele alınmıştır. Regresyon analizlerinin yorumlanmasında standartlaştırılmış

Araştırma bulgularına göre öğretmenlerin nadiren yabancılaşma yaşadıkları, okul yöneticilerinin en çok tercih ettiği güç kaynağının ödül gücü, en az kullandıkları güç kaynağının ise zorlayıcı güç olduğu bulgusuna ulaşılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda ödül ve kişilik gücünün öğretmen yabancılaşması ile negatif, zorlayıcı ve yasal gücün ise pozitif ilişki içinde olduğu görülmüştür. Güç kaynaklarından ödül gücü ve zorlayıcı gücün öğretmen yabancılaşmasını açıklayan iki değişken olduğu saptanmıştır.

Araştırmaya göre görev yapmakta olan okul yöneticilerinin güç stillerinden en yüksek düzeyde ödül gücünü kullanırken en düşük düzeyde ise zorlayıcı gücü tercih ettikleri görülmektedir. Araştırmada öğretmen yabancılaşmasının okul yöneticilerinin kullandığı güç stillerinden ödül ve kişilik gücü ile azalırken, zorlayıcı ve yasal güçle arttığı görülmektedir. Elde edilen bu sonuç öğretmenlerin mesleklerini anlamlandırmada, güçsüzlük duygusu yaşamamalarında, kuralları benimseme ve kendi değer yargıları ile özdeşleştirmede, okula bağlılık ve kendini okulun bir parçası olarak görmesinde ödül gücü ve kişilik gücünün olumlu etki yaratırken zorlayıcı ve yasal gücün olumsuz bir etki oluşturduğu şeklinde ifade edilebilir.

Araştırmada öğretmen yabancılaşma algılarını ödül gününün negatif yönde anlamlandırdığı, zorlayıcı gücün ise pozitif yönde anlamlandırdığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Okullarda öğretmenlerde davranış değişikliği oluşturmak için kullanılan maddi ve manevi ödüllerin öğretmen yabancılaşmasını anlamlı olarak azaltırken baskılama, ceza, tehdit ve zorlama ile anlamlı olarak arttığı söylenebilir.

Araştırmadan elde edilen sonuçlar doğrultusunda bazı önerilerde bulunulabilir. Okul yöneticileri, okullarda demokratik ortam, olumlu okul iklimi, işbirlikçi, başarı ve destekleyici kurum kültürü oluşturabilmeleri için ellerinde bulunan güç kaynaklarını etkin ve verimli kullanmaları gerektiği ile ilgili eğitim programları düzenlenmelidir. Okul yönetici ve öğretmenlerine öğretmen yabancılaşması ve yabancılaşmanın eğitim sistemine verebileceği zararlar hakkında bilgilendirme yapılarak yabancılaşmanın oluşmadan engellenmesi sağlanmalıdır. Milli Eğitim Merkez Örgütü, il ve ilçe düzeyinde yöneticilerin ödül gücünü daha fazla kullanmalarına yönelik programlar hazırlanarak yöneticilerin ödül gücünü daha fazla kullanmalarını sağlanmalıdır. Zorlayıcı gücün öğretmenler üzerinde yarattığı olumsuz etkilerle ilgili okul yöneticilerinin ve öğretmenlerin yer aldığı çalışmalar yapılmalıdır. Alanında uzman ve deneyimli yönetici seçimleriyle kişilik gücü etkili yöneticiler atanmalıdır. Etkili iletişim kurabilen, kişisel özellikleri ile etrafındaki bireyleri etkileyen kişiler yönetici olmaya özendirilmelidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretmen yabancılaşması, okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç stilleri, eğitimde yabancılaşma, yabancılaşma, güç



1. Introduction

The teacher is the most important agent for the realization of education. Education and training cannot be realized without teachers (Balci, 2002; Başaran, 2000). Teachers should have high motivation and job satisfaction in order to be successful, productive and effective in their profession. A highly motivated teacher who is engaged in their job is very important for an effective school environment (Elma, 2003). Nowadays, the term "alienation", which is an organizational disease, is frequently encountered in schools. Especially, administrators and teachers in schools face this problem (Polat & Yavaş, 2012). Elma (2003) states that alienation occurs when the personnel consider their work meaningless, feel powerless in their work, isolate themselves from the organization and their colleagues, feel alone, and do not consider themselves as a part of the organization. Increasing problems (such as the fact that schools are large and complex organizations, variability of input and output, centralized structure, low participation in decisions, and technological developments) result in teachers' inability to obtain satisfaction from their job.

Seeman transformed the concept of alienation from a general concept into a concept with dimensions (Minibaş, 1993). Seeman (1959) examined alienation in five dimensions to be used in empirical studies: weakness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation and self-alienation. The weakness dimension of alienation is due to factors such as lack of sufficient knowledge and skills, lack of control, managerial difficulties, changing technology, lack of motivation, and lack of appreciation. In terms of meaninglessness, it was seen that not being able to see the whole work, not being able to use creativity, not being able to participate in decisions, strict control, working life that became monotonous, and heavy bureaucratic functioning were the causes. On the other hand, the lack of norms also means not being able to integrate with society, not adopting social rules, and degeneration (Elma, 2003). In the dimension of self-alienation, individuals distance themselves from their surroundings in order to escape from group pressure or to react to the situation they live in, and this is due to the fact that their current expectations cannot be matched with their future expectations (Tolan, 1981).

Nowadays, society has many expectations from teachers. It is likely that teachers also have expectations from administrators, students, the environment, parents, society and the state (Balci, 2005). These situations may cause teacher alienation (Şimşek, Balay & Şimşek, 2012). If these expectations of teachers are not met, they suffer from a sense of weakness, and their status against the roles assigned to them and their economic income do not meet these expectations. Some examples of these difficulties are as follows: physical conditions of schools, transportation facilities, high number of students in the classrooms, high social expectations, inability to



develop themselves adequately in the face of technological developments, and lack of knowledge in applying new teaching methods and techniques (Polat, 2007). Some reasons, such as failure to reach the top administrators and not being able to participate in decisions, cause feelings of failure and alienation among teachers (Şimşek, Balay & Şimşek, 2012). Many factors reduce job satisfaction in the teaching profession, such as the fact that teachers are promoted only by participating in administration despite their unwillingness to participate in administration, inadequacies in the reward and punishment system, difficulties in evaluating the achievement of teachers, and measuring success with seniority and service scores in general (Bursalıoğlu, 2015). These problems may cause teachers to become alienated from their profession. Alienation or teacher alienation in education is increasing day by day with the rapid development and changes. As the problems of education increase, this creates a sense of weakness and failure in teachers. Teachers who usually face similar problems have negative feelings about their profession, become insensitive to their job, and experience meaninglessness in their job (Şimşek, Balay & Şimşek, 2012). Constantly changing rules and regulations in the education and examination system may cause teachers to experience a sense of normlessness. Teachers who waver between school, job and society, who cannot realize themselves, and who cannot find their essence, may first experience alienation against their school and job and then against themselves.

The literature presents many studies that have investigated teacher alienation. Teacher alienation has been studied by most researchers in terms of demographic variables. These researchers examined the relationship between teacher alienation and gender, seniority, school type, branch, socioeconomic level, and age (Celep, 2008; Elma, 2003; Emir, 2012; Eryılmaz & Burgaz, 2011; Kılıç, 2009; Kınık, 2010). Some studies also investigated the relationship between teacher alienation and organizational culture, organizational cynicism, organizational exclusion, organizational justice, administrators' moral behaviors, effect of executive behaviors, bureaucratic structure, administration policies, and working conditions (Abaslı, 2018; Anderson, 1973; Aydın, 2015; Brooks, Hughes & Brooks, 2008; Derose, 1985; Kahveci, 2015; Koyuncu, 2011; Shehada & Khafaje, 2015; Tsang, 2016).

One of the elements that is considered to be effective in teacher alienation and important for the effectiveness of the school is the school administration. The administration is a team that exploits employees and materials in the most effective way in order to help the organization reach its goals (Karip, 2005). School administrations have important duties in achieving the goals of schools. Considering teachers' productivity and effectiveness, and school culture and climate, the role of the administrators is undeniable. It can be stated that school administrations can be effective in helping teachers to consider their job meaningful, conform to school rules, and be better committed to school.



Administrators need to have many effective qualities to maximize student learning and unite employees around the same goal. One of the qualities that they should use effectively is the concept of "power". Power refers to an effect used as a guide in individual or group communication and inter-communal relations, and in sectors such as administration, policy, marketing, advertising, and education (Bolelli, 2017). Power, which allows behavioral change by influencing others, is a source that should be used effectively by administrators in this field (Koşar, 2008). Power should be used correctly and effectively, especially in schools (Üstün, 2013)

Power and power sources that shape the effectiveness and behaviors of administrators can also be an important factor in teacher alienation. For being successful, administrators should direct the employees towards the desired behavior (Aydın, 2007; Şimşek, 2005). Administrators should influence the employees and create behavioral changes (Koşar, 2008; Özdemir, 2000). In order to increase the productivity and effectiveness of the organization, administrators need to analyze the power phenomenon and power sources well (Karaman, 2006). It is important that administrators are well aware of the impact of power use and are able to manage the process well. Administrators who can analyze and use power sources well maximize their effects on the employees (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson, 1996).

The literature abounds in studies related to power sources (Etzioni, 1964; Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Peabody, 1961; Rahim, 1989). Power sources were classified as a result of these studies. The most accepted classification is the one made by French and Raven (1959). French & Raven classified power sources as legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, referent power and expert power (Koçel, 1998). In the classification by French and Raven, power sources that draw their strength from their users' positions consist of legitimate power, reward power and coercive power, whereas power sources that draw their strength from their users' personal characteristics include referent power and expert power (Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborn, 2000). The administrator should analyze the power source he/she will use as well as the response of the teacher, and in order to increase the effectiveness of the school, the administrator should be able to create a behavior change that can gather teachers around a goal. Administrators who influence teachers in the right direction through their power can create a positive school climate and a school culture based on cooperation and solidarity. Teachers' weakness and meaninglessness levels may be lower in schools with a positive school climate and collaborative structure. The effectiveness of schools also depends on their ability to be managed effectively. Using temporal and situational power is vital in managing schools (Aslanargun, 2009).



The power use in administration is under-investigated with many different variables. The literature abounds in studies investigating the relationship between power types used in administration and school climate (Diş, 2015; Diş & Ayık, 2016), school culture (Koşar, 2008; Koşar & Çalık, 2011; Özcan, Çağlar, Karataş & Polat, 2014), organizational cynicism (Demir, 2017), organizational trust (Özhan, 2016), organizational commitment (Bağcı & Bursalı, 2011; Sezgin & Koşar, 2010), and organizational citizenship (Yılmaz & Altınkurt, 2012). Studies indicate that power sources used by administrators are important in teachers' commitment to their organizations, forming a collaborative and supportive school culture, forming a trust environment, shaping the school environment, and creating a positive and negative school climate (Bağcı & Bursalı, 2011; Koşar, 2008). The fact that teachers believe that the school administrator's use of power effectively will bring solutions to the problems faced by the teachers may reduce their weakness levels. In schools managed with a democratic and flexible administrative approach, teachers can actively participate in decisions. Decisions taken by the school administrator and teachers together can be effective in decreasing teachers' perceptions of normlessness. School principals who can create an effective communication network, a positive school climate, and a supportive and collaborative school culture may increase teachers' commitment to school and decrease their sense of meaninglessness.

The alienation occurring in schools and society brings about social problems (Bayrak & Terzi, 2004). This alienation may result in schools being unable to fulfill the social function of education sufficiently. Teachers who have a sense of alienation towards the school may not be able to think about the success of the school or student sufficiently because of the limitations of their situations. Eryılmaz & Burgaz (2011) state that teacher alienation would decrease the effectiveness of the school; therefore, it would not be possible to increase student learning to the next level. Thus, it is possible to emphasize that the decrease of organizational alienation is an important factor for healthy functioning of schools. In this case, the administrator's use of power sources appropriately can help teachers consider their job meaningful by letting them do their job lovingly.

"Teachers see administrators as agents that make them happy and unhappy in their jobs and adjust their relationships accordingly. When these relations are constructive and creative, the school atmosphere becomes harmonious and the morale of the staff increases" (Bursalıoğlu, 2015: 47). This brings a positive school climate. In a positive school climate, teachers' perceptions of powerlessness, normlessness and meaninglessness may also diminish, as job satisfaction, morale and motivation of teachers are high, and their job stress is quite low. Teacher alienation may cause many negative results such as the estrangement of teachers from their job, their isolation from society and school, performing their teaching traditionally, troubles in communication among colleagues, troubles in communication with students, and failure of



the school to achieve its objectives. It is inevitable that the problems of teachers alienated from their job will be reflected not only onto themselves but onto the whole society with the butterfly effect. Teachers' love of their jobs and their high morale and motivation are the most important issues for achieving the goals of the school.

Literature provides a limited number of studies that examine the relationship between teacher alienation and power sources used by principals. As a result of these studies, there is a relationship between power sources and alienation (Derose, 1985; Aldemir, 1987). Some studies have concluded that the level of centralization in schools and hierarchical structure and the use of legal force increase the level of alienation (Goldberg 1990; Elma, 2003; Erjem, 2005; Forsyth & Hoy, 1978; Hoşgörür, 1997; Johnson & Ellet, 1992; Suarez, Zielinski & Hoy, 1983; Şimşek, Balay and Şimşek, 2012; Vavrus, 1989; Zoghbi & Lara, 2007). In his study, Karaman (2006) concluded that administrators who take their power from their knowledge create a more effective school environment. When the research studies are examined, it is seen that the behaviors of school principals and the power sources they use have effects on teacher alienation. It is important to determine the relationship between the power sources used by principals and teacher alienation in terms of teachers finding their jobs more meaningful, not feeling weak and doing their job lovingly. In line with this information, it is thought that the current study will make important contributions to the literature. In this sense, this research aims to inform policymakers and school principals about the effects of power sources used by school administrators on teacher alienation. Another aim of this study, which underlines the importance of the power sources used by the school principal on teacher alienation and draws attention to the necessity of using these power supplies more effectively and efficiently, is to shed light on other studies in the literature.

Research Questions

This study aimed to examine the relationship between school principals' power styles and teacher alienation. To achieve this aim, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. Is there a significant relationship between school principals' power styles and teacher alienation as well as the sub-dimensions of power sources?
2. Do the school principals' power styles predict teacher alienation?



2. Method

2.1. Model

This study examined the relationship between school principals' power styles and teacher alienation. The research employed a cross-sectional survey design to examine school principals' power styles and teacher alienation. This study used a correlational survey research design. The dependent variable is teacher alienation, while the independent variables are personal power, legitimate power, reward power and coercive power.

2.2. Sample data collection

Teachers were recruited through the convenient sampling method. The sample consisted of 582 teachers working in 42 different primary, secondary and high schools.

The study included 281 males (48.3%) and 301 females (51.7%). It involved 139 (23.9%), 133 (22.9%) and 310 (53.3%) primary, secondary and high school teachers, respectively. It was observed that 78 (%13.4) participants had a seniority of 0-5 years, 84 (14.4%) participants had a seniority of 6-10 years, and 420 (72.2%) participants had a seniority of 11 years or more. Considering their branch distribution, there were 111 (19.4%) teachers of digital lessons, 167 (28.7%) teachers of verbal lessons, 109 (18.7%) classroom teachers, 59 (10.1%) teachers of applied courses, and 136 (23.4%) out of field teachers.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

Power Type Scale.

This scale was developed by Koşar (2008) and consists of four dimensions: reward power, legitimate power, coercive power and personality power. It is a 5-point Likert scale. Factor analysis was performed for construct validity. Factor analysis showed that items 22, 23, 24 were distributed with similar factor loadings to other dimensions; therefore, after the exploratory factor analysis, these items were excluded from the scale and the data were re-analyzed. The personality power dimension explained 48.4% of the total variance, and the item factor loading values of this dimension ranged from .67 to .91. The second dimension -reward power- explained 13% of the total variance, and the item factor loading values of this dimension varied between .72 and .90. The third dimension -legitimate power- explained 6.03% of the total variance, and the item factor loading values of this dimension varied between .71 and .83. The fourth dimension of the scale explained 3.03% of the total variance, and the item factor loading values of this dimension ranged from .54 to .88. These four dimensions explain 69.8% of the total variance.



In the studies conducted on the reliability of the scale, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients and item-total correlation values of the dimensions were examined. The internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be .97 for personality power, .93 for reward power, .81 for legitimate power, and .81 for coercive power. In addition, the item total correlation values were found to be .66 - .83 for reward power, .48 - .69 for legitimate power, .44 - .74 for coercive power, and .69 - .87 for personality power. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of all items was $\alpha = .93$. Accordingly, the power type scale was found to be a valid and reliable measurement tool.

Teacher Alienation Scale.

The Teacher Alienation Scale was developed by Elma (2003). It is a 5-point Likert scale which consists of 38 items. The teacher alienation scale which was used in this study was determined to have four factors, namely *powerlessness*, *meaninglessness*, *isolation* and *alienation from school*. The result of the exploratory factor analysis revealed that the scale had a single factor. Items 33, 36, 37 and 38 were excluded from the scale since their factor loading values were low. After omitting these items, the variance explained in the scale was found to be 38.54%. Item factor loadings were between .44 and .77.

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .95 in this study. When the item total correlation coefficients were examined, it was seen that they ranged between .44 and .74. Thus, the teacher alienation scale was found to be a valid and reliable measurement tool.

2.4. Data Analysis

Before conducting the statistical analysis, the missing values were determined and the average value was assigned. After completing the missing data entry process, the normality of the data was tested, and Durbin-Watson value was found to be 1.84. In the analysis phase, the condition index (CI) was examined in terms of variance inflation factor (VIF) values and tolerances. It was observed that the VIF values were below 5 and the tolerance values did not have values approaching zero. When the CI of the variables was examined, it was found that there was no CI greater than 30. The skewness and kurtosis values of the data were examined at the last stage of the normality test, and these were determined as (.63) – (.42) for teacher alienation; (-.61) – (.29) for reward power; (.43) – (.14) for legitimate power; (.95) – (.39) for coercive power; and (-.14) – (.68) for personality power. The data showed that the kurtosis and skewness values of the data varied between -1 and +1. Şencan (2005) states that if the skewness and kurtosis values range between (+1) and (-1), this shows that the data are normally distributed.



The data employed from 582 scales were used to analyze the validity and reliability of the scales. Normality analyses were performed. The average values of the whole power type scale and its sub-dimensions (reward power, legitimate power, coercive power, personality power) were determined, and the average of the teacher alienation scale was also found. Correlation analysis was performed to specify the relationship between the variables. Multiple linear regression analysis was performed to determine the predictive power of power styles on teacher alienation. Teacher alienation was considered as the dependent variable while the independent variables were power styles and the sub-dimensions of power styles (*personality power, reward power, legitimate power and coercive power*). Standardized Beta (β) coefficients were examined for interpreting regression analyses, and t-test results were investigated for their significance. The significance level of the data was determined as $p < 0.05$.

3. Findings

Table 1 shows the perceptions of teachers about school principals' power styles and also the distribution of teacher alienation levels.

Table 1 School principals' Power Styles and Teacher Alienation

<i>Variables</i>	\bar{X}	S
1. Teacher Alienation	1.93	.69
<i>Power Sources</i>		
1.Reward power	3.51	1.03
2.Legitimate power	2.93	.95
3.Coercive power	2.08	.97
4.Personality power	3.09	1.06

In Table 1, teachers' perceptions about teacher alienation were noted as ($\bar{X}=1.93$). When teachers' perceptions about the power styles of the school administrators were examined, it was seen that the highest average was found to be in reward power ($\bar{X}=3.51$) while the lowest average was in coercive power ($\bar{X}=2.08$).

Table 2 presents the correlation coefficients of the relationships between the school principals' power styles and teacher alienation.



Table 2. Relationship between school principals' power styles and teacher alienation

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Teacher Alienation	1	-.34**	-.40**	.17**	.27**
2. Personality power		1	.73**	-.16**	-.31**
3. Reward power			1	-.17**	-.33**
4. Legitimate power				1	.66**
5. Coercive power					

** $p < .01$

Table 2 indicates a moderate, negative and statistically significant relationship between school principals' reward power and teacher alienation ($r = -.40, p < .01$) as well as personality power ($r = -.34, p < .01$). The findings show a weak, positive and statistically significant relationship between school principals' legitimate power and teacher alienation ($r = .17, p < .01$) as well as coercive power ($r = .27, p < .01$). According to the findings, it can be stated that as the reward power and personality power used by the school principals increase, teacher alienation decreases. On the other hand, it can be concluded that the more legitimate power and coercive power increase, the more teacher alienation increases.

Table 3 shows the results of multiple linear regression analyses on how teacher alienation was predicted by the personality power, reward power, legitimate power, and coercive power dimensions.

Table 3. Results of Regression Analysis Regarding the Prediction of Teacher Alienation by Power Dimensions

Variables	Teacher Alienation				
	B	t	p	Binary r	Partial R
Constant		19.08	.00		
Personality power	-.06	1.75	.08	-.34	-.07
Reward power	-.18	-4.86	.00	-.40	-.20
Legitimate power	-.02	-.58	.57	.06	-.02
Coercive power	.12	3.58	.00	.27	.15



Table 3 shows that school principals' power styles explained 18% of the total variance of teacher alienation. In addition, it was found that reward power predicted teacher alienation negatively and significantly ($\beta = -.18, p < .05$). Also, coercive power predicted teacher alienation positively and significantly ($\beta = .12, p < .05$). However, personality power ($\beta = -.06, p > .05$) and legitimate power ($\beta = -.02, p > .05$) did not predict teacher alienation significantly.

4. Discussion

School principals' use of power effectively is very important for educational institutions to achieve their goals. Some factors are expected to increase the productivity of teachers and effectiveness of schools, such as liking their job, feeling a part of the school and institution, having high motivation and job satisfaction, working in a collaborative and supportive environment, and having low work stress and anxiety. It is vital that teachers, who are role models for students and have great effects on students, avoid professional alienation. Being equipped with important powers over teachers in schools, school administrators need to be careful when using these authorities and powers. It should be kept in mind that improper and inefficient power use, especially in schools, will leave a bad impression on teachers and students (indirectly), and will have difficult results to correct (Üstün, 2013). School administrators are expected to increase the effectiveness of the school by affecting teachers and students positively.

The findings revealed that teachers rarely experienced alienation. These results confirm those of various studies (Çalışır, 2006; Erjem, 2005; Eryılmaz & Burgaz, 2011; Hoşgörür, 1997). Teacher alienation level was labelled as "sometimes" in some studies (Celep, 2008; Kınık, 2010). There are many reasons for this situation. For example, Bayındır (2002) advocates that teachers who are alienated from their job do not adopt the profession, and that these teachers exclude themselves from many activities such as student achievement and social activities, which in turn reduces the efficiency of schools. Erjem (2005) states that administrative processes are important factors in terms of teacher alienation, and that a non-democratic school administration increases teacher alienation. Şirin (2007) lists many factors which cause teacher alienation, such as centralized structures of schools, administrative processes, curriculum, morale, job satisfaction, motivation, physical facilities of the schools, and lack of equipment. This shows that teacher alienation may be affected by crowded and noisy classes, centralized structure, bureaucratic school climate, limited communication between teacher and school administration, teachers' inability to adopt the profession, lack of social activities, and teachers' loneliness and isolation in their lives. In addition, many reasons (e.g., lecturing the same course for years, the fact that their teaching becomes routine, and having to choose a teaching profession) may lead to teacher alienation. The following features



indicate teacher alienation: considering the profession meaningless in time, being unwilling to meet or see colleagues outside of school, leaving the school as soon as the class finishes, being reluctant to engage in activities with students and teachers, having difficulty in communicating, and having diminished enthusiasm for the profession. Besides, decisions taken by head office and educational policies, changing exam systems, ready-made curricula and activities, and any decisions taken without teachers may cause teacher weakness and normlessness.

When the school principals' power sources were examined, the power sources used were determined as legitimate power, reward power, expert power and coercive power. In this study, it was found that the power styles used by school administrators were listed as reward power, personality power, legitimate power and coercive power. The findings showed that the power source that school administrators used the most was reward power. This confirms the findings of Akyüz, Kaya & Arevi (2015) and Diş (2015), who found that the most commonly used power source was reward power. Unlike the research findings, it is seen that reward power is one of the least used power sources when comparing the studies conducted in the field of reward power (Akyüz, Kaya & Arevi, 2015; Bakan & Büyükbeşe, 2010; Memduhoğlu & Turhan, 2016; Titrek & Zafer, 2009; Yılmaz & Altinkurt, 2012). In our study, the high rate of the use of reward power can be interpreted as the fact that the administrators are aware of this power, realize its positive sides, and use it more frequently than other powers. The study findings indicated that the least used power source by school administrators was coercive power. This shares similar results with various papers (Aslanargun, 2009; Diş, 2015; Helvacı & Kayalı, 2011; Memduhoğlu & Turhan, 2016). In this study, the second most used power was expert power.

The findings of the study confirm the relationship between teacher alienation and power styles used by school administrators. According to the findings, teacher alienation has a negative relationship with personality power and reward power, whereas it has a positive relationship with coercive power and legitimate power. On the other hand, it was noted that while teachers' perceptions of alienation increased with the legitimate power and coercive power used by school administrators, they decreased with the reward power and personality power. It was stated that teacher alienation had a significant relationship with each dimension of the power styles used by school administrators. These findings show that the level of alienation experienced by teachers and the power styles used by school administrators are important. Aldemir (1987) examined the relationship between alienation from work, job satisfaction and power type. He found no relationship for coercive power and reward power, but found that expert power and personality power reduced teacher alienation. Similarly, De Rose (1985)



advocated that there was a relationship between the school principals' power styles and alienation. Goldberg (1990) aimed to determine the relationship between teachers working in lower and upper secondary schools and the power sources used by the school administrators. It was concluded that there was a negative relationship between alienation from work and power types, and that teacher alienation increased as the centralization level of the school increased. In the same study, Goldberg (1990) stated that teachers defined legitimate power as the dominant power base for the majority of the school principals. Similar to the research, the fact that legitimate power puts pressure on teachers confirms that it is a power that increases teacher alienation. Considering the literature, the relationship between alienation and various variables that may lead to teacher alienation was examined. Johnson & Ellett (1992), and Organ & Greene (1981) deduced that one of the reasons for alienation was work stress. Legitimate power and coercive power that includes threats and punishment can be among the factors that increase work stress.

Şimşek, Balay & Şimşek (2012), Forsyth & Hoy (1978), Hoşgörür (1997), Zielinski & Hoy (1983), and Zoghbi & Lara (2007) ascertained that acting within the bureaucratic structure (e.g., centralization, not violating the regulations, officialization and hierarchy of authority) increased alienation. Hence, it is expected that the alienation of teachers who cannot share their ideas with the administration and participate in decisions within the hierarchical structure, might increase due to the legitimate power used. The teacher who encounters this situation, may not only feel weak but want to get away from the environment and isolate himself from his friends. Yılmaz & Sarpkaya (2009) concluded that school administrations exerting pressure on teachers and ignoring their opinions increase alienation. Supporting the current study, the aforementioned research proves that coercive power and legitimate power increase teacher alienation. According to Minibaş (1993), job satisfaction and sense of competence are important factors that have an effect upon alienation. This information confirms the relationship between reward power and alienation, which has a significant impact on job satisfaction. The fact that the school administrator awards teachers with a plaque and appreciates them for their teaching performance can increase teachers' job satisfaction and motivation while decreasing alienation. Elma (2003), Erjem (2005), Johnson & Ellet (1992) and Vavrus (1989) emphasized that centralization, hierarchical structure, and non-democratic school structures induce teacher alienation. Frequent use of legitimate power and coercive power by the school administrator increases alienation. This power can lead to an increase in the sense of alienation among teachers, especially when it is used in preparing lesson programs, assigning watch duties, and distributing unfair work. Teachers' inability to select their administrator, determine the curriculum, have a say in the education policies as well as the school principal's use of the legitimate power and coercive power may cause an increase in teachers' perception of teacher alienation. The teacher who



feels under pressure with these sanctions may feel powerless, and this situation may cause the teacher to consider his profession meaningless. Kılçık (2011) warned that teachers who do not feel effective in school administration and who do not have a say in making decisions feel weaker. The level of alienation may also be higher in schools where the success of the teacher is not recognized, and which have no effective communication environment. Elma (2003) stated that for a successful teacher to consider their job meaningful, both a good communication environment is necessary and the success of employees must be noticed. Reward power can be one of the important power sources to appreciate a successful teacher. The rewarded teacher can do better by considering his job more meaningful. Thus, the alienation level of the teacher who considers his job meaningful may decrease. Giving tasks that teachers like to do and assigning them through persuasion (without forcing teachers) can reduce teacher alienation when assigning extracurricular tasks. A teacher who feels forced may not be willing to go to school. S/he can perceive the task s/he has to do only as a duty, and therefore, consider it meaningless. The teacher who believes in the administrator's knowledge and experience will do the job more lovingly. The fact that the teacher has high job satisfaction and motivation can reduce the teacher's work stress and teacher alienation level. In addition to knowledge and experience, the democratic environment created by school administrators who try to influence teachers with their personal characteristics can be effective in decreasing school alienation. The teacher who is influenced by the personality power of the school administrator can also trust and feel commitment to the school administrator (Koçel, 1998). The sense of trust and belonging in the teacher may increase the teacher's commitment to the school and may reduce the feeling of weakness. The teacher who trusts the school administrator may believe in the necessity of the rules determined by the administrator. The administrator who is an expert in their job can easily and quickly solve the problems faced by the teacher and reduce the level of weakness and meaninglessness.

Another finding of the study is that power styles are variables explaining teacher alienation. Reward power and coercive power are two variables explaining teacher alienation. Reward power explains teacher alienation negatively, while coercive power explains teacher alienation positively.

Considering the study findings, it can be stated that the use of reward power by the school administrator is an important variable in decreasing the level of teacher alienation. The motivation of the teacher who is appreciated and honored for his success can increase. Fairly rewarded, the teacher can continue his work with great pleasure and enthusiasm. Teachers want their success to be appreciated and rewarded (Çelebi, Vuranok & Hasekioğlu Turgut, 2015). The award encourages the teacher to work and empowers the



individual spiritually. Thus, as the teacher receives a recompense for their work, the excitement and enthusiasm of the teacher to their job continues to increase (Emir, 2012). The level of alienation may decrease in the teacher whose enthusiasm and excitement continues. Reward power can help the teacher consider their job meaningful. Koşar & Çalık (2011) found that reward power had a positive relationship with the support, success and task culture dimensions of the school culture. Collaboration between teachers and the presence of a supportive environment in their institutions can also reduce teacher alienation. Reward power is one of the sources of power that increases intrinsic motivation among teachers (Cemaloğlu & Gülcan, 2018). The level of alienation may decrease, as the highly motivated teacher will do his job with pleasure. Owens (2004) states that teachers working with school administrators in a supportive and collaborative way should know that they will be rewarded at the end of the process. This increases the motivation level of the teacher. The teacher who has a high level of motivation may succeed in their profession more easily. The teacher who gains efficiency from their job may find their profession more meaningful.

Coercive power is another variable that positively explains teacher alienation. Likewise, the use of coercive power by school administrators can be interpreted as an effective variable in increasing the level of teacher alienation. In line with this result, it is possible to say that there is a positive relationship between teacher alienation and the way school principals threaten teachers with punishment, make unjust criticisms, and create pressure on them. Coercive power can cause the teacher to isolate himself from his school, and become a person who only attends the class and does not want to communicate with the school administration and other teachers. The teacher who has these feelings may only want to do the assigned task and go out of the school boundaries as soon as possible. The teacher may not receive help from other teachers or the school administration and may feel weak because he avoids communicating when encountering a problem. These teachers may consider their job meaningless in time. They may only adopt the rules to avoid being punished. Their job may become meaningless and the level of teacher alienation may increase. On the other hand, coercive power is a power that takes its strength from the authority. In other words, it takes its power from the status of the individual in the organization (Hitt, Black & Porter, 2005). It is crucial how individuals perceive coercive power, which needs to be used with caution. Not only can coercive power be considered as having a job done with pressure, fear and punishment (Koşar, 2008), but also, it can be perceived as a power used by school administrators to create behavior change in teachers or make teachers do a job. This perception is related to the administrator's ability to use this power effectively, in a timely manner, and correctly (Schermerhorn et al., 2000). School administrators who use coercive power too often can create a negative atmosphere in their schools. In a negative school climate, teacher alienation may increase. Various studies revealed that coercive power was



negatively correlated with the support, success and task culture dimensions of the school culture (Memduhoğlu & Turhan, 2016; Soosai, 1988). Coercive power can cause teachers to isolate themselves from school and their colleagues. As noted, less use of coercive power by school administrators, who play a key role in teacher alienation, would be effective in decreasing teacher alienation.

5. Conclusion

The results of this study revealed that teachers' perceptions of alienation and weakness were found to be low in Karabük province. It can be interpreted that the teachers could identify their jobs with their own value judgments and that they did not consider their profession meaningless. In addition, the teachers had high motivation and job satisfaction but had low stress levels. It can be stated that the teachers were not adversely affected by administrative processes, they felt loyalty to their schools and supported their institutions. The fact that the teachers' perceptions of alienation from work were generally low can be considered positive in terms of the teachers' effectiveness. On the other hand, the fact that the perception of alienation was at a certain level (even at a low level) can be considered as a problem which needs to be investigated.

According to the research, school administrators were found to prefer reward power at the highest level but coercive power at the lowest level. It was observed that teacher alienation decreased with reward power and personality power but increased with coercive power and legitimate power. It can be stated that coercive power and legitimate power have a negative effect while reward power and personality power create a positive effect in terms of teachers' making sense of their profession, not having a sense of weakness, adopting the rules, identifying with their own value judgments, commitment to the school, and seeing themselves as a part of the school. It was noted that reward power interpreted teacher alienation perceptions negatively while coercive power positively made sense of teacher alienation perceptions. It was found that the use of material and moral rewards for creating behavioral change in teachers in schools reduced teacher alienation significantly but increased significantly with suppression, punishment, threat and coercion.

Some suggestions can be made based on the results of the research. Training programs should be organized for school administrators to use the power sources effectively and efficiently in order to create a democratic environment, a positive school climate, and a collaborative, successful and supportive corporate culture in schools. School administrators and teachers should be informed about teacher alienation and its damage to the education system in order to prevent alienation before it occurs. The central



organization of the Ministry should prepare programs for administrators to use reward power more at provincial and district level and ensure that administrators use reward power more. Considering the negative effects of coercive power on teachers, studies involving school administrators and teachers should be carried out. Administrators with effective personality power should be appointed by the help of expert and experienced administrators. Individuals who can communicate effectively and influence other people owing to their personal characteristics should be encouraged to be administrators.

References

- Abaslı, K. (2018). *Örgütsel dışlanma, işe yabancılaşma ve örgütsel sinizm ilişkisine yönelik öğretmen görüşleri* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Akyüz, B., Kaya, N. ve Arevi, B. (2015) Kamu çalışanlarının İş tatmini üzerinde liderin güç kaynaklarının rolü. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 13(25), 71-90.
- Aldemir, C. M. (1983). Yöneticilerin güç tipleri ile işe yabancılaşma ve iş doyumu arasındaki ilişkiler. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 16(1), 61-77.
- Anderson, B. D. (1973). School bureaucratization and alienation from high school. *Sociology of Education*, 46(3), 315-334.
- Aslanargun, E. (2009). *İlköğretim ve lise müdürlerinin okul yönetiminde kullandığı güç türleri* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Aydın, İ. (2015). *Alternatif okullar*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Aydın, M. (2007). *Eğitim yönetimi*. Ankara: Hatipoğlu Yayınları.
- Bağcı, Z. ve Bursalı, Y. M. (2011). Yöneticilerin güç kaynaklarının çalışanların örgüte bağlılıkları üzerine etkisi: Çalışanların algılamalarına bağlı analitik bir inceleme. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9, 9-21.
- Bakan, İ. ve Büyükmeşe, T. (2010). Liderlik türleri ve güç kaynaklarına ilişkin mevcut-gelecek durum karşılaştırması: Eğitim kurumu yöneticilerinin algılarına dayalı bir alan araştırması. *KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 12(19), 73-84.
- Balcı, A. (2002). *Etkili okul, okul geliştirme, kuram uygulama ve araştırma*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Balcı, A. (2005). *Açıklamalı eğitim yönetimi terimleri sözlüğü*. Ankara: Tek Ağaç Basım Yayım.
- Başaran, İ. E. (2000). *Eğitim yönetimi: Nitelikli okul*. Ankara: Feryal Matbaası.
- Bayındır, B. (2002). *Ortaöğretim dal öğretmenlerinin mesleğe yabancılaşmaları ile*



Okul Müdürlerinin Kullandıkları Güç Stilleri ile Öğretmen Yabancılaşması Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

- öğretme-öğrenme sürecindeki davranışları arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.
- Bayrak, C. ve Terzi, Ç. (2004). Okul yöneticilerinin girişimcilik özelliklerinin okullara yansımaları. *XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı*, 6-9 Temmuz 2004 İnönü Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Malatya.
- Bolelli, M. (2017). *Güç ile Yönetim*. İstanbul: Abaküs Yayınları.
- Brooks, J. S., Hughes, R. M. & Brooks M. C. (2008). Fear and Trembling in the American High School: Educational Reform and Teacher Alienation. *Educational Policy*, 22(1), 45-62. doi:[10.1177/0895904807311296](https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904807311296)
- Bursalioğlu, Z. (2015). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Cemaloğlu, N.ve Gülcan, M. G. (2018). *Kuramdan Uygulamaya Okul Yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Celep, B. (2008). *İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin İşe Yabancılaşması (Kocaeli İli Örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.
- Çalışır, İ. (2006). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin işe yabancılaşması: bolu ili örneği*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Çelebi, N., Vuranok, T. T. ve Hasekioğlu Turgut, I. (2015). İlk ve ortaokullarda öğretmenlerin ödül sistemine ilişkin görüşleri (The perceptions of primary and secondary school teachers on reward system). *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34, 75-104.
- Demir, K. (2017). *Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin sinizm düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Sabahattin Zalim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Derose, M. N. (1985). *A study of the relationship between perceived power use by secondary school principals and degree of teachers' alienation in school situations perceived by their principals as stressful* (Doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Diş, O. (2015). *Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile örgüt iklimi arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.
- Diş, O. ve Ayık, A. (2016). Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile örgüt iklimi arasındaki ilişki. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 58, 499-518.
- Elma, C. (2003). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin işe yabancılaşması*



- (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Emir, S. (2012). *Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin yabancılaşma düzeyleri* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.
- Erjem, Y. (2005). Eğitimde yabancılaşma olgusu ve öğretmen: lise öğretmenleri üzerine sosyolojik bir araştırma. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(4), 395-417.
- Eryılmaz, A. ve Burgaz, B. (2011). Özel ve resmi lise öğrencilerinin örgütsel yabancılaşma düzeyleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 36 (161), 271-286.
- Etzioni, A. (1964). *Modern Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Forsyth, P. B., & W. K. Hoy. (1978). Isolation and alienation in educational organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 14 (1), 80-96.
- French, J. R. P. Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. *Classics of Organization Theory*, 7, 259-269.
- Goldberg, P. M. (1990). A study of the relationship between perceived power use and the degree of teacher alienation in New York City intermediate and junior high schools perceived as more or less stressful by their principals. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49(4), 1216-1229.
- Helvacı, A. ve Kayalı, M. (2011). Okul müdürlerinin kullandıkları güç kaynaklarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (Uşak ili örneği). *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(22), 255-279.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, H., & Johnson, D. (1996). *Management of Organizational Behavior*. USA: Prentice Hall Inc. Seventh Edition.
- Hitt, M. A., Black, J. S., & Porter, L. W. (2005). *Management* (International Edition). USA: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hoşgörür, V. (1997). *Eğitim işgörenlerinin örgütsel tutumları (Samsun İli Merkez Ortaöğretim Okulları Örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Johnson, B. L., & Ellett, C. D. (1992) *Analyses of school level learning environments: centralized decision-making, teacher work alienation and organizational effectiveness*. American Education Research Association, California.
- Kahveci, G. (2015). *Okullarda örgüt kültürü, örgütsel güven, örgütsel yabancılaşma ve örgütsel sinizim arasındaki ilişkiler* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.
- Karaman, A. (2006). *Profesyonel yöneticilerde güç yönetimi*. Konya: Dizgi Offset.



Okul Müdürlerinin Kullandıkları Güç Stilleri ile Öğretmen Yabancılaşması Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

- Karip, E. (2005). *Yönetim biliminin alanı ve kapsamı. İçinde: Y. Özden (Ed.). Eğitim ve okul yöneticiliği el kitabı (2. Baskı)*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Kılçık, F. (2011). *İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin işe yabancılaşma düzeylerine ilişkin alguları (Malatya ili örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya.
- Kılıç, H. (2009). *Sosyo-ekonomik değişkenler açısından eğitimde yabancılaşma olgusu ve öğretmen* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Mersin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Mersin.
- Kınık, F. Ş. F. (2010). *Öğretmenlerin yabancılaşma alguları* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*, 440-452.
- Koçel, T. (1998). *İşletme yöneticiliği (6. Baskı)*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.
- Koşar, S. (2008). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Koşar, S. ve Çalık, T. (2011). Okul yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 17(4)*, 581-603.
- Koyuncu, R. (2011). *İlköğretim kurumlarında yönetici davranışlarının öğretmenlerin mesleklerine yabancılaşmasına etkisi Niğde örneği* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Niğde Üniversitesi, Niğde.
- Memduhoğlu, H. B. ve Turhan, M. (2016). Öğretmen görüşlerine göre ilköğretim okul müdürlerinin örgütsel güç kaynaklarını kullanım düzeyleri. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 44*, 73-90.
- Minibaş, J. (1993). *Yabancılaşma kavramının incelenmesi ve banka sektörüne yönelik bir araştırma* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Organ, D. W. & C. N. Greene. (1981). The effects of formalization on professional involvement: A compensatory process approach. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*, 237-252.
- Owens, R. G. (2004). *Organisational Behaviour in Education*, Boston: Pearson Education.
- Özcan, K., Karataş, H. İ, Çağlar, Ç. ve Polat, M. (2014). Eğitim fakültesi



- yöneticilerinin güç kullanma biçimlerinin örgüt kültürüne etkisi: Bir durum çalışması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 14(2), 545-569.
- Özdemir, S. (2000). *Eğitimde Örgütsel Yenileşme (5. Baskı)*, Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Özhan, T. (2016). *Okul müdürlerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel güven düzeylerine yönelik görüşleri arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Düzce Üniversitesi, Düzce.
- Peabody, R. L (1961). Perceptions of organizational authority: A comparative analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 6(4), 463-482.
- Polat, S. (2007). *Örgütsel güven, adalet ve vatandaşlık davranışlarına ilişkin öğretmen algıları* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Kocaeli.
- Polat, M. ve Yavaş, T. (2012). Yabancılaşma, kurumsal değerler ve duygu yönetimi denklemi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2), 218-224.
- Rahim, M. A. (1989). Relationships of leader power to compliance and satisfaction with supervision, evidence from a national sample of managers. *Journal of Management*, 15, 545-557.
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G. & Osborn, R. N. (2000). *Organizational behaviour* (7th ed.). USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Seeman, M. (1959). On the Meaning of Alienation. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 783-790.
- Shehada, M. & Khafaje, N. (2015). The Manifestation of organizational alienation of employees and its impact on work conditions. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 6(2), 82-86.
- Sezgin, F. ve Koşar, S. (2010). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin güç stilleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı arasındaki ilişki. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8(2), 273-296.
- Soosai, S. (1988). *The relationship between principals' power behaviors and the organizational climate of secondary schools in Tamilnadu, India* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Marguette University, Wisconsin.
- Şencan, H. (2005). *Sosyal ve davranışsal ölçmelerde güvenilirlik ve geçerlik*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.
- Şimşek, H., Balay, R. ve Şimşek, S. (2012). İlköğretim sınıf öğretmenlerinde mesleki yabancılaşma. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırma Dergisi*, 2(1), 54-72.
- Şimşek, M. Ş. (2005). *Yönetim ve organizasyon* (8. baskı). Konya: Günay Ofset.
- Şirin, H. (2007). Okul ve özellikleri. İçinde: S. Özdemir (Ed.). *Türk Eğitim*



- Tsang, K. K. (2016). Teacher alienation in Hong Kong. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. Date of Access: 16.03.2019. doi: 10.1080/01596306.2016.1261084.
- Titrek, O. ve Zafer, D. (2009). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin kullandıkları örgütsel güç kaynaklarına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(60), 657-674.
- Üstün, S. (2013). *İlkokul Kurum Yöneticilerinin Güç Tipi Tercihleri: Mersin İli Merkez İlçelerinde Örnek Bir Uygulama* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Mersin.
- Vavrus, M. (1989). Alienation as the conceptual foundation for incorporating teacher empowerment into the teacher education knowledge base. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 33, 120-135.
- Yılmaz, S. ve Sarpkaya, P. (2009). Eğitim örgütlerinde yabancılaşma ve yönetimi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 314-333.
- Yılmaz, K. ve Altinkurt, Y. (2012). Okul Yöneticilerinin Kullandıkları Güç Kaynakları İle Öğretmenlerin İş Doyumu Arasındaki İlişki, *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 20(2), 385-402.
- Zielinski, A. E. & Hoy, W. K. (1983). Isolation and Alienation in Elementary Schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 19, 27-45.
- Zoghbi, P. & Lara, M. (2007). Relationship between Organizational Justice and Cyberloafing in the Workplace: Has "Anomia" a Say in the Matter? *Cyber Psychology & Behavior*, 3, 463-471. doi: 10.1089/cpb.2006.9931, 10.

