



## The Relation between School Administrators' Use of Power Styles and Teachers' Organizational Commitment and Their Job Performance

Hatice Doğan <sup>1</sup>, Kazım Çelik <sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

Power is the ability of an individual or group to influence others and a source of directing behavior in a desired way. School administrators use power styles in order to be able to affect school staff and lead them to the direction of their goals. Power styles are divided into two as stylistic and personal power. Job performance is the level of the staff to carry out the work and organizational goals. In order for the schools to be successful and effective, their staff's performance needs to be high. One of the factors which play a significant role in increasing job performance is organizational commitment. In order for the organizations to reach their determined goals, they need workers who are willing to stay within the organization, do voluntary work for the sake of the organization and feel high commitment to the organization. In this context, administrators' power styles and teachers' organizational commitment are accepted as variables which affect teachers' job performance in school organizations. This study aims at determining to what extent school administrators' use of power styles and teachers' organizational commitment account for the teachers' job performance. The study is in the relational survey model. The sample of the research consists of 292 teachers who have been chosen by accidental sampling and work in the central districts of Denizli. In the study which has been carried out through simple and multiple regression analyses, it has been found out that the school administrators' power styles and teachers' organizational commitment predict the teachers' job performance.

### Keywords

Power styles  
Organizational commitment  
Job performance

### Article Info

Received: 05.25.2018  
Accepted: 12.24.2018  
Online Published: 03.25.2019

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2019.7943

### Introduction

The success of school administrators largely depends on their ability of leading people by affecting them in accordance with the organizations' goals. The ability of leading others to the actions which are in accordance with the goals of an organization requires an administrator to be qualified with leadership characteristics and have some certain skills which modern administrators have rather than being a typical manager who uses constructive power (Şimşek, 2002). School administrators need power to affect their staff and to maintain this process since they are role models in the organizations and form the power of organizations (Hoy & Miskel, 2010).

<sup>1</sup> Pamukkale University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, [htcdgn@hotmail.com](mailto:htcdgn@hotmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Pamukkale University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, [kcelik@pau.edu.tr](mailto:kcelik@pau.edu.tr)

School administrators have to use power in order to affect their staff. In school organizations, administrators display power styles consisting of stylistic and personality traits. School administrators are required to use these power styles in the appropriate place and time. Administrators having power styles are influential on their staff's beliefs, attitudes and behaviours. (Munduate & Gravenhorst, 2003). When teachers' attitudes and behaviours have changed in a positive way, their performances will be high as well accordingly.

The extent of administrators' ability to affect organization members is one of the variables which have an influence on achieving organizational goals in schools. Teachers play a key role in the school efficiency and success. The level of teachers' job performance plays a significant role in reaching the school goals and their job performances need to be high. There may be many factors affecting teachers' job performance in a positive or negative way.

Mowday, Porter and Steers (1979) describes organizational commitment as a behaviour of being voluntary to strive for reaching organizational goals, far beyond just a feeling of loyalty to the organization (as cited in Serin & Buluç, 2012). Workers whose organizational commitment is high adopt the goals and values of the organization they work for, strive for the organization and feel more desire to stay in the organization (Gören & Sarpkaya, 2014). According to Chow (1994), workers' high commitment to the organization results in high loyalty, high productivity and high responsibility. With this regard, organizational commitment, which is having a feeling of strong desire to maintain working in a school, can be said to be efficient in teachers' directing their knowledge and skills towards their job and maintaining schools' existence. Teachers fulfil their administrators' demands by working willingly and reach the highest performance when they are committed to their school (Titrek & Zafer, 2009).

#### *Power and Power Styles*

Some certain resources determine power formation and its extent. Administrators can change and lead people's behaviours by using these resources they have in the process of affecting. Power is the capacity of affecting others. Power is defined as the ability of one to lead others towards the behaviors in the direction of his or her wish (Pfeffer, 1992).

Everybody has power but not everyone can make use of the power s/he has. Power is the capacity and potency (Robbins & Judge, 2013). Power in the organizational behaviour is the ability of one to affect others' attitude and behavior in a way s/he wants (Güney, 2015). According to Weber (1947), power is the possibility of one's displaying endurance towards others in a social relationship (as cited in Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Power is the ability to make someone do something, to order something or guide people about how things should be carried out (Aşan & Aydın, 2006). According to Clegg, Courpasson, and Phillips (2006), power is to organization as oxygen is to breathing. We cannot enquire into power without an enquiry into its organization. Equally, we cannot make serious enquiry into organizations without an enquiry into power. Power is inscribed in the core of organizational commitment.

Power is a capacity of affecting others as a result of using some certain resources. School administrators should use these resources in the appropriate place and time (Güney, 2015). Administrators in organizations have different power styles according to their positions and their personality traits (Karaman, 1999). It is possible to divide power resources into two in general. These are formal and personality powers (Raven, 1993). Legitimate power expresses the use of authority which is gained as a direct result of having a position in the organization. Legitimate power is acknowledged by all the staff in an organization since it is formed by organizational rules (Güney, 2015). Rewarding power, coercive power and legitimate power depend on the organizational position. As the position gets higher, the potential of power increases (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Personality power depends on the identification of people who have personality traits which are admired and modelled (Robbins & Judge, 2013). On the other hand, charismatic power and expertise power are mostly related to administrators' individual characteristic such as their personality, leadership styles, knowledge and social relationships. Whereas some power styles depend on the organizational control, the others mostly depend on individual characteristics (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Administrators obtain power from both formal and personal resources (Schermerhorn, Hunt, & Osborn, 2000). French and Raven (1970) classified power

styles as coercive power, legitimate power, rewarding power, charismatic power and expertise power in 5 parts.

**Coercive power:** Coercive power is administrators' using power as a means of threat and intimidation. It is the power which expresses administrators' material and moral strain towards employees (Altinkurt & Yılmaz, 2012b). Power based on coercion consists of many techniques ranging from making people frighten, using physical power, dismissing from work to psychological pressure (Güney, 2015). **Legitimate power:** Having power is generally acquired by legitimate power in formal groups and organizations. Legitimate power represents formal authority given in order to use and control organizational resources by depending on the structural position (Giessner & Schubert, 2007). **Rewarding power:** It is the power of giving reward or keeping rewards at hand. It expresses subordinates' conforming to the requirements of the superior with the expectation of getting reward, being in a group, recognition and obtaining benefit (Çelik, 2003). People have to obey this rewarding power which is opposite to coercive power since behaving in accordance with the requirements of those who own power can provide people some benefits (Ward, 2001). However, on the negative side, rewards can sometimes those who do not receive them or receive what they believe to be insufficient amounts of them. Since the use of reward power can have potentially important consequences, both good or bad, managers need to use rewards carefully and skilfully and be very alert to how subordinates perceive the administration of them. (Hitt, Black, & Porter, 2005).

**Charismatic power:** According to Robbins and Judge (2013), It is the total of the features and potentials desired to be in a person. This power triggers the feeling of painstaking since people want to be integrated with the owner of this power (Bayrak, 2001). People who have charismatic power inspire their followers, determine some aims and goals which people cannot even imagine and stimulate people to work in the direction of these aims and goals affecting them easily (Güney, 2015). **Expert power:** Knowledge, experience, ability and skill underlie this power (Bayrak, 2001). Knowledge plays a significant role in subordinates' understanding of administrators' power. Having special abilities and skills by administrators is a factor increasing their power as well (Güney, 2015).

Power styles can be put into two categories as organizational and individual. Rewarding power, coercive power and legitimate power depend on the organizational position. As the position gets higher, the potential of power increases. On the other hand, charismatic power and expertise power are mostly related to administrators' individual characteristics such as their personality, leadership styles, knowledge and social relationships. Whereas some power styles depend on the organizational control, the others mostly depend on individual characteristics (Hoy & Miskel, 2010).

The related literature on power mostly deal with the topics related to school administrators' power resources (Titrek & Zafer, 2009; Yorulmaz, 2014; Kayalı, 2011), levels of using power styles (Gültürk, 2012) and the school administrators' preferences for the power styles (Özaslan, 2006). Also, the relationship between the school administrators' power resources and organizational citizenship (Altinkurt & Yılmaz, 2012a; Demir, 2014), organizational silence relationship (Karaman, 2015), organizational atmosphere relationship (Diş, 2015), organizational culture (Koşar & Çalık, 2011), organizational citizenship (Demirel, 2012), power distance and group efficiency (Cole, Carter, & Zhang, 2013), organizational integration (Wu, Liu, Kwan, & Lee, 2015) the relationship between school administrators' use of power styles and mobbing experienced by teachers, organizational commitment, organizational cynism (Atmaca, 2014) were studied.

### ***Job Performance***

According to Rousseau and McLean (1993), performance is there quired effort of workers' in return for their payment (Başaran, 2017), the degree of activities carried out in a determined time serving purpose (Akal, 1992) and the degree of workers' or organizations reaching their goals (Pugh, 1991). Job performance is a concept related to what extent individuals working in organizations fulfill their duty and responsibilities within their job description, to what extent they help the organizations reach their goals and to what extent their own output is sufficient (Kurt, 2013). According to Williams (2002), job performance is defined as a whole of behavior patterns displayed in a workplace and suitable for the aims and goals of an organization. Job performance is described as the behaviors that can be measured

as to what extent it serves the purpose of the organization and that are suitable for the organizations' goals (Suliman, 2001).

The common point of the definitions related to job performance is that the performance of the workers plays a significant role in reaching organizational goals. Therefore, organizations can only be successful in accordance with their staff's performance (Benligiray, 2004). According to Koopmans (2014), the dimensions of job performance can be dealt with as task performance, contextual performance, adaptable performance and detrimental behaviour. Task performance expresses the contribution of the staff to the organization, contextual performance expresses in formal part of the job description, adaptable performance expresses getting adapted to the changing environment and detrimental behaviour expresses behaviours such as personal aggression, indecisiveness and destructive behaviour. It is required to deal with these four dimensions together in order to enable the workers to display high job performance. In organizations where there are workers with high job performance, the organizations' success, efficiency and productivity increase as well.

In the research on the job performance, the topics related to the relationship between role conflict and role ambiguity- job performance (Çelik, 2013), relationship between administrator roles and job performance (Nandkeolyar, Shaffer, Lii, Ekkirala, & Bagger, 2014), the effect of organizational atmosphere on employees' job performance (Tutar & Altınöz, 2010), the relationship between organizational commitment and employee performance (Uygur, 2009), the effect of organizational citizenship behaviour on job performance and intention of leaving work (Çıra & Çelik, 2013), relationship between position power and job performance (Cuddy, Wilmuth, Yap, & Carney, 2015), the relationship between leadership behaviour, organizational creativity and employees' job performance (Yılmaz & Karahan, 2010) and the effect of organizational cynism on job performance (Kahya, 2013) were studied.

### ***Organizational Commitment***

Mathews and Shepherd (2002) identifies organizational commitment as a concept which tries to explain the attitudes and behaviour of people towards the work they are involved in. According to Meyer and Allen (1991), organizational commitment expresses the psychological attitude of an employee towards the organization s/he works in. It is a psychological situation which reflects the relationship between the employee and organization and leads to the decision to maintain organizational membership (as cited in Yüceler 2009). Organizational commitment is a process related to the attitudes and behaviour towards their work. It can also be described as the employees' commitment to their work, their integration into the work and being in harmony with their work. Organizational commitment can be said to exist when the levels of work outcomes, job satisfaction, giving encouragement and job performances are higher than expected (Chen & Chen, 2008).

Meyer and Allen have found out that organizational commitment has 3 different components as affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. The common point of these commitment types is that there is a bond between the workers and organizations, which decreases the possibility of leaving from the organization. (Yüceler, 2009). The development of organizations depends on the positive feelings of the employees towards the organization. For this, it is necessary to have positive attitudes toward the job and field of the work as well as having knowledge and skills required for the job (Bolat & Bolat, 2008).

It can be seen that there are three significant factors in the formation of organizational commitment (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006): a) to believe in the goals and values of the organization, b) the willingness for self-sacrifice in favour of the organization, c) the willingness to stay in the organization (as cited in Atmaca, 2014). In this regard, organizational commitment is considered as a worker's tendency or willingness for his or her commitment to the organization with loyalty, integrating himself or herself into the organization and persistency in the organization (Robbins & Coulter, 2003).

When the research related to the organizational commitment have been examined, it is clear that they address the topics related to the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational confidence (Uysal, 2014), the relationship between power styles, organizational

mobbing, organizational cynism and organizational commitment (Atmaca, 2014), the relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment (Karapostal, 2014; Buluç, 2009), relationship between organizational commitment and job performance (Odle-Dusseau, Hammer, Crain, & Bodner, 2015), relationship between personality roles -culture and organizational commitment (Choi, Oh, & Colbert, 2015; Zhang, 2015), the relationship between organizational commitment and school effectiveness (Yılmaz & Taşdemir 2016 ), the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational silence (Yüksel, 2015), relationship between organizational commitment and motivation (Kalay, 2015), the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational mobbing (Arslan, 2015), the relationship organizational culture and organizational commitment (Çetin, Şeşen, & Basım, 2012), relationship between organizational commitment and organizational culture, organizational justice (Yavuz, 2010), the relationships between power resources and organizational commitment (Cömert, 2014), the relationship between organizational culture, power tendency, organizational integration and organizational commitment (Polat & Meydan, 2011). Also, the issues about the relationship between performance management implementations and organizational commitment (Çorbacı & Bostancı, 2013) and instructors' organizational commitment (Güner, 2015) were studied.

### ***The Relationship between Power Styles, Job Performance and Organizational Commitment***

Administrators need to have the power of affecting the employees in order to be effective in realizing organizational goals. The source of starting the process of influencing and maintaining it is the power of administrators (Özcanay, 2017). Power is mostly the result of the administrators' ability to influence other people or groups rather than a position in the organization (Werner, 1993). School administrators use power in order to affect their staff. In school organizations, administrators display powerstyles consisting of structural and personality traits. School administrators affect their staff in the direction of their job and goals through powerstyles they display. School administrators are influential on their staff with their attitudes and personal traits. The source of the organizational power which the administrators use in order to affect teachers and motivate them is among the significant variables for the efficiency and productivity of the schools (Deniz & Çolak, 2008; Helvacı & Kayalı, 2011; Titrek & Zafer, 2009; Altinkurt & Yılmaz, 2012a). At schools, the performances of those who work together with the administrators are also significant. Job performance is the outcomes obtained by an employee carrying out a task in a given time (Özgen, Öztürk, & Yalçın 2002). In order for the school organization to be effective, teachers' job performances need to be high.

One of the factors increasing teachers' performance in schools is organizational commitment. The job- absence of the individuals with high commitment is lower and the rates of their being late for work and quitting work are lower as well (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). It can be said that employees who have a feeling of commitment to the organization and adopted the goals and values of the organization contribute more to the organization to reach its aims. This study may come up with applicable findings on teachers and school administrators who have the decision-making role in educational issues. In this respect, it is expected that the research results on how administrators' use of power styles and organizational commitment affect the job performance among teachers can do a meaningful contribution to the literature. Therefore, it is aimed to determine to what extent school administrators' use of power styles and teachers' organizational commitment account for the job performance of the teachers. Accordingly, the answers to the questions below have been searched for.

1. According to the teachers' perceptions, what are the power styles of administrators working in primary and secondary schools?
2. According to the teachers' perceptions, how are the teachers' performances working in primary and secondary schools?
3. According to the teachers' perceptions, how is the organizational commitment of the teachers working in primary and secondary schools?
4. Are school administrators' power styles and teachers' organizational commitment in their schools significant predictors of teachers' job performance?

## Method

### *Research Model*

The research which aims at measuring the relationship between school administrators' styles in using power, organizational commitment and teachers' job performance is designed using the relational survey model. According to Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2006), relational researches are the studies which aim to determine the relationship between two or more variables, the existence or degree of variance of these variables. The dependent variable of this study is job performance and its independent variables are power styles and organizational commitment.

### *Population and Sample*

Teachers who work in the schools in the districts of Pamukkale and Merkezefendi in Denizli constitute the population of the research. Data were collected from 335 teachers among 7698 teachers working at state and private schools in 2015-2016 academic year through random sampling method. 43 surveys filled without care or with mistake have been left out. 292 teachers taking part in the research voluntarily constitute the study group of the research.

### *Measurement Tools*

In the study, Power Type Scale, Job Performance Scale and Organizational Commitment have been used as measurement tools. Questions to determine the personal variables are not included in the data collection tool since they are not in the research content. Findings related to the validity and reliability studies of Power Type, Job Performance Scale and Organizational Commitment Scale have been presented below consecutively.

**Power Type Scale:** There are 33 items in the Power Type Scale which was developed by Koşar (2008) with the aim of determining the power styles which school administrators use. The grading options used in the scale have been determined as (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often and (5) Always. A total score cannot be obtained since power styles are in the scope of the features administrators use and have different dimensions, thus; separate scoring have been done for each one of the four dimensions.

As it is stated in the classification of French and Raven (1970), reward power, legitimate power and coercive power were separate factors in the scale, but charismatic and expert power were not separated, which results in getting four dimensions in total. Charismatic power and expert power have been studied as a single dimension under the title of personality power. The personality power dimension consists of 15 items, rewarding power and legitimate power consist of 7 items and coercive power consists of 4 items. The reliability values of the dimensions of personality power, rewarding power, legitimate power and coercive power in Power Type Scale are .98, .92, .86, .81 respectively (Koşar, 2008). The reliability coefficients of the dimensions of personality power, rewarding power, legitimate power and coercive power for this study are .93, .89, .82, .87 respectively.

**Job Performance Scale:** In order to measure the employees' job performances, the Employee's Performance Scale which consists of 4 items used in the studies carried out first by Kirkman and Rosen (1999) and then Sigler and Pearson (2000) was used. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Çöl (2008). Internal consistency coefficient has been calculated as .82 Cronbach's Alpha value (Çöl, 2008). In this study, reliability coefficient is .86. Job Performance Scale has been evaluated in 5 steps ranging from "I completely agree" (5) to "I completely disagree" (1). The performance mentioned here is the performance perceived.

**Organizational commitment Scale:** 3 dimension – Organizational Commitment Scale which was developed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) was adapted to Turkish by Wasti (2000) (Özbakır, 2015). The scale was prepared in three factors in order to determine the relative power of an individual in getting integrated with the organization. Each factor was designed as a sub-scale. These dimensions are affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient is .94 for "affective commitment", .85 for "continuance commitment", .88 for "normative commitment" and .89 for the total scale (Özbakır, 2015). In this study, Cronbach's Alpha value is .88 for affective commitment, .81 for continuance commitment, .92 for normative commitment

and .86 for the total scale. Total score can be obtained since organizational commitment includes the attitudes and behaviour of the employees towards the organization.

#### *Data Collection and Analysis*

In order to administer the data collection tools, necessary permission was received from Denizli Provincial Directorate of National Education, and data were collected from the teachers who voluntarily took part in the study in the year 2015-2016 school year.

In order to decide which statistics tests should be carried out first in the analysis of data, it was examined whether data have a normal distribution or not by studying the skewness and kurtosis values. It was found that skewness and kurtosis values of all the data in the study are between -1 and +1. Thus, it can be said that the data have a normal distribution.

Simple regression and multiple regression analyses were done in the analysis of the data. The number of (dependent) variable predicted in the simple and multiple regression analyses is single. Simple regression analysis is used when the number of predictor (independent) variable is single and the number of multiple regression predictor (independent) variables is more than one. When variables were examined according to the hypotheses of simple regression analysis, it was determined that predictor variable and predicted variable show normal distribution based on skewness and kurtosis values (Skewness value for predictor variable organizational commitment is .165, and kurtosis value is -.078, skewness value for predicted variable job performance is -.775 and kurtosis value is .735). It was determined that the linearity of predicted and predictor variables described a linear relationship when it was tested and examined by using Scatter Plot test. Also, the correlation coefficient between predicted variable and predictor variable is .224. Therefore, the data in the study were analysed through parametric tests.

When the variables were examined according to multiple regression analysis hypotheses, it was determined that predictor variables and predicted variables show normal distribution according to skewness and kurtosis values. The dimensions of predictor variables power styles' skewness and kurtosis values are respectively -.222, -.911 for personality power, -.373, -.699 for rewarding power, .945, .225 for coercive power, .238, -.248 for legitimate power. The skewness and kurtosis values of the dimensions of predictor variables organizational commitment are respectively -.373, .658 for affective commitment, .202, .500 for continuance commitment and .281, -.334 for normative commitment. When the correlation coefficients between predictor variables were examined for the dimensions of power styles, it was determined that there was a positive moderate relationship between personality power and rewarding power. ( $r = .587$ ), a positive low level relation between personality power and coercive power ( $r = .019$ ), and coercive power and legitimate power ( $r = .297$ ), a negative low level relation between personality power and legitimate power ( $r = -.028$ ), rewarding power and legitimate power ( $r = -.099$ ) and rewarding power and coercive power ( $r = -.08$ ). When it was examined for organizational commitment dimensions, it was determined that there was a positive moderate relation between continuance commitment and normative commitment ( $r = .381$ ), continuance commitment and affective commitment ( $r = .497$ ), and normative commitment and affective commitment ( $r = .435$ ). When the problem of the multiple dependence of the dimensions of power styles was examined by means of eigenvalue, situation indexes and variance ratios, it was determined that eigenvalues show parallelism with one another and situational indexes values were not higher than the others (Table1). The highest variance in the predictor variable added to a different eigenvalue shows that each variance accounts for a different dimension.

**Table 1.** The Eigen Values, Situation Indexes, Variance Ratios of Power Styles Dimensions

| Dimension | Eigenvalue | Situational Index | Variance Ratios |                 |                  |                |                   |
|-----------|------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|
|           |            |                   | Stable          | Rewarding Power | Legitimate Power | Coercive Power | Personality Power |
| 1         | 4,870      | 1,000             | ,00             | ,00             | ,00              | ,00            | ,00               |
| 2         | ,073       | 8,180             | ,01             | ,05             | ,01              | ,73            | ,02               |
| 3         | ,038       | 11,353            | ,00             | ,07             | ,69              | ,26            | ,01               |
| 4         | ,012       | 20,575            | ,20             | ,87             | ,17              | ,00            | ,30               |
| 5         | ,008       | 24,443            | ,80             | ,02             | ,13              | ,01            | ,67               |

In Table 2, standard error, tolerance and VIF values are shown in order to examine the problem of multiple connectedness of power styles' dimensions. In the multiple regression analysis, it can be said that there is no connectedness problem in the event that the biggest VIF value is less than 10 and tolerance value is bigger than .20 (Field, 2005).

**Table 2.** Standard Error, Tolerance and VIF Values of Power Styles' Dimensions

| Predictor Variables | B     | Standard Error | Tolerance | VIF   |
|---------------------|-------|----------------|-----------|-------|
| Rewarding Power     | -,009 | ,074           | ,691      | 1,446 |
| Legitimate Power    | ,022  | ,065           | ,901      | 1,109 |
| Coercive Power      | ,108  | ,048           | ,911      | 1,098 |
| Personality Power   | ,329  | ,057           | ,698      | 1,433 |

In table 2, it is seen that the tolerance values of all variables are bigger than .20 and VIF values are less than 10. When Table 1 and Table 2 are examined together, it can be said that there is no multiple connectedness problem among power style dimensions (predictor variables).

In Table 3, the multiple connectedness problem of organizational commitment dimensions is examined by means of eigenvalues, situation indexes and variance ratios. According to Table 3, eigenvalues do not show resemblance. Situation index has not been found to be much higher than the others. According to variance ratios, the highest variance in predictor variables added to a different eigenvalue shows that each variance accounts for a different size.

**Table 3.** Eigenvalues, Situation Indexes and Variance Ratios of Organizational Commitment Dimensions

| Dimension | Eigenvalue | Situational Index | Variance Ratios |                        |                      |                      |
|-----------|------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|           |            |                   | Stable          | Continuance Commitment | Normative Commitment | Affective Commitment |
| 1         | 3,948      | 1,000             | ,00             | ,00                    | ,00                  | ,00                  |
| 2         | ,023       | 13,035            | ,15             | ,01                    | ,08                  | ,91                  |
| 3         | ,017       | 15,042            | ,10             | ,27                    | ,85                  | ,00                  |
| 4         | ,011       | 18,738            | ,75             | ,72                    | ,07                  | ,09                  |

In table 4, standard error, tolerance and VIF values are shown in order to examine the problem of multiple connectedness of organizational commitment dimensions.

**Table 4.** Standard Error, Tolerance and VIF Values of Organizational Commitment Dimensions

| Predictor Variables    | B    | Standard Error | Tolerance | VIF   |
|------------------------|------|----------------|-----------|-------|
| Continuance Commitment | ,069 | ,123           | ,734      | 1,363 |
| Normative Commitment   | ,095 | ,092           | ,772      | 1,295 |
| Affective Commitment   | ,138 | ,082           | ,696      | 1,436 |
| Personality Power      | ,329 | ,057           | ,698      | 1,433 |

In table 4, it is seen that tolerance values of all variables are bigger than .20, and VIF values are less than 10. When the Table 3 and Table 4 are examined together, it can be said that there is not any problem of multiple connectedness among organizational commitment dimension.



## Results

In order to determine the perception levels of teachers related to the administrators' power style dimensions and also their performance and organizational commitment, average and standard errors have been calculated together with all their sub- dimensions. The score interval has been used as 1.00-1.79 (very low), 1.80-2.59 (low), 2.60-3.39 (moderate), 3.40-4.19 (high) and 4.20-5.00 (very high) in order to evaluate the scores obtained.

### *The Perception Levels of Teachers Related to Their Job Performances, Organizational Commitment, School Administrators' Power Style Dimensions*

**Table 5.** The Perception Levels of Teachers Related to Their Job Performances, Organizational Commitment, School Administrators' Power Style Dimensions

|                                  | Average ( $\bar{X}$ ) | Standard Error |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Personality Power                | 3.05                  | .71            |
| Rewarding Power                  | 3.45                  | .96            |
| Coercive Power                   | 2.42                  | .74            |
| Legitimate Power                 | 2.65                  | .54            |
| <b>Job Performance</b>           | 3.16                  | .63            |
| <b>Organizational Commitment</b> | 2.46                  | .35            |
| Affective Commitment             | 2.43                  | .54            |
| Continuance Commitment           | 2.12                  | .33            |
| Normative Commitment             | 2.44                  | .43            |

According to Table 5, teachers perceive personality power ( $\bar{X}$ = 3.05) and legitimate power ( $\bar{X}$ = 2.65) as "moderate level", coercive power ( $\bar{X}$ =2.42) as "low level" and rewarding power ( $\bar{X}$ = 3.45) as "high level", their performance in their schools ( $\bar{X}$ = 3.16) as "moderate level". Teachers perceive organizational commitment ( $\bar{X}$ = 2.46), affective commitment ( $\bar{X}$ =2.43), continuance commitment ( $\bar{X}$ = 2.12) and normative commitment ( $\bar{X}$ =2.44) as in low level.

### *The Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Related to the Prediction of Power Style Dimensions for Job Performance*

**Table 6.** The Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Related to the Prediction of Power Style Dimensions for Job Performance

| Dimensions                    | Predicted Variables: Job Performance |                |         |       |      |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|---------|-------|------|
|                               | B                                    | Standard Error | $\beta$ | t     | p    |
| Stable                        | 1,440                                | ,315           |         | 4,576 | .000 |
| Personality Power             | ,290                                 | ,057           | ,329    | 5,123 | ,000 |
| Rewarding Power               | -,011                                | ,074           | -,009   | -,147 | ,883 |
| Legitimate Power              | ,025                                 | ,065           | ,022    | ,382  | ,703 |
| Coercive Power                | ,092                                 | .048           | ,108    | 1,930 | ,047 |
| R= .345 R <sup>2</sup> = .119 |                                      |                |         |       |      |
| F= 10.401 p=.000              |                                      |                |         |       |      |

When the Table 6 is examined, multiple regression analysis findings indicate that personality power and coercive power among all the power styles are significant predictors of job performance (R=.345, R<sup>2</sup>= .119, p<.05). Power styles dimensions account for nearly 12 percent of job performance. When the t values of regression analysis used in explaining how the power style dimensions as predictor values accounts for job performance are studied, it can be clearly seen that personality power (p<.05) dimensions and coercive power (p<.05) dimensions account for job performance significantly. Rewarding power and legitimate power dimensions are not significant in explaining job performance. When the effects of power style dimensions on explaining job performance are studied, it can be seen

that the effect of personality power dimension is the highest ( $\beta=.329$ ). According to the standardized regression coefficient, the most significant ones of the predictor variables effective in job performance are personality power and coercive power respectively. In this sense, regression equality can be seen below.

$$\text{Job Performance} = 1,440 + 0,290 \times \text{Personality Power} + 0,092 \times \text{Coercive Power}$$

*The Simple Regression Analysis of Organizational Commitment as a Predictor of Job Performance*

**Table 7.** The Results of Simple Regression Analysis of Organizational Commitment as a Predictor of Job Performance

| Dimensions                    |       | Predicted Variable: Job Performance |         |        |      |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------|--------|------|
| Predictor Variable            | B     | Standard Error                      | $\beta$ | t      | p    |
| Stable                        | 2.434 | .183                                |         | 13.275 | .000 |
| Organizational Commitment     | .304  | .075                                | .224    | 4.041  | .000 |
| R= .224 R <sup>2</sup> = .050 |       |                                     |         |        |      |
| F= 16.327 p=.000              |       |                                     |         |        |      |

As a consequence of simple linear regression analysis, it can be said that organizational commitment is a meaningful predictor of job performance ( $p<.01$ ). Organizational commitment accounts for nearly % 5 percent of the total variance in job performance ( $R^2 =.050$ ). In this sense, regression equality can be seen below.

$$\text{Job Performance} = 2,434 + 0,304 \times \text{Organizational Commitment}$$

*The Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Related to the Prediction of Organizational Commitment Dimensions for the Job Performance*

**Table 8.** The Results of Multiple Regression Analysis Related to the Prediction of Organizational Commitment Dimensions for the Job Performance

| Dimensions                    |       | Predicted Variable: Job Performance |         |       |      |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------|-------|------|
| Predictor Variable            | B     | Standard Error                      | $\beta$ | t     | p    |
| Stable                        | 2,133 | ,259                                |         | 8,244 | .000 |
| Continuance Commitment        | ,131  | ,123                                | ,069    | 1,063 | ,289 |
| Affective Commitment          | ,171  | ,082                                | ,138    | 2,083 | ,038 |
| Normative Commitment          | ,138  | ,092                                | ,095    | 1,503 | ,134 |
| R= .241 R <sup>2</sup> = .058 |       |                                     |         |       |      |
| F= 6,329 p=.000               |       |                                     |         |       |      |

When Table 8 is examined, as a result of multiple regression analysis, it has been concluded that affective commitment as an organizational commitment dimension is a meaningful predictor of job performance ( $R= .241$ ,  $R^2= .058$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Organizational commitment dimensions (continuance commitment, affective commitment and normative commitment) account for almost 6 percent of job performance. When the t values of regression analysis used in explaining how organizational commitment as a predictor variable accounts job performance are examined, it is seen that affective commitment ( $p<.05$ ) dimension accounts for job performance in a meaningful way. Continuance commitment and normative commitment dimensions are not effective in explaining job performance. In this sense, regression equality can be seen below.

$$\text{Job Performance} = 2,133 + 0,171 \times \text{Affective Commitment}$$

## Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, it is aimed to determine to what extent school administrators' use of power styles and teachers' organizational commitment according to the teachers' perceptions account for the job performance of the teachers. According to the perceptions of teachers, it has been determined that school administrators use rewarding power most among all the power styles. In the study of Titrek and Zafer (2009), it has been found out that school administrators use legitimate and coercive power most. In the study carried out by Altinkurt and Yılmaz (2012a), it has been found out that according to teachers, school administrators use legitimate power most. Guditus and Zirkel (1980) found out in their study that the most widely used power style is legitimate power. Berdahl and Martorana (2006), Galinsky, Magee, Inesi, and Gruenfeld (2003), Overbeck, Tiedens, and Brion (2006), Van Kleef, De Dreu, Pietroni, and Manstead (2006) and Hassenboehler (2004) reached the similar results. This finding of the study is not compatible with the findings of the present studies. Rewarding is carried by administrators with the aim of keeping hold of the right people in the right time for the right jobs, duties and roles by appreciating and rewarding the best one and with the aim of maintaining attendance of the workers with their highest capacities (Usta & Küçükaltan, 2012). It can be said that school administrators prefer to use rewarding power more common than other power styles in order to motivate teachers and to increase their efforts for the schools' goals. Also, it can be said that school administrators prefer to use rewarding power since rewarding shows teachers which behaviors should be done and which behaviors should not be done.

Teachers have stated that they show a moderate job performance in their schools. In the studies carried out by Özutku, Ağca, and Cevrioğlu (2008) and Kahya (2013), they reached the findings showing that teachers' job performance was moderate. In the studies of Cuddy et al. (2015), similar findings were obtained. The finding obtained related to the job performance of the teachers, who determine the future of the education systems, is alarming for the new generations. This situation may stem from the inadequate job conditions, personal rights and implementations to discredit teaching occupation.

Teachers have stated that their organizational commitment in their schools is in low level. This finding of the study conflicts with the existing studies. Yıldız (2013), Serin and Buluç (2012), Hulpia, Devos, and Van Keer (2010), Nguni, Slegers, and Denesen (2006), Tsui and Cheng (1999) reached the conclusion that teachers' perceptions of their organizational commitment were in a high level. According to Faber and Saks (1980), in the situations where there are limited job opportunities, workers' organizational commitment is low and their commitment in the organizations is an obligatory commitment due to the external factors such as job continuance, payments and so on (as cited in Newton & Shore, 1992). It can be said that the reasons why teachers' organizational commitment is low stem from school administrators' insufficient communication, their problems in human relationships, their lack of vision, and their being closed to the personal and organizational development. Also, frequent changes in the education system, the education system's making the student development difficult due to its being exam centered and this situations' creating a conflict with the primary mission of teaching can be shown among the reasons for this situation.

It has been determined that teachers' affective commitment levels, one of all the organizational commitment dimensions, are high. This finding of the study is compatible with the research findings of Yüceler (2009) who determined that the participants' affective commitment in the studies of Sezgin (2010), Balay (2000), Kurşunoğlu, Bakay, and Tanrıöğen (2010) was higher compared to continuance commitment and normative commitment. Affective commitment which is based on the harmony of the individual and organizational values and being voluntary is high among the teachers and this can be considered as a positive situation in terms of the schools' reaching their aims and increasing the success of the students (Sezgin, 2010).

It can be said that personality and coercive power out of all power styles of school administrators are significant predictors of teachers' job performance. It has not been encountered a similar study related to the prediction of administrators' power styles for teachers' performance. However, in the study of Cömert (2014), it was found out that organizational power styles of the administrators predict teachers' organizational commitment in a significant way. Aydoğdu (2008) concluded that there is a high relationship between the perceptions of teachers working in primary schools related to the school administrators' competence and teachers' organizational commitment. Palar (2013) points out in his study that there is a strong relationship between expert power that administrators use and employees' organizational commitment (as cited in Atmaca, 2014). Almutairi (2013), Selamat, Nordin, and Adnan (2013) and Omidifar (2013) have reached the conclusion in their studies that there is a positive correlation between transformative leadership out of all the leadership styles and organizational commitment. According to Altınkurt and Yılmaz (2012a), as the school administrators' use of coercive power increases, teachers develop an affective and behavioral distance to the organization, their negative attitudes towards the organization increase and their performances decrease. This situation conflicts with the findings of the study. According to the research findings, as the school administrators' use of coercive power increases, teachers' performances based on the obligation increase as well. The administrators who use personality power have higher degrees of skills in affecting their staff (Koşar & Çalık, 2011). According to the research findings, teachers' performances increase due to the school administrators' skills of affecting them based on their personality power.

It can be said that there is a relationship in a low level between teachers' organizational commitment and their job performance. Organizational commitment is a significant concept in terms of increasing the efficiency of the schools and teachers' performances (Serin & Buluç, 2012). This finding of the study conflicts with the findings of the existing studies. Kalkavan (2014) in his study has reached the findings that organizational commitment has a positive effect on job performance. It has not been confronted with any similar study which indicates that organizational commitment predicts job performance. However, in Eskibağ's (2014) study, it is stated that organizational commitment affects teachers' job performance. Sinclair, Tucker, Cullen, and Wright (2005) have reached the findings that organizational commitment leads to performance differences. In their studies, Wright and Bonett (2002) have determined that organizational commitment and job performance are correlated in a moderate way. Eisenberger, et al. (2010) have determined in their studies that correlation between organizational commitment and leader-member transformation, employees' job performance is high.

As a result, personality power and coercive power out of all power styles that administrators use are significant predictors of teachers' job performance at schools. According to the teachers' perceptions, school administrators most commonly use rewarding power. Teachers think that their job performance is in a moderate level. It has been determined that there is a low correlation between teachers' organizational commitment and their job performances. Of all the organizational commitment types, affective commitment is the best predictor of teachers' job performance. Teachers think their organizational commitment in their schools is in a low level.

### Suggestions

As a result of the findings obtained in the research, these suggestions have been developed:

School administrators should be provided with in-service training, their awareness of power styles should be increased and they should be led to the studies which they can put into practice in order to increase the levels of school administrators' use of power styles. Also, a study of extensification, improvement and implementation should be carried out aimed at use of power styles.

School administrators should be provided with the enhancement studies aimed at increasing teachers' job performances. Further opportunities should be provided for the teachers in order to improve themselves. An effective education program needs to be developed aiming at promoting teachers' job performance and organizational commitment. It can be suggested that school administrators should develop their leadership skills leading to internal motivation such as appreciating, rewarding, stimulating others in order to increase the levels of teachers' organizational commitment.

Whether teachers show differences according to the personal variables (gender, school type, seniority) or not can be searched. According to the research, teachers display job performance in a moderate level and organizational commitment in a low level the reasons for this results can be searched.

## References

- Akal, Z. (1992). *İşletmelerde performans ölçüm ve denetimi: Çok yönlü performans göstergeleri*. Ankara: Mülga Milli Prodüktivite Merkezi Yayını.
- Almutairi, D. O. (2013). The relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment: A test on saudi arabian airline. *World Review of Business Research*, 3(1), 41-51.
- Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2012a). Okul yöneticilerinin kullandığı güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 12(3), 1833-1852.
- Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2012b). Okul yöneticilerinin kullandığı güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin iş doyumunu arasındaki ilişki. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 20(2), 385-402.
- Arslan, S. (2015). *İstanbulda bulunan ortaokul kurumlarında görev yapan görsel sanatlar öğretmenlerinin mobbing (yıldırma) yaşama düzeyleri ile örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul Aydın University, İstanbul.
- Aşan, Ö., & Aydın, E. M. (2006). Güç ve politika. Can, H. (Ed.), *Örgütsel Davranış*. İstanbul: Arkan Basım-Yayıncılık.
- Atmaca, T. (2014). *Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç türleri ile öğretmenlerin yaşadıkları yıldırma, örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel sinizm arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Aydoğdu, A. (2008). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin algıladıkları okul müdürü yeterlilikleri ile örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, İstanbul.
- Balay, R. (2000). *Özel ve resmi liselerde yönetici ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University, Ankara.
- Başaran, R. (2017). Örgütsel tutum ve davranışların iş performansı ve işten ayrılma niyetine etkisi: ilişkisel psikolojik sözleşmelerin aracılık rolü. *Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12, 239-270.
- Bayrak, S. (2001). Yönetimde bir ihmal konusu olarak güç ve güç yönetimi II. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(1), 23-42.
- Benligiray, S. (2004). *İnsan kaynakları yönetimi*. Eskişehir: Anadolu University.
- Berdahl, J. L., & Martorana, P. (2006). Effects of power on emotion and expression during a controversial group discussion. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 497-509.
- Bolat, O. İ., & Bolat, T. (2008). Otel işletmelerinde örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı ilişkisi. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11(19), 75-94.
- Buluç, B. (2009). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin algılarına göre okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(57), 5-34.
- Chen, H. F., & Chen, Y. C. (2008). The impact of work redesign and psychological empowerment on organizational commitment in a changing environment: an example from Taiwan's state-owned enterprise. *Public Personnel Management*, 37(3), 279-30.
- Choi, D., Oh, I. S., & Colbert, A. E. (2015). Understanding organizational commitment: A meta-analytic examination of the roles of the five-factor model of personality and culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(5), 1542-1567. doi:10.1037/apl0000014.
- Chow, I. H. S. (1994). Organizational commitment and career development of chinese managers in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *The International Journal of Career Management*, 6(4), 3-9.
- Clegg, S. R., Courpasson, D., & Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and organizations*. London: A Sage Publications Series.
- Cole, M., Carter, M. Z., & Zhang, Z. (2013). Leader-Team congruence in power distance values and team effectiveness: the mediating role of procedural justice climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(6), 962-973.

- Cömert, M. (2014). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri ile okul müdürlerinin kullandıkları örgütsel güç kaynakları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Kahramanmaraş.
- Cuddy, A. J. C., Wilmuth, C. A., Yap, A. J., & Carney, D. R. (2015). Preparatory power posing affects nonverbal presence and job interview performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(4), 1286-1295.
- Çelik, K. (2003). Örgütsel kontrol. In C. Elma & K. Demir (Eds.), *Yönetimde çağdaş yaklaşımlar: Uygulamalar ve sorunlar* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 67-91), Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Çelik, K. (2013). The effect of role ambiguity and role conflict on performance of vice principals: the mediating role of burnout. *Eğitim Araştırmaları -Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 51*, 195-214.
- Çetin, F., Şeşen, H., & Basım, H. N. (2012). Örgüt kültürünün rol ötesi olumlu davranışlara olan etkisi: örgütsel bağlılığın aracı değişken rolü. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi, 13*(2) 2012, 197-211.
- Çıra, A., & Çelik, M. (2013). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışının iş performansı ve işten ayrılma niyeti üzerine etkisinde aşırı iş yükünün aracılık rolü. *Ege Akademik Bakış, 13*(1), 11-20.
- Çorbacı, S., & Bostancı, A. B. (2013). Okullarda öğretmenlere yönelik performans yönetimi uygulamaları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi OYGE Özel Sayısı, 6*, 238-254.
- Çöl G. (2008). Algılanan güçlendirmenin iş gören performansı üzerine etkileri. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi, 9*(1), 35-46.
- Demir, A. (2014). *Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışının öncülü olarak okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları* (Unpublished master's thesis). Cumhuriyet University, Kayseri.
- Demirel, G. (2012). *Okul müdürlerinin güç kaynaklarını kullanma stilleri ve müdür desteğinin kurumsal vatandaşlık davranışıyla ilişkisi: Ankara ili örneği* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Deniz, M., & Çolak, M. (2008). Örgütlerde çatışmanın yönetiminde gücün kullanımı ve bir araştırma. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 7*(23), 304-332.
- Diş, O. (2015). *Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile örgüt iklimi arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Atatürk University, Erzurum.
- Eisenberger, R., Karagonlar, G., Stinglhamber, F., Neves, P., Becker, T. E., Gonzalez Morales, M. G., & Steiger-Mueller, M. (2010). Leader-member exchange and affective organizational commitment: The contribution of supervisor's organizational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(6), 1085-1103.
- Eskibağ, Ş. (2014). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık ve iş doyumları ile mesleki performans arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1970). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Galinsky, A. D., Magee, J. C., Inesi, E., & Gruenfeld, D. H. (2003). From power to action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 453-466.
- Giessner, S. R., & Schubert, T. W. (2007). High in the Hierarchy: How vertical location and judgments of leaders' power are interrelated. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 104*, 30-44.
- Gören, T., & Sarpkaya P. (2014). İlköğretim kurumlarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri (Aydın ili örneği). *Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 40*, 69-87.
- Guditus, C. W., & Zirkel, P. A. (1979). Bases of supervisory power among public school principals. *Administrator's Notebook, 28*(4), 1-4.
- Gültürk, Z. (2012). *Eğitim yöneticilerinin güç kaynaklarından yararlanma düzeyleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, İstanbul.

- Güner, A. G. (2015). *Öğretim elemanlarının örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi (Giresun Üniversitesi örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Cumhuriyet University, Sivas.
- Güney, S. (2015). *Örgütsel davranış*. Ankara: Nobel Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Hassenboehler, D. (2004). The exercise of power by high school principals (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of New Orleans, New Orleans.
- Helvacı, M., & Kayalı, M. (2011). Okul müdürlerinin kullandıkları örgütsel güç kaynaklarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (Uşak ili örneği). *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(22), 255-279.
- Hitt, M. A., Black, J. S., & Porter, L. W. (2005). *Management* (International Ed.). USA: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi* (S. Turan, Trans. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Van Keer, H. (2010). The influence of distributed leadership on teachers' organizational commitment: A multilevel approach. *The Journal Of Educational Research*, 103, 40-52.
- Kahya, C. (2013). Örgütsel sinizm, iş performansını etkiler mi? İş tatminin aracılık etkisi. *Küresel İktisat ve İşletme Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 2(3), 34-46.
- Kalay, M. (2015). *İlkokul ve ortaokullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık ve motivasyonları arasındaki ilişki (Bolu ili örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.
- Kalkavan, S. (2014). *Farklı örgütsel kültürlerde yönetici koçluk davranışının çalışanların iş tatmini, örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel performans algularına etkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). İstanbul Aydın University, İstanbul.
- Karaman, A. (1999). *Profesyonel yöneticilerde güç kullanımı*. İstanbul: Türkmen Yayıncılık.
- Karaman, G. (2015). *Okul müdürlerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik davranışları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Dumlupınar University, Kütahya.
- Karapostal, İ. (2014). *Okul müdürlerinin liderlik biçimleri ile lise öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık davranışlarının incelenmesi (İzmir Aliağa ilçesi örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Okan University, İstanbul.
- Kayalı, M. (2011). *Okul müdürlerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları (Uşak ili örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Uşak University, Uşak.
- Kirkman B. L., & Rosen B. (1999) Beyond Self-Management: Antecedents and Consequences of Team Empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 58- 74.
- Koopmans L. (2014). *Measuring Individual Work Performance*. CPI Koninklijke Wöhrmann, Zutphen
- Koşar, S. (2008). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Koşar, S., & Çalık, T. (2011). Okul yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 17(4), 581-603.
- Kurşunoğlu, A., Bakay, E., & Tanrıoğan, A. (2010). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28, 101-115.
- Kurt, E. (2013). *Algılanan sosyal destek ve iş performansı ilişkisinde bağlılığın aracı etkisi: Turizm işletmelerinde bir araştırma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Mathews, B. P., & Shepherd, J. L. (2002). Dimensionality of cook and wall's (1980) British organizational commitment scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 369-375.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194.



- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 538-551.
- Munduate, L., & Gravenhorst, K. M. B. (2003). Power dynamics and organizational change: An introduction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 52*(1), 1-13.
- Nandkeolyar, A. K., Shaffer, J. A., Li, A., Ekkirala, S., & Bagger, J. (2014). Surviving an abusive supervisor: The joint roles of conscientiousness and coping strategies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(1), 138-150.
- Newton, L. A., & Shore, L. M. (1992). A model of union membership, instrumentality, commitment and opposition. *Academy of Management Review 17*(2), 275-298.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denesen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: *The Tanzanian Case, School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 145-177.
- Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Hammer, L. B., Crain, T. L., & Bodner, T. E. (2015). The influence of family-supportive supervisor training on employee job performance and attitudes: An organizational work-family intervention. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 21*(3), 296-308.
- Omidifar, R. (2013). Leadership style, organizational commitment and job satisfaction: A case study on high school principals in Tehran, Iran. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1*(4), 263-267.
- Overbeck, J. R., Tiedens, L. Z., & Brion, S. (2006). The powerful want to, the powerless have to: Perceived constraint moderates causal attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*(4), 479-496.
- Özaslan, G. (2006). *Eğitim yöneticilerinin güç tipi tercihlerinin değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Selçuk University, Konya.
- Özbakır, R. (2015). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı merkez teşkilatında görev yapan milli eğitim uzmanı yardımcılarının örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Eskişehir.
- Özcanay, T. (2017). *Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynaklarına ilişkin yönetici ve öğretmen görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yakın Doğu University, Lefkoşa.
- Özgen, H., Öztürk, A., & Yalçın, A. (2002). *İnsan kaynakları yönetimi*. Adana: Nobel Kitabevi.
- Özutku, H., Ağca, V., & Cevrioğlu, E. (2008). Lider-üye etkileşim kuramı çerçevesinde, yönetici-ast etkileşimi ile örgütsel bağlılık boyutları ve iş performansı arasındaki ilişki: Ampirik bir inceleme. *İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 22*(2), 193-210.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: politics and influence in organizations*. USA: Harvard Business School.
- Polat, M., & Meydan, C. H. (2011). Örgüt kültürü bağlamında güç eğilimi ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisinde örgütsel özdeşleşmenin aracılık rolü. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 25*(1), 153-170.
- Pugh, D. (1991). *Organizational behaviour*. London: PrenticeHall.
- Raven, B. J. (1993). The bases of power: Origins and recent developments. *Journal of Social Issues, Winter, 227-251*.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2003). *Management* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Jersey: PrenticeHall.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Rousseau, D. M., & McLean, P. J. (1993). The contracts of individuals and organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 15*, 1-43.
- Schermerhorn, J. R. Jr., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2000). *Organizational Behaviour* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). USA.
- Selamat, N., Nordin, N., & Adnan, A. A. (2013). Rekindle Teacher's organizational commitment: The effect of transformational leadership behavior. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 90*, 566-574.

- Serin, M. K., & Buluç, B. (2012). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 18(3), 435-459.
- Sezgin, F. (2010). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığının bir yordayıcısı olarak okul kültürü. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 35(156), 142-159.
- Sigler T. H., & Pearson, C. M. (2000) Creating an empowering culture: Examining the relationship between organizational culture and perceptions of empowerment. *Journal of Quality Management*, 5(1), 27-52.
- Sinclair, R. R., Tucker, J. S., Cullen, J. C., & Wright, C. (2005). Performance differences among four organizational commitment profiles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1280-1287.
- Suliman, A. M. T. (2001), Are we ready to innovate? Work climate-readiness to innovate relationship: The case of Jordan. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 10(1): 49-59.
- Şimşek, M. Ş. (2002). *Yönetim ve organizasyon* (7. bs). Konya: Günay Baskı.
- Titrek, O., & Zafer, D. (2009). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin kullandıkları örgütsel güç kaynaklarına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 15(60), 657-674.
- Tsui, K. T., & Cheng, Y. C. (1999). School organizational health and teacher commitment; a contingency study with multi-level analysis. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 5(3), 249-268
- Tutar, H., & Altınöz, M. (2010). Örgütsel iklimin işgören performansı üzerine etkisi: Ostim imalat işletmeleri çalışanları üzerine bir araştırma. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 65(2), 196-218.
- Usta, I., & Küçükaltan, D. (2012). Ödüllendirmenin örgütsel bağlılığa etkisi: İstanbul'daki beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2), 71-89.
- Uygur, A. (2009). *Örgütsel bağlılık ve işe bağlılık*. Ankara: Barış Platin Kitabevi.
- Uysal, E. (2014). *Lise öğretmenlerinin örgütsel güven algıları ile örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Van Kleef, G. A., De Dreu, C. K. W., Pietroni, D., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2006). Power and emotion in negotiation: Power moderates the interpersonal effects of anger and happiness on concession making. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 557-581.
- Yavuz, M. (2010). The effects of teachers' perception of organizational justice and culture on organizational commitment. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(5), 695-701.
- Yıldız, K. (2013). Örgütsel bağlılık ile örgütsel sinizm ve örgütsel muhalefet arasındaki ilişki. *Turkish Studies-International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 8(6), 853-879.
- Yılmaz, E., & Taşdemir, E. (2016). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıklarının okul etkililiği ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *International Academic Research Congress*, 3407-3413.
- Yılmaz, H., & Karahan, A. (2010). Liderlik davranışı, örgütsel yaratıcılık ve işgören performansı arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi: Uşak'ta bir araştırma. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi: Celal Bayar Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(2), 158.
- Yorulmaz, A. (2014). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki okul yöneticilerinin örgütsel güç kaynakları ve kullanma düzeyleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Yüceler, A., (2009). Örgütsel bağlılık ve örgüt iklimi ilişkisi: Teorik ve uygulamalı bir çalışma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 22, 445-458.
- Yüksel, R. F. (2015). *Okul çalışanlarının örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel sessizlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkilerinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Okan University, İstanbul.
- Zhang, L. (2015). Do academics' personality traits contribute to their organizational commitment? *Journal of Individual Differences*, 36(1), 11-18.

- Ward, E. A. (2001). Social power bases of managers: Emergence of a new factor. *Journal of Social Psychology, February*, 144-147.
- Wasti, S. A. (2000). Meyer ve Allen'in üç boyutlu örgütsel bağlılık ölçeğinin geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik analizi, 8. *Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı* içinde (s. 401-410).
- Werner, I. (1993). *Liderlik ve yönetim* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.) (Vedat Üner, Trans.). İstanbul: Rota.
- Williams, R. S. (2002). *Managing employee performance: Design and implementation in organizations*. London, UK: Thompson Learning.
- Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (2002). The moderating effects of employee tenure on the relation between organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(6), 1183-1190.
- Wu, C. H., Liu, J., Kwan, H. K., & Lee, C. (2015). Why and when workplace ostracism inhibits organizational citizenship behaviors: An organizational identification perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/apl0000063.