

The Power Sources that Principals Handle in School Administration¹

ENGİN ASLANARGUN

Düzce Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi

Abstract: Leadership is a power relationship that exists between leaders or followers in organization and a process which involves utilising power to influence others' behaviors to meet the organizational goals. Leadership seems to be seen as a vehicle with which to exercise power over others to achieve the organisational success. Power has been numerously classified according to power holders in literature. It sometimes referred to different concept but usually includes similar characteristics of leader and member. Significance of effective leadership to motivate teachers have been studied for a long time, in this respect, it is important to define and map to principals' power sources in school administration. The purpose of the study is to determine in which power source(s) that of expert, coercive, reward, referent, informational, legitimate power of reciprocity and legitimate power of dependence that principals handle most in the public elementary and high schools. The test score of teachers and principals in terms of harsh and soft power bases generally differ significantly. It is viewed that soft power bases are more often applied in schools than harsh bases and principals' statements of power usage in schools appeared higher than those of teachers.'

KEYWORDS: principal, administration, power sources

Okul Müdürlerinin Okul Yönetiminde Başvurduğu Güç Türleri

Özet: Örgütsel davranışlar güç ilişkilerine göre şekillenmekte ve bütün sosyal ilişkiler bir çeşit güç ilişkisini yansıtmaktadır. Gücü kullanan kişinin tarzına, çalışanlarla olan iletişim biçimine ve örgüt iklimine göre farklı sınıflandırmalara ayrılan güç konusu, genel anlamda karizmatik, yasal ve geleneksel güç türleri şeklinde alt kategorilere ayrılabilirdiği gibi daha ayrıntılı olarak ödül, zorlayıcı, yasal, karizmatik, uzmanlık ve bilgi güç türleri şeklinde sınıflandırmalara da tabi tutulmuştur. Okul müdürlerinin yönetimde kullandıkları güç türlerini belirlemeyi amaçlayan bu çalışmada nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden tarama modeli kullanılarak öğretmen görüşleri analiz edilmiş ve değişkenlere göre yorumlanmıştır. Araştırmanın sonuçlarına göre hem öğretmenler hem de okul müdürleri okul yönetiminde en fazla bağlılık, uzmanlık ve bilgi güç türlerinin kullanıldığını ifade etmekte; en az başvurulan güç türleri olarak ise ödül, zorlayıcı ve karizmatik güç türleri gösterilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okul Müdürü, Okul Yönetimi, Güç Türleri

¹ This article is derived from my doctoral thesis completed at University of Ankara.

Administrators need to activate the dynamics of organizations in order to achieve the goals. It is essential to act multifunctionally since the work settings and process of production have been heterogeneous especially after the complicate mass industrial organizations. Modernisation have covered the lives of people and this is why administrators need to appeal to various members of organization whose needs, expectations, views and educational level higher than that of previous age. Thus, administrators should have variety of power sources and unique organizational repertoire rich enough to appeal to members.

It is alleged that behaviours of people in any society reflects some kinds of powers shaped by power relations. Power, in this manner defined as an ability to influence others in organization. It has been classified according to the style of people, their communicative competence, organizational climate and also subdivided into more detailed as reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, expert and informative power. Interpersonal relations in the society such as teacher-student, principal-teacher, doctor-patient, commander-soldier, employer-employee reflect some degree of power based relations. In this sense, power is a process of removing the obstacles on the way of achieving the goals in organization. It is communicative potential of human nature that is far from coercion; at the same time power is a way of reaching the expected goals in organization (Hall, 1977, 197; Milton, 2000; King, 1983; French and Raven, 1959; Pfeffer, 1987; Gong, 2006).

Organizations follow some strategies to be effective and achieve the planned goals. It could be achieved only by means of members shared efforts. Leader's behaviour is central in order to activate members and define the politics. Effective leadership is required when to motivate members. Organizational effectiveness could be achieved by internalization of the goals associated with the value expression and self identification. It is related with the power sources that leader should have in organizations (Katz and Kahn, 1966). It is better to explain the words underlining the correlations with others that are helpful to analyse the meaning. Power have usually appeared in literature pertaining to the words such as authority, hierarchy, influence, control and sometimes used interchangeable. It is right to define related concepts together with direct definition of the word itself in order not to cause confusion in context.

According to Pfeffer (1987) power emerges in context and relational manner. It is more appropriate to define people in relation to

others and their relations instead of simple and direct explanation (Pfeffer, 1987, 311). Power is defined contextually and in relation to others. It has similar meaning with control, ability, influence and authority. Power is simply defined as authority or means of getting works done (Hornby, 2001; Nesler, Quigley, Aguinis, Lee ve Tedeschi, 1999, 750). According to Etzioni power is actual process of an agent to influence others. For a person, having power in a society is only possible to influence and activate others for wishes (Etzioni, 1961, 4). Power, authority and influence could be substituted each others interchangeably. Power is sometimes defined as a source of capacity but generally confused with influence. Influence also often defined similar to power, it is a process of activating sources. Authority on the other hand, identified as formally constructed power or legitimacy (Hales, 1997, 22). Power is merely defined as informal authority where as authority is generally defined as legitimate power (Luthans, 1992, 427).

Influence or influence strategies are generally used in social psychology as transformative form of power to get subordinates to do something in organization. Influence is interchangeably used according to object, influential act and alterations over the subject are generally derived from concepts such as control, power and authority (Somech ve Drach-Zahavy, 2002, 167; Katz ve Kahn, 1966, 219; Peiro and Melia, 2003, 15). Levin defined power as a potential required for influence. Influence, in this sense, is a process of applying power. If A changes the status or behaviours of B, than influence is emerged. Influence is only achieved if the act of A has capacity to happen change over B. Consequently, power is influential capacity of A over B (Lippitt, Polansky, Redl ve Roser, 1959, 237; Gold, 1959, 252; Cartwright and Zander, 1959, 216). For example, if a student obeyed the request of a teacher could either been influenced by the perception of social position or his influence strategy as a way of expecting reward of his work (Schwarzwald and Koslowsky, 1999, 16). Influence as a basic concept of leadership, could be defined as a behaviour style of leader to activate subordinates (Balci, 2005, 56). As a result, it is clear that influence is the destination of power process; it is leaders' act to transform the behaviors of others and a kind of influential capacity in organization.

Authority is an other concept similar to power that is generally underlined as legitimate power in social settings. It is character of commonly and voluntarily accepted act due to legitimacy in organizations (Kızılçelik and Erjem, 1992, 315; Hoy and Miskel, 2001; Cevizci, 2000). Obedience and disobedience lies in the concept of authority, in the creation within managerial and structural subsystem of authority. By authority, it means simply legitimate power which is rested in a particular person or position recognized as so vested, and which is accepted as appropriate not only by wielder of power, but by those over whom it is wielded and by the other members of the system (Katz and Kahn, 1966, 203). Power and authority have been used hierarchically and interchangeably, in this respect it has been referring to the authority based concepts such as manager, supervisor and superintendend. Furthermore, it is both lateral and downward that is not only dependend to formal position. When person interacts laterally, they have the same power level and power based behaviour could not be recognized. If the person is promoted to higher position, downward power interaction could be observed according to their level (Ott, 1996, 381; Hall, 1977, 215). Authority is using power to inflence others legitimately and differs in the level of legitimacy. Naked power in this sense have been reported to be different from legitimacy (Luthans, 1992, 427; Lowe, 2006, 63; Hales, 1997, 27). Authority symbolizes the formal leaders' use of legitimate power over group. The level of legitimacy depends on its close relation to power. Normative power is considered legitimate whereas economic power is of medium level and coercion is the least. Weber had stated that each kinds of power use includes coercion where as authority depends to legitimacy. Sovereignty forces person to obey, but authority is an ability to manage people voluntarily, by the way subordinates considers the orders of superiors legitimately (Lunenberg ve Ornstein, 2000, 114; Etzioni,1961,15; Hall, 1977, 197; Özel, 2008). Relations shaped by pure authority could no longer be comprehensive and effective enough. Senge (1996, 506), states that learning organizations are process of ignoring traditional authority and control based structure of organizations. Kotter (1996, 429) also stressed that leaders could enhance their power by using formal authority, nevertheless it is not significant and effective. Consequently, authority defined narrowly than power and have been comprehended more legitimate than power in organizations. It is legitimate power depending on the statue and mostly applicable forms of power; since authority is positionally rooted, members could no longer resist to obey (Gibson et al, 2003, 277).

Hierarchy is defined by Weber as a basic characteristic of classical, bureaucratic organizations attributed to power of leader. It is role system that is based on the relation of subordinate and superior, and symbolizes the formal structure of organizations such as roles, duties, division of labor and informal structure such as climate, values and informal relations both provide clear sense of understanding about organization (Wynn, 2006, 458; Balcı, 2005, 76; Barnard, 1992, 96). Democratic organizational model differs from hierarchical specifically in the points that aspects of power which are fused in hierarchy. The distribution of power with respect to certain kinds of decision is characteristically different in democratic organizations, being shared among the members. Specific and crucial to distinction between democratic and hierarchical structures in the separation of legislative from executive power. Executive power in democratic organizations are usually distributed in accord with the pyramidal structure of authority (Katz ve Kahn, 1966, 212). Sayles (1985, 87) states that power relations are the result of hierarchical structure in organizations. All decision in organization is at the same time a process of power display. In this sense power is generally considered hierarchically and defined as authority of superiors over subordinates (Pfeffer, 1987, 310). Since hierarchy depends the subordinates' certain obedience to superiors, it may cause alienation, resistance and dissatisfaction. Nonetheless hierarchical levels such as leadership, control, accountability, and cooperation are the basic dynamics of organizations (Wynn, 2006, 459; Pfeffer, 1992, 36). Consequently, in relation with power in organization influence, authority, and hierarchy are most prevalent concepts that similarities and distinctions of these concepts have been underlined below:

- Power is potential of A to influence B despite resistance. In other words, power is the capacity required to influence others or ability to manage.
- Influence is the result of A's changeable act over B's behaviour and attitudes. If the act of object results in certain degree of alteration over B, then, influence could appear.
- Authority that is bound to position in organization generally power and legitimacy based. It is legitimate power source stemming from organizational structure and roles.
- Control is compliance behaviour that A manages over B. It is success of influence process. If A has some degree of control over B, it means influence happen to managed and resistance has been overcome.

- Hierarchy refers to formal structure of organization and emphasized structure, roles and division of labour.

As the paradigms have been continually changed in times, power use have also been subjected to change. Paradigms prevalent of time have caused transformation over the use of power bases that leaders need. Aftermath of 21st. century leadership, team spirit, post positivist approaches had begun to replace to bureaucracy and leaders preferred expertise more than authority based power sources (Barbour, 2006, 27). For Mintzberg, (1987, 364) organizational behaviour is a kind of power games that actors try to control, decide and manage for organizations. In order to understand organizational behaviour it should be clear that who is influential, what is required to influence and what could be done for power use in organization. It is more complicated and confusing in modern times that service sector is wide spread. Multicultural society that is governed by democracy, management style had better not be monolytic and leaders should have rich repertoire enough to appeal diversity. Diverse, mutiple and situational approaches could be best aplicable than autocratic styles that gathers all power and decision making process unique to leaders.

The Significance of Study

Social power that of French and Raven's conceptualization (1959) and Raven's further reformulation (1999) have long been accepted as basic classification of power sources for more than half of the century. The importance of effective leadership to motivate teachers have been studied for a long time, in this respect, principals' power sources to influence teachers evoked attention. For this, it is intended to define and map to principals' power sources in school administrtation. The importance of the study has emerged to clarify the views of teachers and to underline the views of principals in educational settings.

Types of Power Bases

Power has been numerously classified according to power holders in literature. It sometimes referred to different concept but usually includes similar characteristics of leader and member. The reason why power is ignored in social sciences generally referred to vague boundaries of social sciences between the other branches of sciences. When looked closely to

power issues in literature, some key points have been underlined that were listed below (Lunenberg ve Ornstein, 2000, 115):

- Legitimate power is alleged to have been the first type of power and if it is overused, it may result in dissatisfaction and resistance if not supported by expertise. If leader only rely on legitimacy will possibly face to resistance.
- Reward power could directly influence performance in the short run, if it is overused subordinate could possibly have the feeling of dissatisfaction or manipulation.
- Coercive power has temporary effect on subordinates and mostly cause side effects such as fear, revenge, prohibition and alienation.
- Expert power is closely attributed to the climate of trust in organization. Behaviours of leader could easily been internalized and it leads to compliance. Being motivated internally, subordinates no longer need to be controlled as it is the case for reward and coercion.
- Referent power evokes the sense of trust, loyalty, compliance and responsibility in respect to subordinates as well as enthusiasm to leader.

The five specific power bases consisted of coercive, reward, legitimate, referent and expert power bases. Expert and referent are personal power bases because they were derived from power holder where as legitimate, reward and coercive powers were positional bases since they typically had stemmed from a position in hierarchy (Nesler, Quigley, Aguinis, Lee ve Tedeschi (1999, 751).

Coercive power is based on target's perception that a source has the ability to provide punishment respectively for target. It is basically caused from the perception of the subordinates about superior. Punishment is the basic consequence of Taylor's Scientific Management process. If the committed behaviour occurs as a result of punishment, then it is termed coercion; if it implies an expectation of reward, then reward power. The degree of power holder's application is crucially important, if there is big reward after targetted behaviour is achieved, in that case little punishment is for mistakes. If the reward is simple for targetted behaviour, the degree of punishment is respectively high (Webb ve Norton, 1999, 37; Hall, 1977, 202). Leaders's coercive power usage in organization could not only directly include punishment such as to arm, shoot, fire out but it can be indirectly that to cancel the rights such as additional pays, day off. It is

fact that those who feel a sense of powerlessness make exceptionally high use of power assertion.

Reward power is established when a power holder has the ability either to reward a target's compliance with something positive or to remove something negative. Power holder's authority is due to his position. It is an important instrument to reward effective and high production for Taylor's philosophy. Reward power is a kind of reinforcement for subordinates presented by the power holder. Reward and coercive power rely on others believing that the agent can provide them the desired reward or can punish them respectively. Using either of these bases will induce only superficial change in the target. Only public compliance is obtained, the continuation of which depends on successful surveillance of the target by the agent. Power holder may use reward in a different way. Increase of performance both qualitatively or quantitatively, continuity of work order may result in pay increase, promotion, more responsibility, job opportunity, praises, privilege could be maintained in organizations. Power holder sometimes provides reward removing obstacles and presenting positive job settings. It is considered a tangible reward and real physical threats, threat of being fired or fined, promises of monetary reward and bonuses or promotion within an organization. (Koçel, 1989, 248; French ve Raven, 1959, 264; Katz ve Kahn, 1966, 205; Bugental and Lewis, 1999, 52; Webb and Norton, 1999, 37; Hall, 1977, 202; Leithwood, 1992, 8; Bruins, 1999, 9; Munduate ve Gravenhorst, 2003, 6; Elias ve Loomis, 2004, 938).

Referent power is a base that subordinates attribute to characteristics, reputation or esteem of the power holder. It is established when a target identifies himself or has a feeling of oneness with the power holder. It leads to private acceptance of the target by enabling him to maintain a satisfactory relationship with the agent and see himself as similar to the agent or certain relevant dimensions (Gibson ve diğerleri, 2003, 275). Referent power implies attraction that the power holder has with his characteristics on the side of the subordinate, nevertheless the power holder sometimes couldn't be aware of such kind of charisma, but subordinates still have compliance to the power holder. The much aspiration, attribution and compliance are in an organization, the higher the power that the power holder has (French and Raven, 1959, 266; Hall, 1977, 202; Koçel, 1989, 249; Munduate ve Gravenhorst, 2003, 6). Although Weber identified traditional and charismatic authority belonging to pre-modern times and legitimate/rational authority to modern times, charisma as a spirit of legitimacy has alleged to have been

discovered again. Aspiration and enthusiastic aspects of leadership is weak in modern bureaucracy and there is risk in routinization of charisma. Charisma that is not backed up in continuation with success, coherence, trust and ideal will inevitably subject to repetition, dissatisfaction and institutionalization that is termed routinization (Aktay, 2009).

Expert power refers to a situation in which a target complies with a power holder's request, because the target perceives the power holder as being someone with superior knowledge. This is a very common form of power and the bases of very large proportion of human collaboration including most companies where the principle specialization allows large and complex enterprises to be undertaken. Leader's expertise can contribute to the level of power in organization and it also provides equal, untreatening and motivating relationship with subordinates (Cartwright ve Zander, 1959, 218; Fiedler, 1959, 379). Expert power depends of individuals perception of having expertise or knowledge on specific domain. If a target perceives an agent as an expert, it will possibly result in private acceptance on the side of target. Subordinate feels that leader's knowledge or expertise is so high that of the others. A patient is no longer have suspicion of the expertise of doctor and tries to do whatever doctor advices. Expert power could be internalized and fulfilled easier than other sources since it depends unique knowledge and experience (Hall, 1977, 202; Bruins, 1999, 9).

Legitimate power is that which is invested in a role. Legitimacy can come from a higher power usually results in acceptable behaviour. It is when a power holder has a legitimate right to make request of the target and an obligation to comply. It leads to private acceptance that comes from within the target and as such it initially is socially dependent on the influencing agent, but it does not require by surveillance of agent in order to be successful. Legitimate power differs from tyrannical use of power since it depends to legitimacy and hierarchy (Koçel, 1989, 248; Hall, 1977, 2002; Wehmeier, 2001, 1294; Munduate ve Gravenhorst, 2003, 6; Elias ve Loomis, 2004, 938; İşbilir, 2005, 105). Modern organizational theory attributes high importance on legitimate authority that flows down through the organizational hierarchy and formal rules promulgated and enforced by those in authority to ensure that organizational behaviour is directed the attainment of established organizational goals (Shafritz ve Ott, 1987, 305).

After sorted out power sources as five bases, French and Raven (1959, 268) led to following hypothesis:

- For all five types, the stronger the basis of power, the greater the power.
- For any type of power, the size of the range may vary greatly, but in general referent power will have the broadest range.
- Any attempt to utilize power outside the range of power will tend to reduce the power.
- A new state of system produced by reward power or coercive power will be highly dependent an agent and the more observable conformity, the more dependent state. For the other three types of power, the new state is usually dependent, at least in the beginning, but in any case the level of observability has no effect on the degree of dependence.
- Coercion results in decreased attraction of target's toward agent and high resistance; reward power results in increased attraction and low resistance.
- The more legitimate the coercion is, the less it will reduce resistance and decreased attraction.

Informational power, later added by Raven to power sources, may exist if a power holder presents information that is logical to target. It leads to internalized and lasting changes in the target's belief, attitude and values. Compared the other bases of social power, the changed behaviour resulting from information is maintained without continued social dependence on the influencing agent and instead, based on the perceived relevance and validity of information. Informational power mostly depends on the target's perceived belief about the agents ability to persuasion and his knowledge to continue that is different from expert power. Positional power refers to reinforcement and punishment that is depending on the agent's formal roles in organization, personal power mostly depends on charisma, expertise and information that is bases of characters of agents (Wilson, 2005, 15; Peiro and Melia, 2003, 17). Expert power may be sufficient to transform person's belief, attitudes and behaviours if the consequence of such a change have no great effect on the target. But informational power seems to become more necessary if the consequences of changes have important practical implication (Munduate ve Gravenhorst, 2003, 8). As a result of continuous research findings and developments, Raven (1999, 165) developed an expanded formulation

power bases and delinates the process involved in the preference of power bases. Further analyses indicated that power base strategies could be subsumed under the underlying structure as harsh and soft bases.

Harsh Power Bases

Harsh bases include reward, coercion and legitimacy of reciprocity while the soft bases include expertise, reference, information, legitimacy of dependence. Harsh sources available to the influencing agent due to the position held in organization. The usage of these sources may be perceived by target as somewhat arbitrary less task based relevant and utilism one's positional advantage in an attempt to gain compliance. It is a downward orientation in the exercise of power. Harsh bases tend to be overt, punitive and heavy handed. It may be through direct assertive request for compliance mediated through manipulative threats and aggression (Schwarzwald ve Koslowsky, 1999, 17; Koslowsky, Schwarzwald ve Ashuri, 2001, 470; Erchul, Raven ve Whichard, 2001, 486; Somech ve Drach-Zahavy, 2002, 168; Wilson, 2005, 23; Schwarzwald, Koslowsky ve Allouf, 2005, 646).

Soft Power Bases

Soft power bases include expertise, referent and legitimate dependence. Soft sources are more task relevant and gain compliance through personal rather than organizational resources. It is lateral power category and deemphasizes the positional advantage of the supervisor and focus on his or her personal resources. Soft strategies said to be invoked when the agent seeks compliance in a polite, friendly and humble. Soft bases tend to be more subtle, positive and non coercive manner by flattering and sypathizing with the influence target. They involve less aggressive and more psychological means of influence and designed to secure a target's volitional compliance. It would also predicted that job satisfaction could be best gained in soft power bases. Soft bases that are generally depending on communicative and personal bases could satisfy needs and expectations of subordinates than harsh strategies (Schwarzwald ve Koslowsky, 1999, 17; Koslowsky, Schwarzwald ve Ashuri, 2001, 470; Erchul, Raven ve Whichard, 2001, 486; Somech ve Drach-Zahavy, 2002, 168; Wlson, 2005, 23; Schwarzwald, Koslowsky ve Allouf, 2005, 646).

It has been shown that compliance to power bases were related to personal qualities of leader, work setting and organizational type, relationship satisfaction among dating couples, organizational commitment and job satisfaction and self esteem. Harsh power bases as being overt, punitive and heavy handed when compared to soft power types which tend to be more subtle, positive and non coercive. The summary of harsh-soft power bases have been displayed in Table 1. below (Wilson, 2005, 16; Schwarzwald, Koslowsky ve Allouf, 2005, 647).

Table 1. *Power bases according to target's compliance*

HARSH POWER BASES	Coercive Power	Target complies because he perceives that the agent has the power to punish, disapprove and dislike him.
	Reward Power	Target complies because he perceives that the agent can provide a tangible rewards and or will approve him.
	Legitimacy of Reciprocity	Target complies after the agent has done something positive for the target. The target feels a need to reciprocate this prior good deed.
SOFT POWER BASES	Expert Power	Target complies because the agent is an expert in the field.
	Referent Power	Target complies because he wants to be associated with or be viewed as similar to the agent.
	Informational Power	Target complies because the information provided by the agent makes logical sense.
	Legitimacy of Dependence	Target complies because the agent is unable to do it himself.

As it is displayed in Table 1 harsh power bases investigated as three bases of coercive, reward and legitimacy of reciprocity; soft power bases were investigated as four bases of informative, expert, referent and legitimacy of dependence.

It is stated that soft power sources refer to higher level of interactive, cognitive and psychological learning. It is not only limited to subordinate and superior relation. It is perceived that interpersonal relations among friendship and extrovert students are more powerfull than others. Furthermore those who are less powerfull, regarded as introvert, are characteristically tend to apply more pysical power. It is reported that when graduate student perceive their supervising professor as using coercive power, the quality of professor-student relationship is reduced significantly. Contrary, if professor are perceived as having high referent, expert and reward power, the quality of interaction significantly increased. With regard to actual compliance, the higher rates were obtained when professors were perceived as having expert and legitimate power. Similarly for gaining comliance in class the most effective power types informational, expert, impersonal reward and legitimate positional power. In other studies, superiors generally tended to use rational and

soft strategies more often than harsh strategies; that is the influenced subordinate by less aggressive, instrumental and psychological means. A significant interaction of instructor gender and race were observed when soft bases were utilized. It is also the fact that power holder who wants to be effective in communication, needs to adopt behaviour that motivate and reward expected behaviour where as to punish unexpected one's (Somech ve Drach-Zahavy, 2002, 175; Elias ve Loomis, 2004, 954; Ring and Kelley, 1959, 270).

Studies conducted in Turkey to observe the power holders' style in schools have resulted to appear certain points and problems in terms of power relations between teacher, students and principals. When to sum up common points of the studies about teachers' thought that principals were appeared to rely on structural and legitimate form of schools more than humanistic and communicative level; they adopt structural based such as setting performance standarts, supervising and ordering; they have not considered sufficient to obey ethical principles such as appreciating others, welcoming critics, tolerating diversities, displaying empathy and wishing to take responsibility; they aren't comprehensive enough to motivate unsuccessfull teachers and displaying poor leadership to foster team work; they give more importance to supervise and evaluate outcomes; have tendency of applying legitimate power that is far from guiding teachers and coping with the problems; principals have been criticized to administer school biased, far from work analysis process and tries to do jobs by themselves instead of building team spirit and cooperation (Bursalıoğlu, 1981, 81; Balcı, 1997, 95; Pehlivan, 1997, 67; Ayvacı ve Küçük, 2005, 155; Töremen ve Kolay, 2003, 344; Uygun, 2004, 210; Akçay, 2003, 83; Okutan, 2003, 95).

Method

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study is to determine in which power source(s) of expert power, coercive power, reward power, referent power, informational power, legitimate power of reciprocity and legitimate power of dependence that principals handle most in the public elementary and high schools. The following questions are intended to be responded in order to reach the general aim of the study.

a. According to teachers' view, which power sources principals mostly use, harsh or soft? Among them which of these power sources such as expert, reward, information, referent, coercion, legitimacy of dependence and legitimacy of reciprocity have mostly been applied?

b. Have teachers' view been differed according to the sub-groups such as sex, age, education, subject, school type and teaching years?

c. According to principals' view, which power sources they mostly use, harsh or soft? Among them which of these power sources such as expert, reward, information, referent, coercion, legitimacy of dependence and legitimacy of reciprocity have mostly been applied?

d. Have the principals' view been differed according to sub-groups such as sex, age, education, subject, school type and teaching years?

e. Have the principals and teachers views been differed in respect to principals use of power in schools?

Data Analysis

Data analysis involves both parametric and non-parametric descriptive statistics, the statistical testing of associational relationship, analysis of variance, t-test, Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis. The number of data that were analysed listed below in Table 2.

Table 2. *Numbers of sampling both for teachers and principals*

City	Number of Schools	Number of Teachers	Percentage	Teachers included to study
Eskişehir	157	3571	% 71	337
Bilecik	41	1441	% 29	138
Total	198	5012	100	475

Source: Statistical Department of Directorate of the cities of Bilecik and Eskişehir (2009).

There are 3571 teachers working at 157 schools in the city center of Eskişehir and 1441 teachers at 41 schools in Bilecik. Schools that have more than 20 teachers were included to study and scala were delivered those by researcher. Since gender is one of the variable in the study, male and female teachers were considered similar to each other proportionately. Power Sources Scala has been developed by the researcher in order to map principals' power sources, were divided into two sections one of which is about personal information and the other is about power sources questionnaire.

After long investigation and reading of literature about social power, power sources scala were developed depending on the French and Raven's classification (1959) and Raven's later reformulation (1998, 1999). Power source scala has grouped as harsh and soft bases; then reward, coercive, expert, referent, legitimate (dependence-reciprocity) and information depending on the original forms and delivered to teachers and principals.

Participant and Procedure

The population of this survey type study which was carried out with quantitative method consisted of the teachers and principals working at public schools located at city centers of Eskişehir and Bilecik in Turkey. There were 475 teachers and 144 principals in the sample of the study. The sample consisted of 475 teachers, 230 females and 220 males, and 102 principals, 13 females and 89 males. 450 teachers and 102 principals were reached and the data was collected by hand with "Power Sources Scale" developed by the researcher.

After having collected the data of teachers and principals, they were analyzed with SPSS. In the analysis of personal details of teachers and principals, percentage and frequency were considered. In the analysis of subdimensions of the power sources of their applicability mean and standart deviation were used. Moreover, in the analysis of subdimensions of the power sorces applicability according to variables like sex, education, age, school type, subject taught at school, experience at subject and school were analysed. In the study, in order to examine the sub problems, one-way ANOVA, t-test, Mann-Whitney U test, Kruskal Wallis H test and to be able to determine the differences between groups, Tukey HSD test was used.

Consequently it is investigated in this study that the outcomes of the harsh and soft bases listed above intended to be analyzed in terms of teachers views. More prevalent use of power in school settings by principals could have an idea of the power relationship between teacher and principal in school administration. This study employs mixed method research design. In March 2009, the questionnaire was distribute to the state schools' teachers and principals working at the city center of Bilecik and Eskişehir in Turkey. Included in the survey were questions on power source of principals that were generally about the building school climate,

interactive and communicative style of principals towards teachers and students, school effectiveness. The survey elicited a response rate of 85 percent.

Results and Implication

Findings have been divided into two main groups of power bases as harsh and soft categories. Table 3 shows the principals usage rates of these power bases.

The test score of teachers and principals in terms of harsh and soft power bases generally differ significantly ($t_{(550)}=2.880$; $p<.05$). It is viewed that soft power bases are more often applied in schools than harsh bases and principals' statements ($\bar{X}=3.61$) of power usage in schools appeared higher than those of teachers' ($\bar{X}=3.46$).

Table 3. Test Results of Harsh and Soft Power Bases

Power Bases	Categories	N	\bar{X}	S	Sd	t	P
Harsh Power Bases	Teacher	450	3,46	8,01	550	2,880	,004
	Principal	102	3,61	5,63			
Soft Power Bases	Teacher	450	3,63	10,58	550	3,496	,001
	Principal	102	3,90	6,87			

The rates of power sources that principals apply greater than teachers could symbolise the excessive use of power in schools. Principals have tended to have the control in schools by applying different types of power. Since principals selection and appointment system in Turkey mostly centralized to Ministry of National Education (MoNE), principals feel himself only responsible to superiors rather than teachers. Principals are aware of the power holder that is effective for schools and act accordingly. Furthermore, the results of both power bases rates higher in principals could be the cause that principals' illusion of using more power.

Since soft power bases are greater in use in schools according to teachers and principals, interaction and communication based relations are considered significant in schools as it is the case in similar studies (Güzelay, 2007, 3; Somech ve Drach-Zahavy, 2002, 175).

Table 4 shows the power type usage of principals in schools.

Table 4. Test Results of the Power Types in Schools

Power Types	Categories	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	P
Reward Power	Teacher	450	3,41	3,40	550	1,225	,221
	Principal	102	3,50	3,38			
Coercive Power	Teacher	450	3,39	3,74	550	2,113	,035
	Principal	102	3,56	3,16			
Legitimacy of Reciprocity	Teacher	450	3,56	4,35	550	2,399	,017
	Principal	102	3,74	3,58			
Expert Power	Teacher	450	3,74	4,28	550	1,177	,240
	Principal	102	3,84	3,26			
Informational Power	Teacher	450	3,50	2,29	550	4,673	,000
	Principal	102	3,88	1,90			
Legitimacy of Dependence	Teacher	450	3,92	2,59	550	5,933	,000
	Principal	102	4,45	1,52			
Referent power	Teacher	450	3,27	2,73	550	2,024	,043
	Principal	102	3,46	2,03			

The response of the teachers and principals in terms of coercion ($t_{(550)}=2.113$; $p<,05$), legitimacy of reciprocity ($t_{(550)}=2.399$; $p<,05$), information ($t_{(550)}=4.673$; $p<,05$), legitimacy of dependence ($t_{(550)}=5.933$; $p<,05$) and reference ($t_{(550)}=2.024$; $p<,05$) have been found significant enough to interpret. Principals thought that they all use multiple power types more than teachers have thought, and it means multiple and excessive use of power is prevalent in schools. Referent power and legitimacy of dependence are the soft power sources that is said to be more dominant in schools much for both teachers and principals.

As a result of the study, it is understood by the perception of the principals and teachers that principals generally handled the soft power sources in the school administration. Teachers' views have tended to be condensed at legitimacy of dependence, informational and expert power sources where as principals alleged to handle legitimacy of dependence, informational and expert power sources. Both teachers and principals pointed out that principals handled the reward, coercive and charismatic power at lower levels.

Although there is similar differences about the applicability of power sources in the school administration respectively, it is interesting that the behaviors of legitimate dependence power were displayed at highest level where as the behaviors of referent power were displayed at the lowest level both for administrators' and teachers' perceptions. Since both the most and the least handled power sources are in soft categories,

it could be said that there isn't clear distinction between the soft and harsh power sources, then administrators could have chance to use either soft or harsh power sources considering the psycho-social and situational factors.

According to the result of this study that investigate the principals' power sources in school administrations in respect to teachers and principals, some implications have been developed together with the similarities and distinctions from literature below:

- Principals response are of higher level than teachers both for harsh and soft power. Principals often reported to use soft power such as legitimacy of dependence, informative and expert power where as teachers thoughts slightly differed in sequence of power types of principals such as legitimacy of dependence, expert and informational power. Legitimacy of dependence is reported to be applied the most where as referent power is the least power sources both for principals and teachers. Erchul and his colleague (2001, 493) reported that that information, expert, legitimacy of dependence and referent power types could be the most effective types to influence teacher by social psychologist. They added that soft power bases especially informational and expert powers could be preferred much by teacher and social psychologist.
- Principals and teachers come to an agreement on the least applied power sources. It is referent power of soft power bases as well as reward and coercive of harsh power bases that principals need to use.
- When to overview, teachers reported that principals sometimes use reward, referent and coercive powers where as they generally use legitimacy of reciprocity, expert, informational and legitimacy of dependence. Principals asserted that they generally use legitimacy of dependence where as they pointed out to use generally coercive, reward, expert, informational, referent and legitimacy of reciprocity.
- Teachers opinions about principals' power sources have generally differed more significantly than principals in terms of variables.
- Teachers opinions for reward power have not differed significantly in the variables of sex, education, subject, types of schools and teaching years, but there is significant difference for the variable of age. Experienced teachers thought that principals

use reward power more than younger teachers. Teachers' opinions only differ in working years significantly for reward power that principals who have less working years in schools stated to use reward power more than others. Chairpersons of departments in faculties are reported to be more prevalent use of reward power with similar studies, then expert power comes. Since reward power mostly depends to monetary resources of organizations, it will inevitably be subjected to run out of monetary sources. However personal power bases are alleged to be more permanent and last respectively. It is also reported that top leaders use more reward, coercion and legitimacy than medium leader (Özaslan and Gürsel, 2008, 102; Schwarzwald, Koslowsky and Allouf, 2005, 649).

In health organizations, doctors are reported to have used reward power mostly when to get things done in their institutions. Teachers in primary schools were suspicious about tangible rewards by principals and this evokes consideration linked to injustice. This study shows that principals applied reward power in fifth sequence among seven power sources is supported by similar studies. Although reward power is less applied power sources in general, excessive use of reward could provide continuity of expected behaviour and motivate individuals. Excessive use of coercive power may sometimes result in expected behaviour.

- In terms of coercive power, teachers' opinions have significantly differed on the variables of sex, age, types of school and teaching years in schools. Women according to men, younger teachers according to olders, high school teachers according to primary school teachers, less experienced teachers according to more experienced have stated that principals use more coercive power. Principals opinions have not differed significantly in coercive power. Coercive power is less used one and have negative impressions on individuals.

Coercion based behaviour in schools have reported to result in dissatisfaction and aggressions. The study investigates the relation power types and satisfaction stated that coercive power have negatively influenced to performance and led satisfaction in organizations. It is also case for the health and educational settings that coercion could not appreciated positively. Excessive bureaucratic organizations could cause teacher feel themselves less powerful due to the fact that power mostly

depends to superiors (Hornstein, 1968; Bachman, Bowers ve Marcus, 1968; Kasapoğlu, 1999, 96; Yücel, 1999, 19). Situational factors that affect leaders' behaviour have some implications on democratic-autocratic and group-individual target relations. Democratic style that is far from coercion could be less stressful and not group oriented where as autocratic style is opposite. It is also stated that coercive power use have negative effect of downward and lateral ways of communication in organizations (Korton, 1959, 351; Julian, 1966; Hall, 1977, 214).

- In terms of legitimacy of reciprocity, teachers view have reported to differ in the variables of age, subjects, types of school and teaching years significantly. Younger teachers, primary school teachers and less experienced teachers thought that principals use more legitimacy of reciprocity. Principals opinions only differ in terms of working years that principals who have been working less in the same school stated to use legitimacy of reciprocity more than others.
- For expert power, teachers opinions differ significantly in the variables of subjects, school type and teaching years. Physical education, art and music teachers, primary school teachers and more experienced teachers have thought that principals use more expert power. Principals opinions only differ in age for expert power that older principals reported to apply expert power more than younger teachers. Expert and referent power have positive inclination on the performance and satisfaction in organization different from coercion. When the perception of teachers about principals focused on expertise, the level of satisfaction could be the highest degree (Bachman, Bowers and Marcus, 1968; Hornstein, 1968). Power source of university professors that were investigated by the perceptions of 346 students concluded that legitimate and expert power sources were the highest level. Similarly, expert power is the most influential to lead subordinate inclination to change. School principals application of exchange theory also displayed that expertise relations are the basic determinants between teachers and principals (Nesler, Aguinis, Lee and Tedeschi, 1999, 752; Myers, 1977; Üstüner, 1999; Çıldır, 2008).

Teachers' professional satisfaction is also influenced by the use of expert power of principals. Principals who help students to learn, support

innovative and diversified teachers and leads teachers to try new methods could be appreciated more than other. Authoritative manner is on the contrary perceived as irritative. According to the study between managerial power and relational trust, the result showed that coercive power, referent power and expert power are important point for communication and personal traits in organizations. Leaders who provide employee with special knowledge, i.e expert power, can encourage and facilitate specific behavioral skills and traits of knowledge workers. That are essential for knowledge acquisition. Furthermore referent does facilitate negotiation between knowledge worker (Politis, 2003).

- For informational power, teachers opinions have differed significantly in the variables of age and school types. Younger teachers and primary school teachers thought that principals use informational power more than the other groups. Principals opinions only differ in working years in same schools for informational power that principals who have worked less in the same school stated to use informational power more than other groups.
- For legitimacy of dependence, teachers opinions differed significantly on the variables of sex, age, subject, types of school and working years. Female teachers, younger teachers, primary school teachers and less experienced teachers have thought that principals use informational power more than other groups. Principals' opinions in this section is similar to informational power that who have worked less in the same school stated to use legitimacy of dependence more than other groups.
- For referent power, teachers opinions have significantly differed in the variables of age, subject, type of school and working years that younger teachers, primary school teachers and less experienced teachers thought that principals use referent power more than other variables. Principals' opinions only differed in types that older principals stated to use referent power more than other groups.

Top managers of companies have responded a study what the most influential personal characteristics of organizational politics and use of power is that speaking fluent and accurate, sensitiveness, expertise of social relation, competence, being admired extrovertness and self-esteem. These are the characteristics that contribute to leader effectiveness which could be classified and headings of expert and referent power (Pfeffer, 1992, 90).

Recommodation

According to study, application of principals' power sources in school administration have fluctuated between the choices of 'generally' and 'sometimes'. The keys of the recommodations summarized below.

- Principals stated that they have generally applied reward power where as teachers thought principals sometimes do it. Principals need to use reward power more directly in order not to cause ambiguity and misunderstandings in administration. Principals not only use reward power for experienced and older teachers, they should also motivate younger teachers by rewards. Younger and less experienced teachers could be empowered with more responsibility to be activated.
- Although coercive power use appeared less in respect to other power sources, principals should better avoid applying it as a means of authority. Destructive consequence of coercive power could be emphasized more so as not to be applied any more in school administration.
- On the outcomes of the study, women teachers' perception of the more coercive power use in schools than men requires principals who are mostly male to be informed when to communicate with women. Vertical use of interaction instead of downward communication could be underlined when decision making.
- Teachers between the ages of 20-30 have stated to face to coercive power more, required principals to rearrange their behaviours; better to guide and lead instead of formal and directive manner.
- Since both teachers and principals came to an agreement of generally use of legitimacy of reciprocity that statements were mostly related to promotion of hardworking teachers differed significantly. Higher rates of these statements that principals asserted have not been shared with teachers required principals to be more open to communication, democratic and transparent in administration.
- Teachers between the ages of 20-30 stated that they have subjected to legitimacy of reciprocity as it was the case for coercive power. Principals need to diversified his power types in order to share power with teachers.

- Teachers who have been teaching one to five years stated that they have subjected to legitimacy of reciprocity more than other groups. It requires principals to focus on expertise in administration instead of formal and structured behaviors.
- It is reported that both principals and teachers have thought the expert power use in school administration of higher rates. Although the expert power use perceived more often than the other power sources, it is not significant and high enough as expected. Principals should consider the importance and keys of expertise and had better to focus on humanistic side of school administration more than technical side.
- Primary school teachers thought that principals use expert power more often than high school teachers. Since most of the primary school principals have been class teachers recently, they could have interacted easily with primary school teachers. Principals have better to be more open and professional to all teachers and personnel in schools.
- Principals assertion that they have applied more informational power than teachers have thought, required more open communication and democracy in schools. Principals should elicit themselves more information based behaviours and honesty in order not to cause misunderstandings and ambiguity.
- Legitimate power of dependence and reciprocity have reported by both principals and teachers of higher rates symbolize the schools mostly administrated legitimately. Legitimacy in administration could be appreciated in some degree but should better be elicited hand in hand with other soft power bases such as expert and referent in order to build positive school climate.
- Referent power is the least preferred bases both for principals and teachers. Since charisma is considered old fashioned and belonged to traditional authority, it is the charisma that create enthusiasm and attractiveness in administration more than the other power types. It could have been favorable to appoint or select principals not only efficient enough for academic knowledge but also effective enough to attract subordinates and create synergy in organizations.

Kaynaklar / References

- Akçay, A. (2003). Müdürler Öğretmenleri Etkileyebiliyor mu? *Milli Eğitim*, 157, 75-88.
- Aktay, Y. (2009). *Karizmanın Rutinleşmesi*, Yeni Şafak Gazetesi, 06.04.2009.
- Ayvacı, H. Ş. ve Küçük, M. (2005). İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Fen Bilgisi Laboratuvarlarının Kullanımı Üzerindeki Etkileri. *Milli Eğitim*, 32 (165), 150-161.
- Bachman, J. G., Bowers, D. G. ve Marcus, P. M. (1968). Bases of Supervisory Power: a Comparative Study In Five Organisational Settings. In A. S. Tannenbaum (eds) *Control In Organisation* (224-236). NY: Mc Graw.
- Balcı, A. (1997). Okul Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Stilleri. *Türkiye'de Eğitim Yönetimi*, Prof. Dr. Ziya Bursalıoğluna Armağan, Ankara: Kültür Vakfı Koleji Yayınları.
- Balcı, A. (2005). *Eğitim Yönetimi Terimleri Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Tek Ağaç.
- Barbour, J. D. (2006). Theories of Administration. In F. W. English (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration* (p. 23-27) Volume 1, London: Sage.
- Barnard, C. (1992). Informal Organisations and Their Relation to Formal Organisations. In J. M. Shafritz ve A. C. Hyde (Eds), *Classics of Public Administration* (p.96-101). Third edition, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bruins, J. (1999). Social Power and Influence Tactics: A Theoretical Introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(1), 7-14.
- Bugental, D.B. ve Lewis, J.C. (1999). The Paradoxical Misuse of Power by Those Who See Themselves as Powerless. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(1), 51-64.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1981). *Eğitim Yöneticisinin Yeterlikleri, İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Yeterliklerine İlişkin Araştırma*, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yay.
- Cartwright, D. ve Zander, A. (1959). Power and Influence in Groups: Introduction. In D.Cartwright ve A. Zander (Eds.) *Studies in Social Power* (p.215-235). Ann Arbor MI: Research Center For Group Dynamics, University of Michigan.
- Cevizci, A. (2002). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*,5. Basım. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.
- Çıldır, T. K. (2008). *Yönetici ve Öğretmen Görüşlerine Göre Peter Blau'nun Sosyal Takas Kuramının Ankara İli İlköğretim Okullarında Uygulanma Durumu*. Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Elias, S.M. ve Loomis, R.J. (2004). The Effect of Instructor Gender and Race/Ethnicity on Gaining Compliance in class. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34 (5), 937-958.
- Erchul, W.P., Raven, B.H., ve Whichard, S.M. (2001). Social Psychologist and Teacher Perceptions of Social Power in Consultation. *Journal of School Psychology*, 39 (6), 483-497.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organisations, On Power, Involvement and Their Correlates*. NY: The Free Press.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1959). Personality and Situational Determinants of Leadership Effectiveness. In D.Cartwright ve A. Zander (Eds.) *Studies in Social Power* (p.362-380). Ann Arbor MI: Research Center For Group Dynamics, University of Michigan.
- French, J. R. ve Raven, B. (1959). The Bases Of Social Power. In D.Cartwright ve A. Zander (Eds.) *Studies in Social Power* (p.259-269). Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnely, J. H. ve Konopaske, R. (2003). *Organisations, Behaviour, Structure, Processes*. Eleventh Edition. NY: Mc Graw Hill.
- Gold, M. (1959). Power in the classroom. In D.Cartwright ve A. Zander (Eds.) *Studies in Social Power* (p.251-258). Ann Arbor MI: Research Center For Group Dynamics.
- Gong, J. (2006). Power. In F. W. English (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration* (p. 784-785) Volume 2, London: Sage.
- Güzelay, G. (2007). *İnsan Kaynağı ve Önemi*. Hürriyet, İnsan Kaynakları. 30.09.2007.
- Hall, R. H. (1977). *Organisations: Structure and Processes*. London: Prentice.

- Hales, C. (1997). Power, Authority and Influence. In A. Harris, N. Bennett and M. Preedy (Eds.) *Organisational Effectiveness and Improvement in Education*. Buckingham: OUP.
- Hornby, A. S. (2001). *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary*. Oxford: OUP.
- Hornstein, H. A. (1968). Influence and Satisfaction in Organisations: A Replication, *Sociology of Education*, 41, 380-389).
- Hoy, W. K. ve Miskel, C. G. (2001). *Educational Administration Theory, Research and Practice*. NY: Mc Graw Hill.
- İşbilir, H. (2005). *İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Duygusal Yeterlikleri ile Kullandıkları Yönetimsel Güç Kaynakları Arasındaki İlişkinin Öğretmen Algularına Dayalı Olarak İncelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gaziantep Üniversitesi, SBE.
- Julian, J. (1966). Compliance Pattern and Communication Blocks in Complex Organisations. *American Sociological Research*, 31(3), 382-389.
- Kasapoğlu, M. A. (1999). *Sağlık Sosyolojisi: Türkiye'den Araştırmalar*. Ankara: Sosyoloji Derneği Yayınları.
- Katz, D. ve Kahn, L. K. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organisations*, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kızılcılık, S. ve Erjem, Y. (1992). *Açıklamalı Sosyoloji Terimleri Sözlüğü*. Konya: Göksu Matbaası.
- King, R. (1983). *The Sociology of School Organization*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Koçel, T. (1989). *İşletme Yöneticiliği*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Yay.
- Korton, D. C. (1959). Situational Determinants of Leadership Structure. In D.Cartwright ve A. Zander (Eds.) *Studies in Social Power* (p.351-361). Ann Arbor MI: Research Center For Group Dynamics, Michigan.
- Koslowsky, M., Schwarzwald, J. ve Ashuri, S. (2001). On Relationship between Subordinates Compliance to Power Sources and Organizational Attitudes. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 5(3), 455-476.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). Power, Dependence and Effective Management. In J.S.Ott *Classic Readings In Organisational Behaviour* (p.425-434), Florida: Harcourt Brace.
- Leithwood, K. (1992). The Move Toward Transformational Leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 8-12.
- Lippitt, R., Polansky, N., Redl, F. ve Rosen, S. (1959). The Dynamics of Power. In D.Cartwright ve A. Zander (Eds.) *Studies in Social Power* (p.236-250). Ann Arbor MI: Research Center For Group Dynamics, Michigan.
- Lunenberg, F. C. ve Ornstein, A. C. (2000). *Educational Administration, Concept and Practices*, Third Edition, Stamford: T. L.
- Luthans, F. (1992). *Organizational Behaviour*, Toronto: Mc Graw Hill.
- Milton, K. (2000). Connected Learning Spaces: *The Role of power dynamics in the Social Construction of Knowledge*. www.public.asa. edu/ kmilton/cls. Retrieved 15.5.2005.
- Mintzberg, H. (1987). The Power Game and the Players. In J.M. Shafritz ve J.S. Ott (Eds.) *Classics of Organisation Theory* (p.364-373). California: The Dorsey Press.
- Munduate, L. ve Gravenhorst, K.M.B., (2003). Power Dynamics and Organisational Change: An Introduction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52(1), 1-13.
- Myers, R. J. (1977). *Fear, Anger and Depression in Organisations: A Study of the Functional Consequences of Power*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, St. John's University.
- Nesler, M.S., Quigley, B.M., Aguinis, H, Lee, S.J. ve Tedeschi, J.T. (1999). The Development and Validation of a Scale Measuring Social Power Based French and Raven's Power Taxonomy, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29 (4), 750-771.
- Okutan, M. (2003). Müdürlerin İdari Davranışları. *Milli Eğitim*, 157, 89-97.
- Ott, J. S. (1996). Power and Influence. In J. S. Ott (Eds.) *Classic Readings In Organizational Behaviour*. (p.379-388). Florida: Harcour Brace.

- Özaslan, G. ve Gürsel, M. (2008). Eğitim Yöneticilerinin Güç Tipi Tercihlerinin Değerlendirilmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25, 88-111.
- Özel, M. (2008). *İşleri Güzellikle Yürütün!* Yeni Şafak, 28 Aralık 2008.
- Pehlivan, İ. (1997). Eğitim Yöneticilerinin Etik Davranışları Üzerine Araştırma. *Türkiye’de Eğitim Yönetimi*, Ziya Bursalıoğluna Armağan, Ankara: Kültür Vakfı Koleji Yay. 3.
- Peiro, J.M. ve Melia, J.L.(2003). Formal and Informal Interpersonal Power in Organisations: Testing a Bifactorial Model of Power in Role sets. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52(1), 14–35.
- Pfeffer, J. (1987). Understanding the Role of Power in Decision Making. In J.M. Shafritz ve J.S. Ott (Eds.) *Classics of Organisation Theory* (p.309-334). California: The Dorsey.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Güç Merkezli Yönetim, Örgütlerde Politika ve Nüfus* İstanbul: Boyner Holding Yayınları.
- Politis, J. D. (2003). *The effect of Mnagerial Powerand Relational Trust on the Skills and Traits of Knowledge Acquisition: Evidence from the United Arap Emirates*. <http://www.62.233.187.104>. Retrieved 21.04.2008.
- Raven, B. H. (1998). Conceptualizing and Measuring a Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(4), 307-332.
- Raven, B. H. (1999). Kurt Lewin Address: Influence, Power, Religion and the Mechanism of Social Control. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(1), 161-186.
- Ring, K. ve Kelly, H.H. (1959). A Comparison of Augmentation and Reduction as Modes of Inluence. In D.Cartwright ve A. Zander (Eds.) *Studies in Social Power* (p.270–277). Ann Arbor MI: Research Center For Group Dynamics.
- Sayles, L. R. (1985). *Leadership: What Effective Managers Really Do and How they Do It*. USA: Mc Graw Hill.
- Schwarzwald, J. ve Koslowsky, M. (1999). Gender, Self Esteem and Focus of Interest in the use of Power Strategies by Adolescentsın Conflict Situations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55 (1), 15–32.
- Schwarzwald, J. , Koslowsky, M. ve Allouf, M. (2005). Group Membership, Status and Social Power Preferences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35 (3), (pp. 644–665).
- Senge, P. M. (1996). The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of The Learning Organisation. In J.S.Ott (Eds.) *Classic Readings In Organisational Behaviour* (p.506–513), Florida: Harcourt Brace.
- Shafritz, J. M. ve Ott, J. S. (1987). Power and Politics. In J.M. Shafritz ve J.S. Ott (Eds.) *Classics of Organisation Theory* (p.304–309), California: The Dorsey Press.
- Somech, A. ve Drach-Zahavy, A. (2002). Relative power and influence strategy: the effects of agent/target power on superiors’ choices of influence strategies. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 23, 167-179.
- Töremen, F. ve Kolay, Y. (2003). İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Sahip Olması Gereken Yeterlikler. *Milli Eğitim*, 160. 341-351.
- Uygun, T. (2004). İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Katılımcı Yönetim Yeterlikleri. *Milli Eğitim*, 162, 203-214.
- Üstüner, M. (1999). *Okul Yöneticilerinin Öğretmenleri Etkilemekte Kullandıkları Güçler ve Öğretmen Moralî*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, SBE., Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.
- Webb, L. D. ve Norton M. S. (1999). *Human Resource Administration, Personal Issues and Needs in Education*, Third Edition, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Welheimer, S. (2001). *Oxford Advanced Learners’ Dictionary*, London: OUP.
- Wilson, K. E. (2005). *The Likelihood of Use And Acceptability of Social Power Bases In School Consultation*. Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of North Carolina State University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Social Psychology, Raleigh.
- Wynn, S. R. (2006). Hierarchy in Organisations. In F. W. English (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration* (pp. 458–459) Volume 1 London: Sage.
- Yücel, C. (1999). *Bureaucracy and Teachers’ Sense of Power*. Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education Leadership, Blacksburg, Virginia.