

Examining the Relationship between Teachers' Perceptions of Primary School Principals' Power Styles and Teacher Professionalism

Serkan Koşar¹, Ali Çağatay Kılınc², Emre Er¹, Zeki Öğdem¹,
Gökhan Savaş³

¹Gazi University, ²Karabük University, ³Kastamonu Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between primary school principals' power styles and teacher professionalism. A total of 264 teachers employed in 10 primary schools in Kastamonu, Turkey, participated in this study. Kosar's (2008) "Power Styles Scale," and the "Teacher Professionalism Scale"—originally developed by Tschannen-Moran, Parish, and DiPaola (2006), and adapted into Turkish by Cerit (2013)—were used to gather data. The mean, standard deviation, correlation, and regression analyses were calculated to evaluate the data. The results revealed that teacher professionalism was positively and significantly related to personality and reward power, while being negatively and significantly correlated with legitimate and coercive power. The findings also showed that the power styles of school principals significantly predicted teacher professionalism. The outcomes of the study are discussed with respect to improving teacher self-efficacy.

L'objectif de cette recherche était d'étudier le rapport entre les styles ou processus du pouvoir des directeurs d'écoles primaires et le professionnalisme des enseignants. À cette étude ont participé 264 enseignants travaillant dans 10 écoles primaires à Kastamonu, en Turquie. L'article « Power Styles Scale » de Kosar (2008) et la « The Teacher Professionalism Scale » d'abord développée par Tschannen-Moran, Parish et DiPaola, et ensuite adaptée en turque par Cerit (2013), ont servi à la cueillette de données. Pour évaluer les données, on a calculé la moyenne, l'écart type, la corrélation et les analyses de régression. Les résultats indiquent que le professionnalisme des enseignants présente une corrélation positive significative avec le pouvoir du référent et le pouvoir de récompense, et une corrélation négative significative avec le pouvoir légitime et le pouvoir coercitif. Les résultats indiquent également que le style du pouvoir des directeurs est un prédicteur fiable du professionnalisme des enseignants. On discute des résultats de l'étude dans l'optique d'améliorer l'auto-efficacité des enseignants.

Introduction

Teacher professionalism encompasses the improvement of the knowledge, skills, and competencies of teachers to enhance teaching profession standards, and to address students'

varying needs more effectively (Demirkasimoğlu, 2010). A review of related literature shows that there have been a series of both theoretical (Calgren, 1999; Coleman, Gallagher, & Job, 2012; Demirkasimoğlu, 2010; Grady, Helbling, & Lubeck, 2008; Hall & Schulz, 2003; Hargreaves, 2000; Helsby, 1995; Lai & Lo, 2007; Rizvi & Elliott, 2007) and empirical studies on this concept (Cerit, 2013; Day, Flores, & Viana, 2007; Dowling, 2006; Hildebrandt & Eom, 2011; Locke, Vulliamy, Webb, & Hill, 2005; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Tschannen-Moran, 2009). The theoretical studies have generally dealt with defining teacher professionalism, determining its boundaries, describing its historical development, explaining the reason for its emergence, and examining its relationship with teacher training. Empirical studies, on the other hand, have focused on the relationship between teacher professionalism and bureaucratic school structures (Cerit, 2013; Tschannen-Moran, 2009), teacher autonomy (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005), and job performance (Dowling, 2006) as well as the different variables that influence teachers' perceptions of professionalism (Day et al., 2007; Hildebrandt & Eom, 2011; Locke et al., 2005).

Principals are integral in determining how teachers perceive *professionalism*, which Boyt, Lusch and Naylor (2001) define as the attitude and behavior teachers have towards their job. The power styles used by principals could be significant due to this, as they have the potential to affect the relationship between the principal and their teachers. There has been increased academic interest in how power affects organizations, with many researchers focusing on the importance of power relationships and effective administration (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004; Elliott, 2000; French & Raven, 1959; Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Kılavuz, 2002; Koşar, 2008; Koşar & Çalık, 2011; Mintzberg, 1983; Morgan, 2006; Pfeffer, 1992; Schermerhorn, Hunt, & Osborn, 2000). Associated research related to power in teaching examines six subject areas.

- Power style preferences by job satisfaction, education, age, and sex (Karaman, 1999);
- The kind(s) of power seen as being influential in particular positions and jobs; (Kırel, 1998);
- Which power style(s) and in what ways are used by administrators, as well as the response of employees to such uses (Kırel, 1998);
- The perceptions of heads of departments and instructors have regarding preferred power style(s) (Özaslan, 2006);
- The power style(s) employed by school administrators (Koşar, 2008); and
- The power style(s) used by administrators' to control and manage their subordinate's behaviors towards organizational purposes in various service sectors (Munduate & Dorado, 1998).

This study investigates the relationship between the power styles used by principals and teacher professionalism. Since principals are important to professional teacher development (Barth, 1990), their power styles could be an important variable in the way professional teachers behave. Rizvi (2008), for example, emphasized that principals should share power with teachers to improve teacher professionalism. Another study reported that the level of collaboration between principals and teachers should be increased; additionally, the administrative competencies of principals should be improved to promote teacher professionalism (Botha, 2011). From these studies, therefore, it could be argued that the ways school principals use power is associated with teacher professionalism and development. In this respect, the findings of our current study may contribute to a better understanding of the predictors for teacher professionalism, and may help determine the relationship between the power styles used by

school principals and teacher professionalism. This is a valuable construct for both student achievement and school improvement. The analyses in this study also deliver guidance for which power styles are effective for the development of teacher professionalism. With these predictions, this study could have some important implications for policy makers, school administrators, and teachers.

Power Styles

The essence of power can be explained as the ability to have control over the behavior of others (Schermerhorn et al., 2000). Robbins and Coulter (2003) define *power* as the skill an administrator possesses to influence organizational actions and decisions. In comparison, according to Horner (1997) power is the capability to do something and obtain a result. Clegg, Courpasson, and Phillips (2006) further describe power as the oxygen needed for breathing in organizations. This can be related to the work of Karaman (1999), who states that in organizations, administrators have power styles related to their position in the organization as well as their personal characteristics.

Position power and personality power are two important power bases recognized in organizational behavior that also apply to teachers' professionalism. *Position power* is related to an administrator's position in the organizational structure, a power that is often bestowed by their superiors; in contrast, *personality power* refers to an administrator's personality characteristics (Hitt, Black, & Porter, 2005). Research has determined many classifications for power and power styles; however, there are only five popular power styles in the field of educational administration: legitimate power, coercive power, reward power, charisma power, and expert power (French & Raven, 1959). These five power styles have been shown to be used to purposely change employee beliefs, attitudes, and behavior (Munduate & Gravenhorst, 2003). Derived from theoretical and experimental studies conducted in the USA, the conceptualization of French and Raven in regard to power styles has been used as a base in a wide range of studies (Boonstra & Gravenhorst, 1998; Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004; French & Raven, 1959; Fuqua, Payne, & Cangemi, 2000; Griffin, 2002, 2006; Karaman, 1999; Koop & Grant, 1993; Koşar, 2008; Mintzberg, 1983; Mondy & Premeaux, 1995; Mullins, 2005; Rahim, Antonioni, & Psenicka, 2001).

Due to their position within an organization, an administrator holds three distinct types of power style which are legitimate power, reward power, and coercive power (Hitt et al., 2005; McShane & Von Glinow, 2005; Medina, Munduate, & Guerra, 2008; Schermerhorn et al., 2000). *Legitimate power* is the official authority granted to the administrator through their job title, which employees are expected to respect (Hitt et al., 2005; Şimşek, 2005). *Coercive power* is the degree to which an administrator deprives his/her employees of desired rewards or the degree to which s/he use punishment to control other people (Schermerhorn et al., 2000). Since this power type is based on disciplining others, it can be used by both superiors and subordinates (Karaman, 1999). Subordinates may use coercive power by slowing down the work flow, by not carefully following the orders from administrators and by hiding vital information from superiors. The influence of this power comes from the certain habits of administrators, such as scare tactics and the penalization of subordinates (Hellriegel, Jackson, & Slocum, 2002). *Reward power* is defined as the capability to re-numerate (French & Raven, 1959), and refers to the degree to which an administrator employs an external and/or internal incentive system to control other people. Money, promotion, praise, or attractive works are all examples of these

compensations (Schermerhorn et al., 2000). Reward power is one of the strongest styles of position power for an administrator (Hitt et al., 2005) as the administrators are more likely to use reward power to motivate subordinates to focus on organizational purposes.

Personality power denotes to personality characteristics of administrators regardless of their positions in organization. Personality power is especially valuable for those who want to be a leader or in a leadership role (Hitt et al., 2005). The two main components of personality power are charisma power and expert power (Hitt et al., 2005; McShane & Von Glinow, 2005; Medina et al., 2008; Schermerhorn et al., 2000). *Charisma power* is defined as a quality unique to an individual who has extraordinary, exceptional or spiritual powers or features (Adair, 2002). An individual who has charisma power often has significant influence over those who admire them (Hodge, Anthony & Gales, 1996). In contrast, *expert power* results from the administrator's knowledge, skills, and experience (Hellriegel et al., 2002; Koşar, 2008). Because of their knowledge and skills, administrators utilizing this power type have the ability to influence and guide the behaviour of others (Schermerhorn, 2005). As charisma power and expert power do not depend on organizational culture or position, they are among the more effective and permanent power styles for both administrators and employees (Nahavandi & Malekzadeh, 1999).

Teacher Professionalism

Professionalism in the teaching profession is regarded as an employee's tendency to review and improve their knowledge, skills, and competencies in order to be more efficient in their job, and to provide a more qualified service (Demirkasımoğlu, 2010). Grady et al. (2008) associated professionalism with having knowledge and skills unique to a specific field, undertaking responsibility for professional improvement, and making decisions in matters concerning the related field. Thus, it can be argued that professionalism is when employees improve upon the qualifications required in their field to deliver better service. Professionalism is also associated with the teacher as an employee. Day (1999) describes teacher professionalism as a teacher's ability to perform and enrich effective classroom practices, create an environment appropriate for learning in the classroom, and improve their professional knowledge and skills with the aim of providing students with richer learning experiences. Another study explained teacher professionalism as having the knowledge and skills required by the teaching profession, meeting the learning needs of students, developing a high-level commitment to the teaching profession, and having adequate autonomy to make decisions about the teaching process (Day, 2002, as cited in Cerit, 2013).

Within the context of professionalism in teaching the expectation of both the school and the teacher is an important factor in achieving more effective teaching. Cerit (2013) argued that the social demands and expectations of schools towards the cultivation of active, entrepreneurial, and creative individuals forces schools to provide a higher-quality teaching and learning environment. Furthermore, the needs of students to improve their team working skills, develop high-level thinking, and use communication and information systems effectively not only directly affects the form of teaching in the school, but also makes it necessary for teachers to continually improve their knowledge and skills to ensure more effective classroom teaching. These student focused needs also require teachers to learn from one another and to collaborate efficiently with their colleagues, school administrators, and parents (Hargreaves, 2000). Thus, improving the professional skills of teachers to ensure the maximum satisfaction of student

needs and expectations underlies teacher professionalism, and is a potentially influential factor in increasing student learning (Demirkasımoğlu, 2010).

When investigating teacher professionalism, there are various attitudinal factors that need to be taken into account. Evans (2011) discussed teacher professionalism across three dimensions: behavioral, attitudinal, and intellectual. The *behavioral dimension* is the degree to which teachers fulfill the profession's requirements (Evans, 2011). In other words, this dimension is related to the actions a teacher plans, implements, evaluates, and improves to increase student learning. The *attitudinal dimension* refers to a teacher's perspective and perception of their profession (Evans, 2011). The *intellectual dimension* involves a teacher having the knowledge and skills required by their profession, improving themselves continually, having a good command of their field, and following developments in the field closely (Evans, 2011). The classification regarding teacher professionalism provided by Evans (2011) is considered significant in that it elucidated the expectations of a professional teacher. Therefore, it is suggested that a professional teacher is expected to focus on student learning—which is the technical reason for the school—create a climate suitable for learning in the classroom, regularly review their perspectives concerning the profession, and renew themselves by following developments and innovations in their field.

Furlong (2001) focused on the concept of autonomy in teacher professionalism, and stated that as part of professionalism teachers should be able to behave autonomously when planning, conducting, and evaluating teaching. In addition, other teacher professionalism requirements, such as contributing to the school decision-making processes with their knowledge, skills, and specialties (Day et al., 2007), creating effective teaching practices based on the theoretical bases in their fields as well as their knowledge (Carlgen, 1999), and having a curious and investigative nature (Kincheloe, 2004), are also important. Consequently, to ensure a school has an effective learning community and to increase student learning, teacher professionalism—which affects the perspectives, attitudes, and behavior of teachers regarding their profession—needs to be paid close attention.

Although there have been studies focused on the relationship between power and organizational commitment (Bar-Haim, 2007; Pierro, Raven, Amato, & Bélanger, 2013; organizational trust (Altinkurt & Yılmaz, 2011), organizational culture (Koşar, 2008), employee job satisfaction (Yılmaz & Altinkurt, 2012), compliance behaviours (Rahim & Afza, 2001), organizational citizenship behaviours (Altinkurt & Yılmaz, 2012), conflict management and job performance (Jang, 2004; Rahim et al., 2001; Schulman, 1989) and organizational climate (Decker, 1989; Soosai, 1988), there has been little research on the relationship between styles of power and teacher professionalism. Thus, the present study seeks to make a significant contribution to the literature by revealing the explanatory and predictive relationships between a school principal's power styles and teacher professionalism. This study sought to answer two questions:

- Are there significant relationships between primary school principals' power styles (as perceived by teachers) and teacher professionalism?
- Are the power styles (as perceived by teachers) of primary school principals a significant predictor of teacher professionalism?

Method

Model

In this study, we develop a correlational research model that investigates the relationship between the primary school teachers' perceptions of their school principals' power styles and teacher professionalism. The dependent variable in this study is teacher professionalism, and the independent variables are the power style dimensions, personality power, reward power, legitimate power, and coercive power.

Procedure and participants. A three part questionnaire was used to the gather data. The first part elicited personal demographic data such as gender, age, years in current school, and total teaching experience. The second part examined the teachers' perceptions of the power styles employed by school administrators using "The Power Styles Scale," and the third part measured the teachers' professionalism using the "The Teacher Professionalism Scale." The researchers distributed the questionnaires to the primary school teachers. The necessary instructions and explanations were printed at the beginning of the questionnaire, and teachers were asked to complete the questionnaires voluntarily. Each participant completed the questionnaire within 6 and 8 minutes.

A total of 300 teachers were randomly selected from 10 primary schools located in the city center of Kastamonu, Turkey, in the 2013-2014 academic year. Out of these, 259 completed the questionnaire, a response rate of 83.3 percent. The sample in this study was therefore comprised of 259 primary school teachers employed in 10 primary schools in Kastamonu, Turkey, who responded to the items of the questionnaire voluntarily and anonymously.

The sample comprised 118 (44.7%) male and 146 (55.3%) female teachers. 50 (18.8%) were in the 25 to 29 age group, 65 (24.7%) were in the 30 to 34 age group, 61 (23.1%) were in the 35 to 39 age group, and 88 (33.4%) were 40 years old or over. 112 (42.4%) teachers had been employed in their current schools for 1 to 5 years, 84 (31.8%) for 6 to 10 years, 45 (17%) for 11 to 15 years, and 23 (9.2%) for 16 years or more. 107 (40.6%) teachers had 1 to 9 years total teaching experience, 110 (41.7%) had 10 to 19 years total teaching experience, and 47 (17.7%) had 20 or more years total teaching experience.

Instruments

The Power Styles Scale (PSS). This scale developed by Koşar, (2008) consists of 33 items arranged under four factors. It is a Likert-type scale with a rating scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always). Although this study was adapted from French and Raven (1959), which classified school principals' power styles under five types—legitimate, coercive, reward, charisma, and expert—the results of a factor analysis conducted by Koşar, (2008) yielded a four-factor structure, in which the charisma power and expert power subscales were merged into one scale, named personality power. Therefore, this study used a four-factor PSS structure to determine the teachers' perceptions of the power styles that school principals employ. Personality is the first factor measured, which has 15 items, with factor loadings varying between .73 and .88. The second factor on the scale is reward power, which has 7 items, with factor loadings ranging from .50 to .67. The third factor is legitimate power that has 7 items, with factor loadings ranging from .58 to .83. The last factor is coercive power, which has 4 items, with factor loadings ranging from .54 to .72. The percentage of variance explained by the personality, reward, legitimate, and coercive power dimensions were 38.56%, 12.64%, 11.19%, and 9.07%, respectively. These four power factors explained approximately 71.46% of the total variance. The internal consistency

coefficients, from which the reliability of the scale was calculated, were .98 for personality power, .92 for reward power, .86 for legitimate power, and .81 for coercive power. The item total correlations varied between .74 and .92 for the personality power dimension, between .66 and .81 for the reward power dimension, between .41 and .74 for the legitimate power dimension, and between .29 and .79 for the coercive power dimension (Koşar, 2008). In this study, the internal consistency coefficient varied between .47 and .74. Sample items from the PSS factors are given below.

Personality power.

- School principal is seen as an instructional leader by teachers (33).
- School principal definitely produces solutions for problems that teachers cannot solve (28).

Reward power.

- School principal assigns tasks to teachers that are pertinent to their capabilities (5).
- School principal appreciates the successful teacher (2).

Legitimate power.

- School principal affects teachers with their authority (11).
- School principal controls teacher behavior within the school (10).

Coercive power.

- School principal gives teachers who get on well with them a rough time.
- School principal criticizes teachers redundantly.

The Teacher Professionalism Scale (TPS). This scale was developed by Tschannen-Moran, Parish, and DiPaola (2006), and was adapted into Turkish by Cerit (2013). It consists of 8 items answered on a rating scale from 1 (I strongly disagree) to 5 (I strongly agree). The factor analysis conducted by Cerit (2013) yielded a single-factor structure, and factor loadings for the items varied between .55 and .90, and the total variance explained by the items was 61.62%. The internal consistency coefficient for the teacher professionalism scale was calculated to be .90, while the item-total correlations varied between .45 and .84 (Cerit, 2013). In this study, the internal consistency coefficient, which was calculated to test the reliability of the scale, was found to be .91. Sample items from the TPS factors are given below.

- Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.
- Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.

Data Analysis

Research data were analyzed using SPSS 15.0. The data were analyzed in two stages. First, the dataset was examined for missing or incorrect data, and necessary corrections were made. Then, the study sub-problems were analyzed. At this analysis stage, the arithmetic mean values of the scale items included in each sub-dimension were calculated. The related analyses were carried out based on these factor values.

The arithmetic mean and standard deviation values were calculated to determine the primary school teachers' perceptions of the power styles employed by their principals in their administrative and professional duties. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was used to determine the relationship between the power styles employed by the principals and

teacher professionalism, and a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to predict how the principals' power styles affected the teachers' professionalism. The standardized Beta (β) coefficient and t-test results were considered in the interpretation of the regression analysis.

Findings

Mean and Standard Deviation Values Related to the Variables, and the Relationships between the Variables

Table 1 presents the mean and standard deviation values related to the research variables, as well as the relationships between the dependent and the independent variables.

Table 1 indicates that reward power was conducted by principals at a higher level than personality, legitimate, and coercive power. The mean of the teacher professionalism scale shows that the primary school teachers' perceptions of their professionalism were below medium-level. Teacher professionalism was positively and significantly associated with personality power ($r = .47, p < .01$), and reward power ($r = .53, p < .01$), but negatively and significantly associated with legitimate power ($r = -.26, p < .01$) and coercive power ($r = -.37, p < .01$).

The Prediction of Teacher Professionalism

Table 2 shows the results of the regression analysis regarding the prediction of teacher professionalism according to the power styles practiced by school principals.

Table 1

The Mean and Standard Deviation Values, and the Relationships between the Variables

Variables	\bar{X}	S	1	2	3	4	5
1. Personality power	3.48	.80	-	.71**	-.13*	-.36**	.47**
2. Reward power	3.73	.75		-	-.26**	-.46**	.53**
3. Legitimate power	2.74	.82			-	.59**	-.26**
4. Coercive power	1.87	.81				-	-.37**
5. Teacher professionalism	2.81	.42					-

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 2

The Results of the Regression Analysis Regarding the Prediction of Teacher Professionalism

Variables	B	Sh	B	T	p
Constant	2.54	.28		9.14	.00
Personality power	.17	.07	.19	2.61	.01
Reward power	.30	.07	.32	4.18	.00
Legitimate power	-.08	.06	-.10	-1.50	.13
Coercive power	-.09	.06	-.10	-1.44	.15

$R = .56, R^2 = .32, F(4, 258) = 30.64, p < .05$

As can be seen from Table 2, a multiple R of .56 explained 32% of the variance in the teacher professionalism scores. Personality power ($\beta = .19, p < .05$) and reward power ($\beta = .32, p < .05$) were seen to be significant predictors of teacher professionalism. However, legitimate power ($\beta = -.10, p > .05$) and coercive power ($\beta = -.10, p > .05$) did not significantly predict teacher professionalism.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study, which used school administrators' power styles as predictors for teacher professionalism, supports the notion that power styles are a significant social construct needed to better understand and explain teacher professionalism. According to the research findings, teachers' perceptions regarding their professionalism were at a medium-level. Other studies, meanwhile, have found that the teachers' perceptions regarding professionalism were at a low-level (Bayhan, 2011; Cerit, 2013). Teacher professionalism refers to teachers continuing to professionally improve by designing the most effective teaching practices aimed at student learning and implementing them in the classroom, and continually improving their professional knowledge and skills (Day, 2000; Day et al., 2007). However, from other studies it has been observed that teachers who work to improve their teaching try to meet the different learning needs of students, and strengthen their professionalism by effectively collaborating with their colleagues (Calgren, 1999; Cerit, 2013; Demirkasimoğlu, 2010; Kincheloe, 2004). In this regard, then, it could be surmised that if teachers have low level perceptions regarding their professionalism, they have negative feelings about the situation in their school. Therefore, teachers with this perception may have low motivation and a low commitment to their profession, which could have a negative effect on the classroom teaching.

The results show that according to the perceptions of teachers, the principals used personality power and reward power more than either legitimate power or coercive power. This study regarded personality power as the combination of expert and charismatic power (Koşar, 2008), see the Instruments section). Thus, personality power includes both charisma power which denotes to extraordinary, exceptional or spiritual features of the administrator (Adair, 2002) and expert power which is related to the knowledge, skills, and experience of the administrator (Hellriegel et al., 2002). In other words, personality power stems from the personal features, knowledge or skills of the administrator, not from the position that s/he holds in the organization. Schermerhorn (2005) argues that administrators using mainly expert power in the organization are more likely to influence the behaviors of others. Hoy and Miskel (2005) also assert that school principals who are in favor of using personality power are more respected, trusted, and seen as powerful individuals in the school, because they are perceived as instructional leaders, and are good at articulating the vision and mission of the school and communicating with other members of the school community. Hence, it is possible to argue that the participants of this study preferred to use personal power more than legitimate and coercive power styles to influence or motivate others in the organization. Furthermore, reward power, which is part of position power, was perceived by primary school teachers to be more important than either legitimate power or coercive power. According to Hitt et al. (2005), reward power is one of the strongest styles of position power for an administrator. Hitt et al. (2005) also observed that there is a more positive atmosphere in schools where personality power and reward power are dominant, while there is a less positive atmosphere in schools where legitimate power and coercive power are prevalent. Kilavuz (2002) determined that the

employees of administrators who used reward power had higher satisfaction levels, and that this reward power was followed by expert power. This study had similar results. Soosai (1988) found a negative, medium-level, significant relationship between coercive power and influence, which is similar to our findings regarding coercive power. Thus, it is not surprising that the support provided by principals is crucial for the motivation of school members to increase student success and make more contributions to school improvement.

Decker (1989) found that there was a relationship between the power styles employed by administrators and the organizational climate perceived by teachers. According to Elliott (2000), personality power is quite important for decision-makers. In addition, this power type can affect the behavior of people, depending on the knowledge and skills of administrators (Schermmerhorn, 2005). This may imply that if the personality power is used effectively, school administrators may need less legitimate power to influence teachers. The results of the study mainly suggest that school principals tend to use legitimate power or coercive power when teacher professionalism is low. As a matter of fact, it seems plausible that the use of legitimate power or coercive power may hinder the professional behaviors of teachers by decreasing the authority that teachers have had to make decisions about instructional issues or to take an active part in the management of scholarly issues. Some researchers (Handy, 1981; Katz & Kahn, 1977) claim that it is not possible to ensure employee organizational commitment using legitimate power alone. The results of this study, therefore, may also suggest that principals use a contingency approach, employing more coercive or directive power styles when teacher professionalism is low; however, they may conduct personality power or reward power when teacher professionalism is high.

Teacher professionalism requires teachers to learn from one another and to collaborate with other employees in school as well as with parents (Hargreaves, 2000). Conversely, this collaboration process is often ignored by school administrators who employ legitimate power and coercive power styles. Organizations where such power styles are dominant have bureaucratic characteristics, and transfer little authority to those they view as subordinates. If there is no transfer of authority, it is impossible for employees to try new things. Therefore, a bureaucratic school culture hinders the behavior needed for teachers to use their initiative and to collaborate with each other effectively. In addition, Handy (1981) states that personal power is not welcomed in organizations with dominant bureaucratic structures. According to Uğuz (1999), it is difficult for new and creative ideas to be considered in these organizations because of the many bureaucratic formalities that exist. Coercive power in administrators involves the seeking of compliance through scared tactics and punishment (Hellriegel et al., 2002). When principals support collegial and congenial relationships among school members and build a positive learning and teaching environment within school, teachers feel committed to the school and have the tendency to exert more effort. Principals play a key role in the communication between teachers, parents, and students, and in promoting improvement in the school's commitment climate (Tarter, Hoy & Kottkamp, 1990). Accordingly, teachers should work collaboratively and willingly so that there is a positive working and learning environment in the school.

This study has shown that the power styles used by school administrators are an important variable in predicting teacher professionalism. From these results, it is recommended that principals consider teacher professionalism as an important variable when using certain power styles. However, as the lack of sufficient research on the teacher professionalism construct prevents us coming to more detailed conclusions, we suggest that more research is needed in

this area. The contradictory findings found in teacher professionalism studies increases the importance of future research on this construct. From our research results, it was observed that the teachers' levels of professionalism were not even close to desired levels. Therefore, school-based activities need to be carried out to develop a positive school culture to encourage teachers to display more professionalism. It is likely that the tendency of teachers to display professionalism increases in a school that focuses on improving teaching and increasing student achievement. This study was a cross-sectional survey, so longitudinal studies that examine power styles and the professionalism of teachers would be beneficial to confirm our findings. This study mainly obtained quantitative findings, but future studies could use different samples (e.g., private schools) and qualitative methods such as interviews and observations to obtain more detailed information.

References

- Adair, J. (2002). *Inspiring leadership: Learning from great leaders*. London, UK: Thorogood.
- Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2011). Okul yöneticilerinin kullandığı güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki [Relationship between school administrators' organizational power sources and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviours]. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(3), 1833-1852.
- Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2011). Relationship between the school administrators' power sources and teachers' organizational trust levels in Turkey. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(1), 58-70.
- Bar-Haim, A. (2007). Rethinking organizational commitment in relation to perceived organizational power and perceived employment alternatives. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7(2), 203-217.
- Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bayhan, G. (2011). *Öğretmenlerin profesyonelliğinin incelenmesi [The investigation of teachers professionalism]* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Boonstra, J. J., & Gravenhorst, K. M. B. (1998). Power dynamics and organizational change: A comparison of perspectives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 97-120.
- Botha, R. J. (2011). The managerial role of the principal in promoting teacher professionalism in selected Eastern Cape schools. *African Education Review*, 8(3), 397-415.
- Boyt, T. E., Lusch, R. F., & Naylor, G. (2001). The role of professionalism in determining job satisfaction in professional services: A study of marketing researchers. *Journal of Service Research*, 3(4), 321-330.
- Buchanan, D., & Huczynski, A. (2004). *Organizational behaviour* (5th ed.). London, UK: Prentice Hall.
- Carlgren, I. (1999). Professionalism and teachers as designers. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(1), 43-56.
- Cerit, Y. (2013). Okulun bürokratik yapısı ile sınıf öğretmenlerinin profesyonel davranışları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between bureaucratic school structure and classroom teachers' professional behaviours]. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 497-521.
- Clegg, S. R., Courpasson, D., & Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and organizations*. London, UK: SAGE.
- Coleman, M. R., & Gallagher, J. J., & Job, J. (2012). Developing and sustaining professionalism within gifted education. *Gifted Child Today*, 35(1), 27-36.
- Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning*. London, UK: Falmer.
- Day, C. (2000). Effective leadership and reflective practice, reflective practice. *International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 1(1), 113-127.

- Day, C., Flores, M. A., & Viana, I. (2007). Effects of national policies on teachers' sense of professionalism: Findings from an empirical study in Portugal and in England. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 30*(3), 249-265.
- Decker, S. R. (1989). *The relationship among principal power tactic usage, leadership style and school climate in selected Iowa elementary schools* (Doctoral dissertation). City, State/prov, Institution Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database. (UMI No. 8919922)
- Demirkasımoglu, N. (2010). Defining "Teacher Professionalism" from different perspectives. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences, 9*, 2047-2051.
- Dowling, F. (2006). Physical education teacher educators' professional identities, continuing professional development and the issue of gender equality. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 11*(3), 247-263.
- Elliott, S. T. (2000). *Power, principals, and promotion* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Colorado, Denver, CO.
- Evans, L. (2011). The 'shape' of teacher professionalism in England: Professional standards, performance management, professional development and the changes proposed in the 2010 White Paper. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(5), 851-87.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Fuqua, H. E., Jr., Payne, K. E., & Cangemi, J. P. (2000). *Leadership and the effective use of power*. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volumes/Fuqua,%20Jr.,%20Harold%20E.%20Leadership%20and%20the%20Effectives%20Use%20of%20Power.pdf>
- Furlong, J. (2001). Reforming teacher education, re-forming teachers: Accountability, professionalism and competence. In R. Philip & J. Furlong (Eds.), *Education reform and the state: Twenty five years of politics, policy and practice* (pp. 118-135). London, UK: Routledge-Falmer.
- Grady, M. P., Helbling, K. C., & Lubeck, D. R. (2008). Teacher professionalism since A Nation at Risk. *Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(8), 603-607.
- Griffin, R. W. (2002). *Management* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Griffin, R. W. (2006). *Fundamentals of management: Core concepts and applications*. (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hall, C., & Schulz, R. (2003). Tensions in teaching and teacher education: Professionalism and professionalisation in England and Canada. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 33*(3), 369-383.
- Handy, C. B. (1981). *Understanding organizations* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Hazell Watson & Viney.
- Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 6*(2), 151-182.
- Hellreigel, D., Jackson, S. E., & Slocum, J. W. (2002). *Management: A competency-based approach* (9th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern.
- Helsby, G. (1995). Teachers' construction of professionalism in England in the 1990s. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy, 21*(3), 317-332.
- Hildebrandt, S. A., & Eom, M. (2011). Teacher professionalization: Motivational factors and the influence of age. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 416-423.
- Hitt, M. A., Black, J. S., & Porter, L. W. (2005). *Management* (International ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hodge, B. J., Anthony, W. P., & Gales, L. M. (1996). *Organization theory: A strategic approach* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Horner, A. (1997). *Güç: Güç sahibi olma isteği ve güce sahip olmaktan korkma [The wish for power and the fear of having it]* (Trans. S. Kunt). Ankara, country: HYB.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2005). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (7th

- ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Jang, D. (2004). *Power, influence, and conflict in Korean school councils* (Doctoral dissertation). City, State/Province, Institution. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database. (UMI No. 3147632)
- Karaman, A. (1999). *Profesyonel yöneticilerde güç kullanımı [The use of power of professional administrators]*. İstanbul, Turkey: Türkmen.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1977). *Örgütlerin toplumsal psikolojisi [Social psychology of organizations]* (Çev. H. Can ve Y. Bayar). Ankara, Turkey: Türkiye Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü.
- Kılavuz, D. P. (2002). *Çalışanın liderinden memnun olması: Liderin güç tarzının ve çatışmayı yönetme tarzının etkileri [Doctors satisfaction with their leader: The effects of the power style and conflict management style of the leader]* (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Kirel, Ç. (1998). *Örgütlerde güç kullanımı [Use of power in organizations]*. Eskişehir, Turkey: Anadolu University Publications.
- Kincheloe, J. C. (2004). The knowledges of teacher education: Developing a critical complex epistemology. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31, 49-66.
- Koop, R., & Grant, R. (1993). *Information systems and power: Structural versus personal views*. Retrieved from <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=158011.158235>
- Lai, M., & Lo, L. N. K. (2007): Teacher professionalism in educational reform: the experiences of Hong Kong and Shanghai. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 37(1), 53-68.
- Locke, T., Vulliamy, G., Webb, R., & Hill, M. (2005). Being a 'professional' primary school teacher at the beginning of the 21st century: A comparative analysis of primary teacher professionalism in New Zealand and England. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(5), 555-581.
- McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2005). *Organizational behaviour*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Medina, F. J., Munduate, L., & Guerra, J. M. (2008). Power and conflict in cooperative and competitive context. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17 (3), 349-362. Retrieved from <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713684945>
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mondy, R. W., & Premeaux, S. R. (1995). *Management: Concepts, practices and skills* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization* (Updated Edition of the International Bestseller). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mullins, L. J. (2005). *Management and organisational behaviour* (7th ed.). London, UK: Prentice-Hall.
- Munduate, L., & Dorado, M. A. (1998). Supervisor power bases, co-operative behaviour and organizational commitment. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 163-177.
- Nahavandi, A., & Malekzadeh, A. R. (1999). *Organizational behaviour*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29(1), 38-54.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). Understanding power in organizations. *California Management Review*, 34(2), 29-50.
- Pierro, A., Raven, B. H., Amato, C., & Bélanger, J. J. (2013). Bases of social power, leadership styles, and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(6), 1122-1134.
- Rahim, M. A., & Afza, M. (2001). Leader power, commitment, satisfaction, compliance, and propensity to leave a job among U.S. accountants. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 133(5), 611-625.
- Rahim, M. A., Antonioni, D., & Psenicka, C. (2001). A structural equations model of leader power, subordinates' styles of handling conflict, and job performance. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12(3), 191-211.
- Rizvi, M. (2008). The role of school principal in enhancing teacher professionalism: Lessons from

- Pakistan. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 36(1), 85-100.
- Rizvi, M., & Elliott, B. (2007). Enhancing and sustaining teacher professionalism in Pakistan. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 13(1), 5-19.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2003). *Management* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr. (2005). *Management* (8th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2000). *Organizational behaviour* (7th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schulman, J. M. (1989). *Power behaviour, job satisfaction and leadership effectiveness in public school principals* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Institution, state/prov city. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database. (UMI No. 8921859)
- Soosai, S. (1988). *The relationship between principals' power behaviours and the organizational climate of secondary schools in Tamilnadu, India* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Institution, state/prov city. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database. (UMI No. 8904281)
- Şimşek, M. Ş. (2005). *Yönetim ve organizasyon* (8. Baskı) [*Management and organization* (8th ed.)]. Konya, Turkey: Günay Ofset.
- Tarter, C. J., Hoy, W. K., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1990). School health and organizational commitment. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 23(4), 236-242.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools: The role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 217-247.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Parish, J., & DiPaola, M. F. (2006). School climate and state standards: How interpersonal relationships influence student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 386-415.
- Uğuz, S. S. (1999). *Örgüt kültürünün yönetim ve organizasyon yapısına etkileri ve örgüt kültürü ile ilgili bir araştırma* [*The effects of the organizational culture on organizational structure and a study related to organizational culture*] (Unpublished master thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Yılmaz, K., & Altınkurt, Y. (2012). Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin iş doyumunu arasındaki ilişki [Relationship between school administrators' power sources and teachers' job satisfaction]. *Kastamonu University Kastamonu Education Journal*, 20(2), 385-402.

Serkan Koşar received his Bachelor Degree from Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Department of Classroom Teaching. He earned his MA in 2008 and PhD in 2012 from Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences. He worked as a primary school teacher in Saraykent Benli Primary School (2005-2006). He is currently employed as a Research Assistant in Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Department of Educational Sciences. His research interests are power styles, organizational culture, organizational commitment, influences and politics tactics.

Ali Çağatay Kılınç received his Bachelor Degree from Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Department of English Language Teaching. He earned his MA in 2010 and PhD in 2013 from Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences. He worked as an English teacher in Tosya Namık Kemal Primary School (2006-2011) and as a research assistant in Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Department of Educational Sciences (2011-2013). He is currently employed as an Assistant Professor in Karabuk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Educational Sciences. His research interests are educational leadership, teacher professionalism, teacher motivation, organizational climate and culture, organizational commitment, and school capacity.

Emre Er received his Bachelor Degree from Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Department of Chemistry Teaching. He earned his MA in 2013 and he is a PhD candidate since 2013 in Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences. He is currently employed as a Research Assistant in Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Department of Educational Science. His research interests are organizational change, social network theory, school development and school change capacity.

Zeki Öğdem received his Bachelor Degree from Burdur MAKU University Faculty of Education Department of Science Teaching. He earned his MA in 2007 and he is a PhD candidate since 2010 in Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences. He is currently employed as a Research Assistant in Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Department of Educational Science. His research interests are educational leadership, professional learning communities and organizational learning.

Gökhan SAVAŞ received his Bachelor Degree from Marmara University Atatürk Faculty of Education Department of English Language Teaching. He started working as an English teacher in Küre High School. He worked in various levels of schools in Kastamonu. He also worked as a project coordinator in Kastamonu Provincial Directorate of National Education and took part in several European projects. He is currently employed as an Assistant Manager in Kastamonu Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School. He is also a MA student in Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences. His research interests are teacher leadership, learning schools and school culture.

Appendix A: The Power Styles Scale

School principal	1. Never	2. Rarely	3. Sometimes	4. Often	5. Always
1. ... rewards well-done works.	()	()	()	()	()
2. ... appreciates the successful teacher.	()	()	()	()	()
3. ... thanks those fulfilling their duties.	()	()	()	()	()
4. .. values all teachers.	()	()	()	()	()
5. .. assigns tasks to teachers which are pertinent to their capabilities.	()	()	()	()	()
6. ... facilitates successful teachers' works.	()	()	()	()	()
7. ... gives high register scores to those teachers who do positive things throughout the whole year.	()	()	()	()	()
8. ... always keeps distance from teachers.	()	()	()	()	()
9. ... maintains a formal attitude in his or her relationships with teachers.	()	()	()	()	()
10. ... holds the control of teachers' acts within school.	()	()	()	()	()
11. ... affects teachers with his/her authority.	()	()	()	()	()
12. ... during that working day, maintains a harsh attitude towards those teachers who are late for school.	()	()	()	()	()
13. ... applies different strategies such as warning and reprimand when teachers do something wrong.	()	()	()	()	()
14. ... maintains a harsh attitude to enable discipline in school.	()	()	()	()	()
15. ... gives teachers lower-type duties when they are unsuccessful in others.	()	()	()	()	()
16. ... gives teachers a rough time who gets on well with him/her.	()	()	()	()	()
17. ... forces teachers to fulfill their duties by threatening them to punish.	()	()	()	()	()
18. ... criticizes teachers redundantly.	()	()	()	()	()
19. ... is the most suitable person for the principal position.	()	()	()	()	()
20. ... is a role model for teachers.	()	()	()	()	()
21. ... has a personality that evokes admiration among teachers.	()	()	()	()	()
22. .. is respected among teachers.	()	()	()	()	()
23. ... trust himself/herself.	()	()	()	()	()
24. ... models teachers for his or physical appearance and behaviours.	()	()	()	()	()
25. ... has influential power on teachers.	()	()	()	()	()
26. ... gains his or her power by being a favourite person.	()	()	()	()	()
27. ... is seen as quite sophisticated.	()	()	()	()	()
28. .. definitely produces solutions for problems that teachers cannot solve.	()	()	()	()	()
29. ... is seen as someone who is always consulted for his knowledge.	()	()	()	()	()
30. ... reaches his/her current position by his/her own knowledge.	()	()	()	()	()
31. ... has an accumulation of knowledge that persuades teachers in any subject.	()	()	()	()	()
32. ... gains his or her power by being a sophisticated person.	()	()	()	()	()
33. ... is seen as an instructional leader by teachers.	()	()	()	()	()

Appendix B: The Teacher Professionalism Scale

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Very frequently (5)
1. The interactions between faculty members are cooperative.	()	()	()	()	()
2. Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.	()	()	()	()	()
3. Teachers help and support each other.	()	()	()	()	()
4. Teachers in this school exercise professional judgment.	()	()	()	()	()
5. Teachers are committed to helping students.	()	()	()	()	()
6. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm	()	()	()	()	()
7. Teachers "go the extra mile" with their students.	()	()	()	()	()
8. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.	()	()	()	()	()

Note: The Power Styles Scale was developed by Koşar (2008) in Turkish language and Turkish educational context. Therefore, the scale represents the characteristics of Turkish educational system. This form was a translation version of the scale into English. The second instrument used in the current study was The Teacher Professionalism Scale which was originally developed by Tschannen-Moran, Parish and DiPaola (2006) and adapted into Turkish by Cerit (2013). The authors presented the original version of this scale in the Appendix; however, it is included here to note that we received the necessary permission for the use of the scale from Cerit (2013), as he was the author who adapted the scale for the Turkish language and culture.