



Power-center forming games behaviors of school principals: Mixed method research

Esef Hakan Toytok^{a*}, Mehmet Doğan^b

^a Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Faculty of Education Onikişubat, K.Maraş 46050, Turkey

^b Provincial Directorate of National Education, Akçalı Tükoğlu, K.Maraş 46800, Turkey

Abstract

The aim of the research is to examine power-center forming games behaviors of the school principals according to view of the teachers. In the research a mixed type was preferred and descriptive sequential pattern was used. The population of the research has consisted of teachers working in kindergarten, primary schools, middle schools and high schools in Onikişubat and Dulkadiroğlu districts of Kahramanmaraş in 2020-2021 academic years. In the quantitative dimension of the research, simple random sampling method was used as sample and consisted of 553 teachers. In the qualitative dimension of the research, purposeful sampling method was used and consisted of 16 teachers who attended quantitative dimension. After the collection and analysis of quantitative data in the research; qualitative data were collected and analyzed. The obtained data were analyzed by passing through the appropriate quantitative and qualitative statistical protocol for research. According to the obtained results based on the research data; In the quantitative dimension, it has been determined that the behavior of the School Principals on forming Power Center Games is at a moderate level according to the views of the teachers. While it was determined that a meaningful difference in the several of "gender, branch, type of school", it was seen that there was not a meaningful difference according to several of "service life and unionizing". In the qualitative dimension, it was determined that school principals used power-center forming games behaviors higher-up in the interview made with teachers. It has been observed that while the school principals exhibit the behaviors of "bossing, expertise, empire and budgeting" games more than the behaviors of Power Center Games, they rarely prefer the behaviors of "sponsorship and alliance building" games.

Keywords: Principals; power; political games; power-center games

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduce the problem

Ability, power and effort of a human can sometimes remain incapable to provide requirements and wishes. This situation may direct people to take place in a group or create an organization (Şahin, 2004). It has been known that organizations which were founded to realize certain purpose have fulfilled very important duties. Organizations have gone into power struggle to compete other organizations and to adapt development

* Corresponding Esef Hakan TOYTOK. Phone.: +905353858555
E-mail address: hakantoytok@hotmail.com

to continue their existence in today. While organizations have lived this power struggle, members have also lived this power struggle within their selves. Especially, some issues such as allocation of resources on hand, unforeseeing the future and changes that have lived in organizations or neighbours have directed the members to power struggle to protect their individual benefits, in other words, to political games. In this connection, members have used policy instruments to affect the decisions that will support their aims and benefits based on the fact that many decisions are made in uncertain situations and events are rarely evaluated objectively (Robbins & Judge, 2013). Policy instrument and organizational policy may be cause adverse conditions such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, intention to leave of employment, (Harris, Andrews & Kacmar, 2007; Vigoda, 2000) increasing negligent behaviors (Vigoda, 2000) and feeling of vengeance (Harris at. al, 2007). In addition, this situation means that the members of the organization harm others and the organization; negatively affecting the productivity in the organization can also cause the appearance of anti-production behaviors (Gencer, 2018).

One of the unavoidable facts of the organizational life is to be political and to play political games (Mohan Bursali, 2008). The fact that each person wants to have more resources in line with its own wish and aims have faced off organization members about sharing available resources and this has also created inevitable power struggle. Politics have created an important role in this available power struggle and also in attain the power (Gencer, 2018). Politics concept that we can face off in all aspect of organizational life has different meanings from person to person, but it takes its place as an important behavior in organizations. Because the most important aim in politics is to take control of the power. Power is a concept that takes place in center of organizations, can provide to be understood organizational changing, a lot of organizational process, decision, conflict and leadership (Cömert, 2014). Rousseau (2012) had also explained the importance of power concept.

To create a value and reveal wealth resources that organization have, it needs understanding of pluralist management, democratic and participant. Today, the ability of school principals who exhibit behaviors more effectively in school management process, the importance of having a certain knowledge in order to achieve higher levels of the aims of the school and its sharers further increase state. It can be said that organizations that can accommodate differences and supported by these differences are at a more advanced stage than other organizations in terms of having a competitive advantage in our age. In this situation, the fact that administrator and members who have different knowledge and ability in organizations become has revealed as the most important power factor. (Memduhoğlu & Yılmaz, 2017). However, it has seen that different power creation which can hide some information from its own members. Such a situation has decreased the contribution of the resource of human that it is seen as the most important power (Mohan Bursali, Kızıloğlu & Bayrak Kök, 2018).

In communities such as school, where organizational life is very important, it is among the duties of administrators the fact that the individual and the organization have certain expectations from each other and the fact that these expectations are balanced (Uğurlu, Kırıl, & Aksoy, 2011). In this respect, school principal who is the top of the hierarchy in school has a lot of duties like administrators of other all organizations. It has being thought that success of teachers and students in school depends on administering effectively and voluminously directly. For this reason, the importance of having political behaviors and political games in the management of the school where changing and development are fast is increasing more and more (Mehtap, 2011). In this context, it has being seen inevitable that school principals and teachers exhibit behaviors which include political games in schools that affecting neighbours and be affected from neighbours (Gencer, 2018).

Political Games

When the article about political games is examined, it is seen that political games are used in the same sense as political behaviors (Kesgen, 1999). We can define political games as activities that are not seen as part of the roles of individuals in the organization, but can affect all individuals in the organization (Hoy & Miskel, 2015). We can classify the games exhibited as political behavior in four categories: authority games, rival games, exchange games and powerhouse games (Hoy & Miskel, 2015). The power center building games that constitute the subject of our research are; It is expressed as the games that individuals who have the same characteristics as power in the organization set up with the behaviors they display in order to increase their power in the organization (Cacciattolo, 2014). Superiors, subordinates and peers in the organization can display their power-center forming games in different ways (Hoy & Miskel, 2015). It can be seen that administrators and other persons perform power-center forming games to protect their own benefits towards other persons whom they interact with. especially, these games that members of organization performed by reviewing all possibilities in order to realize individual aims; "sponsorship", "making an alliance", "patronize" and "budgeting" are discussed in 6 groups (Doğan, 2020).

Power-Center Forming Games

It has been stated by the majority of the authors that the concept of power is so close to the political concept that it can even mean the same meaning (Kesgen, 1999). The concept of "power", which is at the center of people's attention in organizational management, can be said as a resource used by managers or efficient people in the organization to change the behaviors of individual or individuals (Gencer, 2018). In parallel with the power, the games performed by the individual in the organization to increase the organizational power can be defined as power-center forming games (Cacciattolo, 2014). All individuals in the organization can be used in power-center forming games (Hoy & Miskel, 2015). These games which become a social fact are expressed that administrators perform many times to protect their own benefits towards

the other persons interact with in society. These games that members of organizations review all possibilities to make real their individual aims; "sponsorship", "making alliance", "emperorship" and "budgeting" games are discussed in 6 groups (Gencer, 2018).

Sponsorship Games

The sponsorship game is a powerhouse game that the members of the organization play by using their superiors. The player who perform this power-center forming game expect the power by presenting his/her own loyalty to superior persons in the name of power and by attaching himself/herself with them (Korucuoğlu, 2016). People who play this game aim to connect themselves to a rising star (Korucuoğlu & Şentürk, 2018). In order to gain power, she/he associates herself/himself with those above her by offering her loyalty (Gencer, 2018). The sponsor in this game is usually the person's boss or people who have more power (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1988). There are some rules of this game, which is played as the people in the upper position that the individual associates herself/himself with (Mintzberg, 1989). In this game, the individual first shows her/his loyalty and devotion. The sponsor's request or orders are indulged. The person should not be in the forefront and should explain many situations by attributing to the sponsor. As a final step, she/he should express her/his gratitude to the sponsor at every opportunity. Thus, it is ensured that the powers of the sponsor are transmitted to the players playing the sponsorship game (Gibson et al., 1988). Sponsors in the game become a reflective power to players by giving some services such as making easier taking information, inactivating formal source and shielding in formal. Some costs of the sponsorship game may also arise. When the sponsor loses its power, negative consequences such as regular disobedience of the players against the sponsor may occur (Medwick, 1996).

Making Alliance Game

Making alliance game has being played by the administrators who are in relation with each other muffledly and sometimes experts (Korucuoğlu, 2016). This game is performed between peers who take support from each other (Yazıcı, Nartgün & Özhan, 2015). The making alliance game is performed in the progress within the organization between experts and managers in supporting each other to create power (Gencer, 2018). These games can be performed inside or outside the organization. While aiming to provide common aims in alliances; It is aimed to increase the power of sub-units in formations outside the organization (Gibson et al., 1988). In this game, the process proceeds as follows: Individuals who are worried about any subject embark on the different quest to eliminate these concerns. By creating a group in the organization, individuals are in search of a informal leader who will represent themselves. For this purpose, they form interest groups. while these interest groups that were created disappeared when most problems were troubleshooter, other groups where common benefits continue keep at their togetherness. Many of these groups can continue to grow as they become power-center with the help of interest groups. This is how alliances are formed.

Empire Forming Game

This game is performed by cooperating with subordinates by especially middle managers instead of cooperating with equal or superior persons (Gencer, 2018). This game is performed in the form of taking control of their subordinates in order to increase administrators' own power within the organization (Korucuoğlu, 2016). The empire building game is a game played by managers who can gather subordinates and persons in subunit by influencing them and in order to try to increase or create their own power center by using their existing powers (Mintzberg, 1983). Especially, in organizations that come behind according to their equals there are aspiring to become more powerful or take power. In such a situation, it can be quite difficult to be tolerant, since the main purpose of the game is to influence the other. In this respect, the empire building game is a complicated and highly politicized game by being used all means of political influence (Gencer, 2018).

Expertise Game

In the expert game, people perceived as professionals in the organization aim to have a say in the work of others (Mintzberg, 1985). Experts who put their special information into practice try to secure their position (Yazıcı et al., 2015). The organization needs these people in terms of technical and expertise. For this reason, the performers of the game have technical skills or expertise. Performers can perform the game aggressively, using their expertise in this game. In the game, performers can protect their power by trying taking control their position in organization by not sharing their ability and knowledge that belongs to only them by saying their position can not be deposited for.

Patronize Game

The boss game is a game performed by the administrators who have legal power to form a power base against those who do not or have little power (Korucuoğlu, 2016). This game is performed by people who have legal rights to gain power by using their legal rights (Yazıcı et al., 2015). Managers can patronize on their subordinates by using official authority, or a public official can play this game on citizens. The boss game is mostly seen as a game played by the weak people (Korucuoğlu, 2016). It has been observed that people with legal rights tend to use their power when the use of authority by subordinates is opposed, hindered or shown to be incapable by other people. This game can be performed by using little or by no using legitimate power that is given by law. The main purpose of the game user here is to create a power center. The individual in the managerial position can play this game by using her/his legal authority on her/his employees. Competent people can use their skills by performing this game on non-competent people (Gencer, 2018).

Budgeting Game

The budgeting game is always performed to obtain the surplus and to reach more large resources (Korucuoğlu, 2016). The main purpose of this game is to guarantee the unequal

distribution of unshared resources and to use these resources for certain groups. In this respect, the budgeting game may resemble the empire-building game (Mintzberg, 1983; Yazıcı et al., 2015). The budgeting game is based on rules determined to create power in manner of political (Gender, 2018). The main purpose of this game is to increase all kinds of advantages (position, equipment, money, etc.) that the manager has obtained. Many of these benefits are achieved through financial instruments. On this opportunity, budgets form the center of this game (Mintzberg, 1983).

It is stated that if political games are managed correctly, it is known that useful consequences will be for organizations. Even if organizational structure and types are different, It is impossible that thinking that will not be political games in organizations. Therefore, seeing political games as a real in the organizations and presenting capacity of the organizations will always bring benefit. Political games are performed to express different behaviors. The important point in these games is to firstly determine which political game they are in.

In this research, it has been focused that power-center forming games behaviors of school principals according to teachers. When the relevant literature is searched; Although many studies have been conducted on political behaviors and political games, it has not been found any previous research for power-center forming games behaviors (SPPCFGB) according to teachers' opinion. With this research, it is aimed to contribute to the literature by examining the power-center forming games behaviors of school principals SPPCFGB according to the opinions of the teachers. In addition, it has being thought that this research can contribute in the name of forming types of suitable behavior by informing about power-center forming games behaviors of school principals according to teachers' opinions in school that they are thought as on the factory floor to politicians and bureaucrats in National Education Ministry (NEM).

1.2.Problem Statement

Power-center forming games behaviors (SPPCFGB) not only affect the effective management of schools, but also affect teacher behaviors. For this reason, it is aimed to present the opinions of school principals about the behavior of power center games correctly. Starting from this point of view, the problem statement is expressed as follows. "What are the teacher views on SPPCFGB behaviors?"

Sub Problems

1. According to the teachers' opinions, what is the level of the School Principals' Power-Center forming Games behaviours?
2. The opinions of the teachers on the level of using the Power-Center Building Games behaviours of the School Principals are;
 - a. Gender,
 - b. Branch,

- c. The type of school he/she works at,
 - d. Years of service at the school where he works,
 - e. Does it make a difference in terms of membership to any union?
3. What are the teachers' views on SPPCFGB behaviors?

2. Method

In this section, information about the research model, population, sample, data collection tools and data analysis processes is included.

2.1. Model of the Research

In the research, the opinions of School Principals about Power-Center Forming Games behaviors were obtained by a mixed research method based on the opinions of teachers working in public schools in kindergarten, primary, secondary and high schools in Kahramanmaraş Merkez, Onikisubat and Dulkadiroğlu districts in the 2020-2021 academic year. Studies in which qualitative and quantitative research approaches are used together are called mixed methods research (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). In the research, descriptive sequential pattern that one of the mixed type method was used. The purpose of choosing this pattern is to support the quantitative data obtained with qualitative data. Descriptive Sequential Pattern is a mixed researching pattern continuing with first quantitative next qualitative research for finding more deep and special results with first section that researcher started to using quantitative research method (Creswell & Clark, 2018).

2.2. Population and Sample

The teachers working in public schools in Kahramanmaraş center, Dulkadiroğlu and Onikisubat districts in the 2020-2021 academic years constitute the population of the research. In sample selection of the research, simple random sampling method that it is accepted as one of the possibility based sampling was preferred. The simple random sampling method is “the random selection of sampling units from the created population list” (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2019; Can, 2019). In this context, 553 teachers working in Dulkadiroğlu and Onikisubat districts of Kahramanmaraş province were included as participants in the quantitative part of the research. In qualitative part of the research, Purposeful Sampling Method was preferred in order to acquire in depth and rich results. In this context, preferring purposeful sampling method can provide acquiring more efficient results in the explaining a lot of events and facts. In this context, after the findings of the quantitative data of the research were analyzed, the results were evaluated. In accordance with the results obtained after this evaluation, the study group of the qualitative method was selected.

The study group of the qualitative method consists of 16 teachers working in Dulkadiroğlu and Onikisubat districts of Kahramanmaraş province. Information about the sampling is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Teachers Participating in the Research

Parameters	P	%
Gender		
Female	240	43.4
Male	313	56.6
Branch		
Preschool Teacher	46	8.3
Class Teacher	172	31.1
Branch Teacher	335	60.6
What is your year of service at your school?		
2 Years and Below	113	20.4
3 - 6 Years	229	41.4
7 - 10 Years	103	18.6
11 Years and above	108	19.5
What type of school do you work at?		
Kindergarten	39	7.1
Primary School	182	32.9
Middle School	230	41.6
High School	102	18.4
Are you a member of any union?		
Yes	431	77.9
No	122	22.1
Total	553	100

This section consists of information about the data collection tools used in the research. In this study, "Personal Information Form" developed by the researcher and "Power-Center Forming Games Scale Used by School Principals" developed by Gencer, Tok and Ordu (2018) and semi-structured interview forms developed by the researcher were used.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

Along with the description of subjects, give the mended size of the sample and number of individuals meant to be in each condition if separate conditions were used. State whether the achieved sample differed in known ways from the target population. Conclusions and interpretations should not go beyond what the sample would warrant.

The scale developed by Gencer, Tok and Ordu (2018) was used to determine the power center building games behavior levels of school principals according to teacher opinions.

In this scale, there are some expressions that teachers can use to express their views on SPPCFGB behaviors regarding their own views. Participating teachers were asked to read each statement and indicate by marking the most appropriate one in general. The scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 41 articles. There is no reverse article. It consists of 6 dimensions in total and its dimensions are; “Sponsorship” consisting of 5 items (1, 2, 3, 4 and 5), “Alliance Building” consisting of 5 items (6, 7, 8, 9 and 10), and “boss” consisting of 12 items (11, 12,13, 14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21, and 22), “expertise” consisting of 5 items (23, 24, 25, 26 and 27), “empire” consisting of 5 items (28, 29, 30) , 31 and 32) and “budgeting” consisting of 9 items (33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 and 41). The scale was arranged in a 5-point Likert type, with the value number 1 “I totally disagree”, the value number 2 “I do not agree”, the value number 3 “I agree moderately”, the value number 4 “I agree” and the value number 5 “I completely agree”. Corresponds to the expression.

Table 2. Point Limits Determining Participants' Level of Agreeing with Statements

Statements	Value	Limits
I totally disagree	1	1.00 - 1.80
I do not agree	2	1.81 - 2.60
I agree moderately	3	2.61 - 3.40
I agree	4	3.41 - 4.20
I completely agree	5	4.21 - 5.00

In the study conducted by Gencer, Tok and Ordu (2018), the internal coefficients of consistency of the scale were; $\alpha = .98$ in the “sponsorship” dimension, $\alpha = .92$ in the “making an alliance” dimension, $\alpha = .97$ in the “boss” dimension, $\alpha = .88$ in the “expertise” dimension, $\alpha = .81$ in the “empire” dimension, and $\alpha = .81$ in the “budgeting” dimension. It was found that $\alpha = .90$. The internal consistency values of the current study are presented in Table 3.

Table 2. Cronbach Alfa (α) Numeric Values

Dimensions	First Scale Development Study	Research
Sponsorship	.98	.89
Making an alliance	.92	.88
Boss	.97	.87
Expertise	.88	.78
Empire	.81	.78
Budgeting	.90	.94

Cronbach's Alpha values to determine the internal consistency coefficient for the reliability of the scale; $\alpha = .89$ in the “sponsorship” dimension, $\alpha = .88$ in the “alliance” dimension, $\alpha = .87$ in the “boss” dimension, $\alpha = .78$ in the “expertise” dimension, $\alpha = .78$ in

the “empire” dimension, and $\alpha = .78$ in the “budgeting” dimension, $\alpha = .94$ for the sum of the scale were acquired as $\alpha = .96$.

2.4. Analysis of Data

In the research, the data obtained from the scales of belief in education and job dependency levels were analyzed using an appropriate statistical program. Descriptive statistics method was used to find the answer to the first research question. In order to answer the second research question, the coefficient of skewness was calculated to find out whether the distribution of the levels of "SPPCFGB" behaviors, which are the dependent variables, is normal. The skewness value was checked to determine the normality of the " SPPCFGB " scale. Since this value is between -1 and +1 for all sub-dimensions of the scale, it has been observed that the levels of “SPPCFGB” behaviors are normally distributed (Büyüköztürk, 2019: 40). Levene's homogeneity test was applied to determine whether parametric/non-parametric tests will be used in the second research question, and according to the results of this test, independent sample t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), Mann Whitney – U test, Kruskal Wallis test and Post Hoc (LSD) test used. In order to be able to analyze with a parametric test, it is necessary to show normal distribution of the data and to ensure homogeneity in the data. When one of these conditions is not fulfilled, non-parametric tests without strict assumptions are applied (Karagöz, 2010). Levene's test results for the normality of the distributions (skewness values) and homogeneity of variances obtained as a result of the tests performed for this purpose are presented in Tables 4 and 5.

Skewness values are presented in Table 4 to determine the Normality Distribution Level of Power Center Game Behaviors Used by School Principals.

Table 4. Test of Normality of Distribution

Factors	Skew (Skewness)	Kurtosis (Kurtosis)
Sponsorship	.194	-.525
Alliance	.142	-.363
Boss	.006	.076
Expertise	.200	-.222
Empire	.505	.310
Budgeting	.770	.215

As can be seen in Table 4, as the skewness coefficient is between -1 and +1 in the result of the test made for teachers' perception levels, it is seen that the distribution is normal in all sub-dimensions. Homogeneity of variances to determine whether parametric or non-parametric tests will be used in the sub-dimensions of the second research question; Levene's test results are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Levene's Test Results for Homogeneity of Variances

Demographic Variables	Gender	Branch	Years of Service at School	School Type	Union Membership Status
	p	p	p	p	p
Sponsorship	.067	.396	.034*	.444	.066
Alliance	.122	.557	.006*	.421	.203
Boss	.290	.347	.299	.400	.017*
Expertise	.077	.206	.391	.642	.359
Empire	.793	.887	.998	.075	.245
Budgeting	.081	.394	.122	.042*	.537

P<.05*

Since the independent variable, gender and union membership status in the research question has 2 categories, t-test and Mann Whitney - U Test; One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), Kruskal Wallis – H Test was used since branch, years of service at school and school type were more than 2 categories. Effect size calculation was made to determine the degree of significant difference in parametric tests. The effect size calculation gives information about how much of the total variance in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable. Effect size, (f^2) points range from 0.00 to 1.00. The values of the effect size were considered as .10, .30 and .50 small, medium and large effect sizes, respectively (Büyüköztürk, 2019). Simple correlation was used to determine the relationship between dependent variables. While evaluating the results of the correlation analysis, it was interpreted 0.00-0.30 as low, 0.30-0.70 as medium, between 0.70-1.00 as high level (Büyüköztürk, 2019).

3. Results

In this section, the data obtained in the quantitative dimension of the research and the findings that emerged as a result of the analysis of the Findings obtained by the interview technique in the qualitative dimension of the research are included.

3.1. Findings concerning Quantitative Dimension

In this section, the Findings that emerged from the analysis of the data collected in the quantitative dimension of the research are included.

3.1.1. Results Related to the First Sub-Problem

Regarding the first sub-problem of the research; It was aimed to determine the level of teacher perceptions. The averages of the perception levels of the participants are given in Table 6 separately for each item.

Table 6. Perception Levels of Teachers

Articles	\bar{X}	SS
S.1 Our school principal builds up friendships with her/his superiors to acquire influence.	2.86	1.183
S.2 Our school principal takes support from her/his union in order to maintain her/his current position.	3.05	1.258
S.3 Our school principal establishes closeness with people with political identity in order to maintain his current position.	2.67	1.233
S.4 Our school principal establishes positive relations with powerful parent- teacher association's members in order to maintain his/her current position.	2.73	1.244
S.5 When our school principal rewards teachers, he/she gives importance their social status in society, not their success.	2.23	1.072
S.6 Our school principal acts in unison with them by taking support of assistant managers towards	2.95	1.188
S.7 Our school principal acts in unison other school principals to acquire power.	2.64	1.081
S.8 Our school principal tends to act in unison some institution principals to acquire power.	2.67	1.124
S.9 Our school principal ignores the mistakes of the assistant managers in order to build alliances.	2.40	1.060
S.10 Our school principal speaks highly of the assistant managers in order to get their support.	2.55	1.047
S.11 Our school principal takes parents and teachers who support their views to the school-parents association.	2.48	1.133
S.12 Our school principal benefit from the projects of talented teachers to increase his/her own reputation.	2.79	1.209
S.13 Our school principal prompts tp teachers to organize social events (school nights, poetry recitals, etc.) in order to advertise himself/herself.	2.67	1.216
S.14 Our school principal benefits from the support of the board of management of school-parents association for his own reputation.	2.47	1.161
S.15 Our school principal also communicates with some teachers outside of school (lunch, home visits, etc.) in order to increase his/her power at school.	2.46	1.126
S.16 Our school principal says to the higher authorities that appropriation budget for the school are insufficient.	3.11	1.112
S.17 Our school principal motivates teachers to work harder to get support from certain projects (TUBITAK, overseas projects, etc.).	3.25	1.094
S.18 Our school principal makes an effort to get the support of parents who have economic power.	3.11	1.130
S.19 Our school principal (kermess, etc.) tries to increase the school budget with social activities.	3.38	1.169
S.20 Our school principal is in an effort to use the school garden for income purposes (wedding hall, parking lot, tea garden, etc.) during the holidays.	1.86	.938
S.21 Our school principal wants to get more share from the National Education budget for his/her school.	3.26	1.168
S.22 Our principal wants teachers and assistant manager to work hard to increase the school's budget.	3.36	1.122
S.23 Our school principal asks teachers to increase their efforts so that his/her school receives more funding.	3.09	1.163
S.24 Our school principal collects donations from individuals and organizations for the needs of the school.	2.80	1.112
S.25 Our school principal emphasizes the importance of his/her own knowledge and abilities at every opportunity.	2.58	1.143
S.26 Our school principal states that the school needs its own knowledge and skills.	2.62	1.100
S.27 Our school principal talks about the originality of his/her ideas.	2.62	1.042
S.28 Our school principal makes the teachers feel that he has full knowledge of the legislation on education.	3.27	1.058
S.29 Our school principal reminds teachers of where the school comes from by means of his/her knowledge, talent and experience.	3.08	1.057
S.30 Our school principal presses teachers close to fulfill his/her wishes.	2.35	1.184
S.31 Our school principal uses his status to impose his/her ideas on teachers.	2.28	1.163
S.32 Our school principal does not want to listen to teachers' suggestions.	2.00	.995
S.33 Our school principal makes you feel that he will make the final decision in all matters.	2.70	1.276
S.34 Our school principal makes us feel obliged that participation in non-compulsory projects is obligatory.	2.37	1.125
S.35 Our school principal warns hardly to teachers about their mistakes.	2.26	1.061

S.36	Our school principal is close to criticism.	2.28	1.133
S.37	Our school principal over tasks teachers except their jobs definition	2.22	1.000
S.38	Our school principal wants to control every event in the school himself/herself.	2.71	1.160
S.39	The style of speaking of our school principal is offensive towards teachers.	2.01	1.102
S.40	Our school principal gives orders at every opportunity.	2.08	1.015
S.41	Our school principal expects responsibilities from teachers beyond their duties.	2.35	1.110
	General	2.65	1.120

3.1.2. Results Regarding the Second Sub-Problem

In the second sub-problem of the research; The Findings regarding the variables of gender, branch, years of service at school, school type and union membership status of teacher perceptions are included.

Perception Levels regarding the Gender Variable

In this section, it is aimed to determine the perception levels in relating to the gender variable according to the perceptions of the teachers. It was decided to perform parametric tests in order to be provided homogeneity in all sub-dimensions and that distribution of perception level of teachers' are normal. The Findings of the Independent Samples t-Test, which was conducted to determine whether teacher behaviors show a significant difference according to the gender variable, are given in Table 7.

Table 7. t-Test Results according to Gender Variable

Sub-Dimensions	\bar{X}	SS	t	P	η^2
Sponsorship					
Female	2.633	0.961	-1.632	.103	
Male	2.771	1.028			
Alliance					
Female	2.588	.880	-1.223	.222	
Male	2.682	.922			
Boss					
Female	2,693	0,741	-4.546	.000***	.037
Male	2.973	0,685			
Expertise					
Female	2.654	.849	-2.262	.024*	.009
Male	2.813	.774			
Empire					
Female	2.478	.798	-3.112	.002**	.017
Male	2.690	.787			
Budgeting					
Female	2.250	1.001	-1..772	.077	
Male	2.393	.857			

N (female) = 240, N(male) = 313. $P \leq .050^*$, $P \leq .010^{**}$, $P \leq .000^{***}$

According to the Findings of the t-Test performed to test the relevance between the groups in Table 7, in terms of the gender variable of the teachers; sponsorship ($P=.103$),

making an alliance(P=.222) and budgeting dimensions (P=.077) is not seen a meaningful difference (p>.05). Statistically significant differences were observed in terms of patronize (P=.000), expertise (P=.024) and empire (P=.002) dimensions (p<.05). It was revealed that this significance was in favor of men in the dimensions of patronize, expertise and empires.

PCFGBSP Levels relating to the Branch Variable

In this section, it is aimed to determine the perception levels of the branch variable according to the perceptions of the teachers. the ANOVA test, one of the parametric tests, was applied to provide homogeneity in all sub-dimensions and according to the branch variable, the distribution of teachers' perception levels is normal. Related analyzes are given in Table 8.

Table 8. ANOVA Results according to Branch Variable

Sub-Dimensions	\bar{X}	SS	F	P	LSD	η^2
Sponsorship						
Kindergarten	2.822	.951				
Class Teacher	2.721	1.057	.358	.699		
Branch Teacher	2.691	.980				
Making an Alliance						
Kindergarten	2.713	.922				
Class Teacher	2.516	.858	2.388	.093		
Branch Teacher	2.695	.922				
Patronize						
Kindergarten	2.603	.716				
Class Teacher	2.817	.750	3.794	.023*	Kindergarten Teacher <Branch Teacher	.014*
Branch Teacher	2.903	.703				
Expertise						
Kindergarten	2.613	.850				
Class Teacher	2.661	.766	2.468	.086		
Branch Teacher	2.805	.824				
Empire						
Kindergarten	2.387	.761				
Class Teacher	2.500	.816	4.635	.010**	Kindergarten Teacher<Branch Teacher, Class Teacher<Branch Teacher	.017*
Branch Teacher	2.678	.785				
Budgeting						
Kindergarten	2.130	.906				
Class Teacher	2.216	.928	3.910	.021*	kindergarten Teacher< Branch Teacher	.014*
Branch Teacher	2.417	.917			Class Teacher< Branch Teacher	

N (Kindergarten T.) =46, N (Class T.) =172, N(Branch T.) = 335. P ≤ .050*, P ≤ .010**, P ≤ .000***

According to the analysis Findings in Table 8, no statistically significant difference was found for the distribution of sponsorship (P=.699), alliance building (P=.093) and expertise (P=.086) (p>.05). On the other hand, when the dimensions of patronage

($P=.023$), empire ($P=.010$) and budgeting ($P=.021$) were examined, it was seen that teachers differed significantly according to the branch variable ($p<.05$). In order to find the source of the significant difference, by performing LSD statistics that is one of the Post Hoc tests, it was found that meaningful difference was in favour of kindergarten, class teachers and branch teacher in budgeting, patronize, empire sub-dimension. Regarding making an alliance, empire and budgeting dimensions, kindergarten and classroom teachers; It is seen that the perception levels are lower than the teachers in other branches.

Levels Related to Variable of Years of Service at School

In this section, it is aimed to determine the perception levels of the variable of years of service in the school according to the perceptions of the teachers. Since the distribution of perception levels of teachers according to the variable of years of service at the school was normal and homogeneity was ensured in the dimensions of patronize, expertise, empire and budgeting, the ANOVA test was applied. Since homogeneity could not be achieved in the distribution of sponsorship and making an alliance sub-dimensions, Kruskal Wallis – H Test, which is one of the non-parametric test techniques, was applied. Related analyzes are given in Table 9 and 10.

Table 9. ANOVA Findings according to Years of Service at School Variable

Sub-Dimensions	SS	\bar{X} F	P	η^2
Patronize				
2 Years and below	2.751	.668		
3 - 6 Years	2.856	.776	1.10	.349
7 - 10 Years	2.921	.677	0	
11 Years and above	2.881	.700		
Expertise				
2 Years and below	2.766	.825		
3 - 6 Years	2.784	.839	1.35	.256
7 - 10 Years	2.777	.697	4	
11 Years and above	2.604	.831		
Empire				
2 Years and below	2.637	.804		
3 - 6 Years	2.565	.803	.246	.864
7 - 10 Years	2.614	.823		
11 Years and above	2.613	.762		
Budgeting				
2 Years and below	2.433	.967		
3 - 6 Years	2.295	.957	.723	.538
7 - 10 Years	2.273	.806		
11 Years and above	2.353	.915		

N (2 Years and below) =113, N (3 - 6 Years) =229, N(7 - 10 Years)=103, N(11 Years and above) = 108.

According to the Findings in table 9, as a result of the analysis studies carried out according to the variable of years of service in the school; no statistically significant difference was found concerning the distributions of the sub-dimensions of patronize ($P=.349$), expertise ($P=.256$), empire ($P=.864$) and budgeting ($P=.538$) ($p>.05$).

Table 10. Kruskal Wallis – H Test Results according to Variable of Year of Service

Sub-Dimensions	S.O	Sd	X ²	p	η ²
Sponsorship					
2 Years and below	291.584				
3 - 6 Years	257.910	3	7.972	.069	
7 - 10 Years	272.646				
11 Years and above	306.370				
Forming an Alliance					
2 Years and below	281.398				
3 - 6 Years	262.124	3	4.271	.234	
7 - 10 Years	282.053				
11 Years and above	299.120				

N (2 Years and below) =113, N (3 - 6 Years) =229, N(7 - 10 Years)=103, N(11 Years and above)=108.

As a result of the Kruskal Wallis – H Test performed in Table 10, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in terms of sponsorship ($p=.069$) and making an alliance ($p= .234$) dimensions according to the teachers' variable of years of service at school .

Levels of Teachers Regarding the Variable of School Type Working

In this section, it is aimed to determine the perception levels of the teachers according to the school type variable. According to the variable of the type of school they are working in, the distribution of perception levels of the teachers is normal; Depending on this result, the ANOVA test was applied since homogeneity was ensured in the sub-dimensions of sponsorship, making an alliance, patronizing and expertise. Since homogeneity could not be achieved in the distribution of the sub-dimensions of empire and budgeting, Kruskal Wallis - H Test, which is one of the non-parametric test techniques, was applied. Related analyzes are given in Tables 11 and 12.

Tables 11. ANOVA Results according to School Type Variable

Sub-Dimensions	\bar{X}	SS	F	P	Fark (LSD)	η^2
Sponsorship						
Kindergarten	2.882	1.025				
Primary School	2.708	1.024	.753	.521		
Middle School	2.730	1.011				
High School	2.610	.930				
Kindergarten	2.713	.934				
Primary School	2.529	.850	2.133	.095		
Middle School	2.743	.912				
High School	2,584	.956				
Kindergarten	2.632	.812				
Primary School	2.783	.728	3.608	.013*	Kindergarten <Middle S.;	.019
Middle School	2.960	.691			Primary S. <Middle S.	
High School	2.813	.720				
Kindergarten	2.697	.880				
Primary School	2.659	.788	2.097	.100		
Middle School	2.845	.801				
High School	2.684	.831				
Kindergarten	2.374	.743				
Primary School	2.531	.828	3.895	.009**	Kindergarten< Middle S.;	.021
Middle School	2.727	.812			Primary S. < Middle S.; High	
High School	2.514	.690			S. <Middle S.	

N (Kindergarten) =39, N (Primary S.) =182, N(Middle S.)=230, N(High S.) = 102. $P \leq .050^*$, $P \leq .010^{**}$, $P \leq .000^{***}$

According to the Findings of the analysis in Table 11, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference for the distribution of sponsorship ($P=.521$), making an alliances ($P=.095$) and expertise ($P=.100$) according to the type of school variable the teachers are working in ($p > .05$). However, according to the school type variable where the teachers work; when it is thought in terms of bossship ($P=.013$), and empire ($P=.009$) dimensions, it has seen a meaningful difference ($p < .05$). As a result of the statistical tests carried out to find the source of the significant difference; In the sub-dimensions of patronize and empire, it was seen that there is a school type variable that works in kindergarten, primary school, high school and secondary school (in favor of secondary school type). In concern with the dimensions of patronize and empire, teachers working in kindergarten, primary and high school types; It is seen that the level of teachers working in secondary school type is lower than that of teachers.

Table 12. Kruskal Wallis – H Test Results according to School Type Variable

Sub-Dimensions	S.O	sd	X ²	p	Post Hoc	η ²
Budgeting						
Kindergarten	232.744				Middle S>Kingergarten	
Primary S.	253.286	3	11.995	.007**	Middle S >primarys	
Middle S.	299.876				Middle S >High s	
High S.	284652					

N (Kindergarten) =39, N (Primary S.) =182, N(Middle S.)=230, N(High S.) = 102. $P \leq .050^*$, $P \leq .010^{**}$, $P \leq .000^{***}$

As a result of the Kruskal Wallis–H Test performed in Table 12, a statistically significant difference was found in terms of budgeting ($p=.007$) dimension according to the school type variable in which the teachers work ($p<.05$). It was observed that the significant difference in the budgeting sub-dimension was the type of school working in kindergarten, primary school, high school and secondary school (in favor of secondary school type). In concern with the budgeting dimension, teachers working in kindergarten, primary school and high school; It is seen that the level of teachers working in secondary school type is lower than that of teachers.

Levels of Any Union Membership Status Variable

In this section, it is aimed to determine the perception levels of teachers according to the variable of being a member of a union. According to the variable of being a member of a union, the distribution of perception levels of teachers is normal; The Independent Groups t-Test was conducted because homogeneity was ensured in sponsorship, making an alliance, expertise, empire and budgeting sub-dimensions. In the sub-dimension of patronize, the Mann Whitney - U Test, which is one of the non-parametric test techniques, was used because homogeneity could not be achieved in the distribution. Related analyzes are given in Tables 13 and 14.

Table 13. T-Test Results According to the Variable of Union Membership Status

Sub-Dimensions		\bar{X}	SS	t	P	η^2
Sponsorship						
	Yes	2.716	1.030	.238	.812	
	No	2.693	.894			
Making an Alliance						
	Yes	2.623	.921	-.907	.366	
	No	2.703	.844			
Expertise						
	Yes	2.760	.829	.909	.364	
	No	2.689	.743			
Empire						
	Yes	2.601	.815	.188	.851	
	No	2.587	.736			
Budgeting						
	Yes	2.325	.942	-.273	.785	
	No	2.350	.862			

N (yes) = 431, N(no) = 122. $P \leq .050^*$, $P \leq .010^{**}$, $P \leq .000^{***}$

According to the Findings of the independent groups t-Test performed to test the significance between the groups in Table 13, in terms of any union membership status variable; there is no any meaningful difference for sponsorship ($P=.812$), alliance building ($P=.366$), expertise ($P=.364$), empire ($P=.851$) and budgeting dimensions ($P=.785$) ($p > .05$).

Table 14. Mann Whitney - U Test Results according to Union Membership Status

Sub-Dimensions	S.O	S.T	U	p	η^2
Patronize					
	Yes	281.968	121.528.000	121.528.000	.169
	No	259.451	31.653.000		

N (yes) = 431, N(no) = 122. $P \leq .050^*$, $P \leq .010^{**}$, $P \leq .000^{***}$

According to the Findings of Mann Whitney-U Test conducted to test the significance among the groups in Table 14, in terms of any union membership status variable; no statistically significant difference was found for the patronize dimension ($p > .05$).

3.2. Results Related to the Qualitative Section

In this part of our research, it is aimed to reveal the opinions of teachers in the sub-dimensions of patronize, expertise, empire and budgeting, which are significantly different as a result of the analyzes made in the quantitative section on the power-center forming games behaviors of school principals. Based on the answers given by the teachers to the interview questions, the data obtained as a result of the descriptive analyzes were shown with diagrams. In the quantitative part of our research on school principals' power center building games behaviors according to teachers' opinions, the answers to the

interview questions regarding the sub-dimensions that have significant differences are discussed separately. The number in parentheses under the expressions in the diagrams used in the research expresses the number of teachers who answer in the interview. Since the names of the participants were kept confidential in the study, without giving the names to teachers and the letter, D: refers to the Dulkadiroğlu district; O: the letter of the Onikisubat district where the research was conducted, A: the letter kindergarten level, the letter I: the primary school level, the letter O: the secondary school level, L: the teachers working at the high school level; The number 1: is used to represent female teachers and the number 2: is used to represent male teachers.

“How do you evaluate your school principal's selection of members to the parent-teacher association? If it were you, how would you choose?” Findings Related to the Question:

The teachers were asked how the school principals evaluated the selection of members to the Parent-Teacher Association. Teachers' views on this question:

“...he is making a democratic choice. It must be so. I would do it like him/her. (DAÖ1)”

“...The school principal made a choice among the parents who attended the meeting, again with the votes of the participants and partly based on his/her own observations. I would also care of volunteering. (DOÖ1)”

“... At the general parents' meeting held at the beginning of the year, the members are chosen by election from among the parents who attend the meeting. In this way, I think that he/she will choose people who think of school as his home, in the same way, I would choose from among the candidates. (OAO1)”

“...It was a fast and solution-oriented democratic election that brought out democratic fairness and voluntarism. If I were in his/her place, I don't know if I could find a different method and way, but on the principle that there is no need to re-experience what has been experienced, I keep these attitudes and behaviors and work of the manager in a corner of my mind with the thought that if I become a manager one day, I will implement them. (OOÖ2)”

“...Our school principal tries to choose nonpoor people while choosing the members of the Parent-Teacher Association. He/she thinks that such people will provide financial resources to the school. If I were in principal's place, I would do the same. (OİÖ1)”

“...The school principal considers the financial situation and responsibility of the individuals when selecting members to the school-parent union. We surely would always do the same to run the business more smoothly. (OLÖ1)”

“...School principals make choices from people who have his/her own opinion. Instead of benefiting the school, he chooses among those who will advantage that supports himself. The school principal should choose people who are objective, no political, and work for the only school. (DIO1)”

“What kind of work does your school principal exercise to increase the income of the school? If you were in his/her place, what would you do and what would you not do?”

Findings Related to the Questions:

Teachers were asked about the school principal's efforts to increase the income of the school. Teachers' views on this question:

“...Our school principal provides some income to the school by making donations to the school by meeting with wealthy people in order to meet the needs such as paint, whitewash and repair of information equipment.. (DIÖ1)”

“...by holding a class reunion, School Principal provides to be donated to school from grad student, from people who have a good job. The school principal contributes to the school in certain amounts by cooperating with our considerable parents, public institutions and local administration in our city. (DLÖ1)”

“...The school principal provides revenue types by requesting donations to the school from the wealthy people around the school. (OIÖ1)”

“...The school principal tries to increase the school income by selling some of the interesting and remarkable activities of the teachers with the children in the classrooms at certain times of the year. (OAO1)”

“...The school principal meticulously pays attention to the income of the fees in order to increase the school income.(OLÖ2)”

“...The school principal is trying to contribute to the school-parent union with the income obtained from the sale made by the commission established at the school by evaluating the waste materials with a certain economic value that can be recycled. (DOÖ1)”

“...The school principal is trying to provide resources to the school from waste to be used in recycling. (OAO2)”

“...Our school principal sells recycling materials and increases school revenues in order to increase the revenues of the school. (OOÖ1)”

“...There is also a certain amount of income from the canteen in our school.(DIÖ1)”

“...The school principal opens a canteen at the school under the name of the cooperative, and with this canteen, the nutritional needs of the students are met and a certain amount of income is provided to the school. (OIÖ2)”

“...The school principal also finds sponsors who contribute a certain amount to the school in order to meet the needs such as arranging the green area of the school for the activities to be carried out at the school, building a hobby garden for the school, making uniforms for the school team, in cooperation with our considerable parents, public institutions and local administration in our city. (DLÖ1)”

“What is your opinion about the money allocated to your school from the National Education budget? What do you think your school principal can do to get a bigger share from the National Education budget?” Findings Related to the Question:

The teachers were asked about the money allocated to the school from the national education budget and the works done by the school principals. Teachers' views on this question:

“...As far as I know, it is said that a certain amount of allowance is allocated from the Ministry of National Education to each school, even if it is insufficient, but no budget comes to the school at all or is reflected very little. They also tell schools to turn the trick your business with local resources. That money is used in different places. No matter what the School Principal does, he/she cannot get a share of national education except for a major repair. Either he/she will be someone he knows someone in National Education Directorate or he/she can't get it. (DİÖ1)”

“...I think the income is of course low. The income given is not enough to meet the expenses. I think that the only thing that the school principal can do is to inform about the needs to the necessary places and ask for the budget to be adjusted and increased accordingly.(DOÖ2)”

“...I don't think it's enough, and why would our School Principal try to get more money from the budget? In order to realize their dreams, each school should be provided with a certain amount of annual budget. Everything is the language of love for our children. Nothing can replace our childhood memories. (OAO1)”

“...I do not have detailed information, but I know that the resources allocated are insufficient. Maybe the School Principals should introduce the school perfectly. (OLÖ2)”

“... In order to get support from the National Education Directorate, the school's needs are listed and sent to the relevant units. In addition to this, our school principal sometimes also provides support to the school through the people he is close within the National Education Directorate. (DAÖ1)”

“...No matter what the school principal does, he cannot get a share of National Education Directorate except for a major repair. Either he will be someone he knows in national education or he can't get it. (OİÖ1)”

“...The School Principal can request help from the relevant unit in National Education Directorate or from people whom he can talk to in National Education Directorate for the needs of the school. (OLÖ1)”

“...I know that no money is allocated to the school from the budget of the National Education Directorate, apart from equipment materials, electricity, internet, natural gas, water bills. It can be ensured that the workshops go into production in a way that generates income. The school principal can ask for help from the people whom to the relevant unit in National Education Directorate, or from people whom he or she feels close to in National Education Directorate for the school needs,. (OLÖ1)”

“How do you evaluate the knowledge, ability and originality of your school principal? What do you think the ideal school principal should be?” Findings Related to the Question:

Teachers were asked about their thoughts on the knowledge, talent and originality of school principals. Teachers' views on this question:

“...Not only Our school principal is well-equipped in every field, bu also he is really good in experience, knowledge and family communication, especially in the field of special education. In my opinion, an ideal principal should be one who is open to every idea, farsighted, stands behind the teacher, and most importantly, constantly motivates his teacher. (DAÖ1)”

“...The knowledge, skills and abilities of our school principal are sufficient for school management. A school principal should act in line with the goals and objectives of the school, motivate the staff and students in the best way, and ensure the formation of a corporate culture that aims to achieve success together. (DLÖ2)”

“In order to achieve success, school principal should put effort in in direction of fully aims of school. He should have good relations with everybody and treat everyone equally. The school principal should be able to remain calm in negative situations. He/she must have a quick wit. The school principal should be able to constantly motivate his/her employees by taking responsibility when appropriate. The school principal should be able to manage human relations well. (OIÖ2)”

“... I think School Principal managed the school well. I think the principal should be disciplined. The school principal should make the teacher and student feel that he/she is constantly following them. School principal should make a great effort for school. A school principal should definitely devote himself to his profession, not to his earnings. (OAO2)”

“...I find it sufficient. I think that the ideal manager should be as careful in terms of discipline as he is a humanist. He should be treat equally all teachers in the school. He/she should be able to balance his relations with his teachers within the institution and his external friendship relations. (OLÖ1)”

“...Our school principal is knowledgeable and talented in education and other financial matters. An ideal school principal should be particularly student-focused. In this regard, the school principal should pave the way for teachers and encourage them. The school principal should not keep himself in an unreachable position. (OOÖ1)”

“How do you evaluate your school principal's knowledge of legislation, past experiences, decision-making and use of power? How do you think a school principal should be?”
Findings Related to the Question:

The teachers were asked about the school principals' knowledge of the legislation, their past experiences, the style they took decisions, and their thoughts on the use of force. Teachers' views on this question:

“...Our school principal is a person who previously served as the branch office of the National Education Directorate. The school principal has good knowledge of legislation, past experience, the way he takes decisions, and the school principal's use of force is good. However, the school principal should treat more fairly. (DIÖ2)”

“...I think our school principal has good knowledge of legislation. I think he is experienced. He takes decisions together, asks his staff and evaluates them. I did not encounter the use of force (DLÖ2).”

“...The School Principal's knowledge of legislation and regulations is very good. The school principal generally performs the process of the school in accordance with the legislation and does not go beyond the legislation while making decisions. In my opinion, the authority of the school principal should be expanded. To make it clear with just one example, the school principal cannot even give permission to his own staff, he directs the teacher to the doctor and has them get a false report. (OiÖ1)”

“...the school principal usually takes decisions by counseling. The school principal tries to implement the decisions taken without retarding. The school principal does not make his/her legal aspect feel in the use of force. He/she appreciates the staff with their actions. The school principal does not have any coercive attitude. Since he/she is a talented and knowledgeable person, he/she can be consulted on most issues. (DAÖ2)”

School Principal who has the full knowledge of events and subjects, put into practice the experiences that he/she had previously, is patient, can always exchange opinions according to pluralism, if his/her duty and responsibility hinder, instead of using his/her power of office prefers dialogue. In my opinion, one should not take power from office. he/she should add power for the office. (OOÖ2)”

“...I think our principal is experienced. However, I also witnessed that he/she took support on some issues. (OAO2)”

“...I find the school principal sufficient in terms of experience and experience. No teacher or administrator should exposed to the use of physical force as a force. (OLÖ1)”

“...I find the school principal distressing. The fact that someone who has been a principal in primary education for years is unaware of the secondary education legislation creates a great problem in the process of the institution, both in terms of staff and students. Not every manager has the skills to manage every institution. The methods he uses to make himself/herself listened to lead up to other problem areas. The skill and competence of the personnel should be taken into account in decision-making and distribution of duties. (DLÖ1)”

“How does your school principal communicate? Do you think he distributes work and responsibilities correctly? Why?” Findings Related to the Question:

The teachers were asked about their thoughts on the school principals' communication and the distribution of work and responsibilities. Teachers' views on this question:

“...Our manager is good at communicating. The school principal solves problems with us without difficulty. He is determined, clear whether it is giving and distributing work and responsibilities. Works are overcome easily. He is a principal who thinks about his teacher and stands behind him. (DAÖ1)”

“...I think that communication is established through sincerity. I think the distribution of work and responsibilities is correct and fair. (DLÖ2)”

“...The communication skills of our school principal are very good, he tries to implement the legislation without hurting and breaking it. I believe that he does the job distribution correctly, he gives even the assistant personnel the things they can do, for example, he immediately reshuffles the personnel he is not satisfied with cleaning. (OIÖ1)”

“...I think the principal has a communication that is positive, kindly motivating, fluid and transparent, making the individual feel special. (OOÖ2)”

“...”The school principal gives responsibility, but because he masters the subjects, he can make changes according to himself. He tries to make the distribution of duties as accurate as possible. He may have to do to run the business so. (OIÖ2)”

“...I think that communication is established through sincerity. I think the distribution of work and responsibilities is correct and fair. (DOÖ2)”

“...The distribution of responsibility is not made equally, unfortunately, whoever causes a problem pays attention to him/her. I don't think this the right management style. There should be a fair distribution of tasks. Otherwise, there will be reactions against the school principal. This situation harms healthy communication at school. (OLÖ2)”

“...I cannot say that our principal is good at communication. There was no teacher he did not argue with. He always prefers the same people in terms of work and responsibilities. (DIÖ2)”

“...The school principal's communication was terrible. His style also did not suit for a manager at all. Instead of appreciating the personnel who fulfill their responsibilities, he also gives the responsibilities of others to him/her, he was giving more responsibilities to teachers who fulfill their responsibilities. (DLÖ1)”

4. Discussion and Conclusions

According to the opinions of the teachers, the article with the highest arithmetic average of the PCFGBSP behavior levels is “Our principal (kermess, etc.) works to increase the school budget with social activities.” became the article. According to the teachers' opinions in the research, the article with the lowest arithmetic average is; With the statement “Our principal makes an effort to use the school garden for income purposes (wedding hall, parking lot, tea garden, etc.) during the holidays”, it was concluded that they were at the level of “I agree less”. According to these Findings, teachers think that they use PCFGBSP at a moderate level. Organizations, as depending on the limited resources in available, the possibility of some uncertainties about the future; The mutual struggles of different power centers appear as political areas in which there are various practices in order to have this power (Armağan, 2005). In such cases, in the political areas that occur in organizations; (Atay,2010) managers can use power center forming games as a means of reaching individual goals and creating resources to achieve these goals, to maintain their existing position or to increase their power within

the organization. Political games cannot be ignored in educational organizations, which are a political system (Medwick, 1996). Schools, which have an undeniably important place in the social life of today's world, are educational organizations; The first and most important condition of the capacity of influencing individuals and shaping social life as a social institution is the continuation of the existing system in a certain order (Celep, 1998). For this purpose, school principals should give priority to the aims of the school, which is an educational organization, over their individual aims. For the success of their institution, school principals should be able to foresee different political games, power center forming games and the factors that form to the formation of these games, the effects that may occur on the Findings of these games, and the teachers involved in these games (Medwick, 1996). The fact that low level of competitive behaviors in organizations reduces the possibility of political behaviors (Cacciattolo, 2014). However, schools, like other organizations, appear as a living area of political games. Supporting the Findings of this study, Gencer (2018) stated that teachers' perceptions of PCFG behaviors are at the "moderate" level. Yazıcı et al. (2015), on the other hand, stated in their research that academicians do not prefer power center forming games. Similarly to this research, Oruç (2015), in his research, found that university faculty members used to political behavior at a low level. Erol (2014), on the other hand, found in his study that the political perceptions of the faculty members in education faculties are high. So much so that in educational organizations, it is thought that schools should be away from political games for their purposes or that there should be no high level political games. Because according to Ertem (2011) political games appear as behaviors resulting in nonfunctional in the organization and appearing with in the frame of individuals' power relationship taking place in the organization. In studies on different fields; Alp (2010) concluded that employees' perception of organizational policy is not a significant relationship, Shaver (2003) has an uncertain effect, and Atay (2010) has concluded that it is highly effective on intra business. According to views of teachers PCFGB levels in terms of gender variable; has not shown a meaningful difference for making alliance, sponsorship and budgeting dimensions, however in patronise, expertise and empire dimension it was found that perception level of male teachers is higher than perception of female teachers. The values, expectations and habits of a society are important by becoming different according to the genders of the individuals in that society (Ersoy, 2020). It can be said that there are roles determined by gender characteristics in the society as the reasons that keep women's leadership behaviors in social life in the background compared to men. In business life, although women do not see themselves as different from male teachers, they can be stayed in the background in some situations that arise within the organization (Terzioğlu & Taşkın, 2008). Women who use power-center forming games behaviors at a lower rate within the organization will not be able to feel the power-center forming games behaviors against them as much as men. In social life, women state that they do not intend to use politics vividly, since there are certain behaviors that limit them (Gencer, 2018). Women living in a patriarchal society such as Turkish society and

working in organizations where men are more dominant state that they perceive organizational politics as an obstacle to their professional development areas and they see this situation as a male-specific area (Davey, 2008). On the lines of the Findings obtained in our current study; Mann (1995), Ferris et al. (1996), Korucuoğlu (2016), Gencer (2018), and Akbaş and Bozkurt Bostancı (2019) found in their studies that men have higher political perceptions. However, in the studies of Yılmaz (2008) and Donald, Bertha and Lucia (2016); They found that women have higher political perceptions. As a result of the research, the reason that male teachers' perception levels in bossship, expertise and empire dimensions are higher than female teachers; that men can be more challenging in educational organizations; on considering the traditional social structure, it can be argued that women are less effective in management than men. From this point of view, it can be concluded that female teachers perceive power center games less than male teachers. The answers given by the teachers to the interview questions in the qualitative dimension of the study support these Findings. In the interviews with the teachers, it is seen that the perception levels of the female teachers about the PCFGSP behaviors, which also support the quantitative findings, are lower than the male teachers, based on the views they have expressed about the dimensions of patronize, expertise and empire. Ferris and Kacmar (1992), Kesgen (1999), Eryılmaz (2014), Erol (2014), Aydın (2015), Oruç (2015), Bıyık et al. (2016) and Shaloot (2016) on the political perceptions of teachers in terms of gender variable stated that there was no significant difference. The sponsorship game is a power-center games that the members of the organization play by using their superiors. The player, who plays this power center forming game, expects power by offering loyalty to people higher than himself and associating himself with them in the name of power (Korucuoğlu, 2016). The sponsor in this game is usually the person's boss or people with more power (Gibson et al., 1988). The making alliance game is played by managers and sometimes experts, who have muffledly support relations with each other (Korucuoğlu, 2016). This game is played between peers seeking mutual support from each other (Yazıcı et al., 2015). The budgeting game, on the other hand, is always played to get more than what is needed and to reach larger resources (Korucuoğlu, 2016). The main goal of this game is to guarantee the unequally distribution of unshared resources and to be able to use these resources for certain groups. In this respect, the budgeting game may resemble the empire-building game (Mintzberg, 1983; Yazıcı et al., 2015). In the Findings obtained in the qualitative part of the research, by supporting this situation; PCFGSP behaviors based on teacher opinions; They expressed their supporting opinion that there was no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers in terms of gender variable in their perceptions in relation to sponsorship, alliance building and the budgeting game. According to the opinions of the teachers, PCFGSP levels in terms of branch variable; There was no statistically significant difference in the dimensions of sponsorship, alliance and expertise. There was a statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions of patronise, empire and budgeting according to the branch variable. The

reason of this difference can be seen as a reflection of approaches that teachers used to affect the students based on features of developmental period of students as well because other branch teachers teach to upper classes. In the interviews in the qualitative part of the research, it was stated that school principal did not prorate the responsibilities and the persons causing a problem are given importance. In addition, the teacher in the interview states that the communication of the school principal is poor and his/her style does not suit the principal at all. For this reason, he states that PCFGSP's behaviors do not try to influence teachers with the negative communication they exhibit, instead of creating an impact on them. The opinion of this teacher in the interview supports the result obtained. At the same time, it is thought that other branch teachers aim to fulfill a duty assigned to teachers about PCFGSP behaviors. Supporting the finding of the study, Altinkurt and Yılmaz (2012) concluded that school administrators' perceptions of organizational power sources differ in terms of the branch variable of teachers. Uzun (2019) also concluded that teachers' views on organizational power sources used by school administrators differ in terms of branch variable. In their studies, Memduhoğlu and Turhan (2016) and Cömert (2014) concluded that the perceptions of the branch teachers were more significant than the perceptions of the class teachers between the perceptions of branch and power sources of the teachers. However; Erol (2014) proved in his study that faculty members working in different departments of education faculties perceive the political environment in similar ways. Medwick (1996) also stated that teachers and school principals working in schools at the basic education level of power games have similar perceptions about political games. Kayalı (2011) and Yorulmaz (2014) did not find any relationship between power supplies and teachers' branches in their studies. In terms of the sub-dimensions of patronize, empire and budgeting of teachers' PCFGBSP behaviors, it was concluded that kindergarten and classroom teachers had lower PCFGBSP levels than teachers from other branches. Patronise game is performed to acquire the power by using their legal rights by people have legal rights. The empire game is performed in the form of taking control of the subordinates of the managers in order to increase their own power within the organization (Korucuoğlu, 2016). The budgeting game, on the other hand, is to increase many advantages (position, equipment, money, etc.) obtained by the manager. Many of these benefits are acquired through financial instruments. On this opportunity, budgets form the center of this game (Mintzberg, 1983).

According to the opinions of the teachers, PCFGBSP levels in terms of the variable of years of service at school; it is seen that there is no significant difference for the sub-dimensions of sponsorship, patronise, making an alliance, expertise and budgeting. From this point of view, it can be said that the length of the teachers' years of service in the school does not have any effect on the perceptions of the school principals in relation to the power center forming games behaviors. In support of the Findings of the study, Alp (2010), Helvacı and Kayalı (2011) and Akbaş and Bozkurt Bostancı (2019) found that the variable of length of service did not reveal any differentiation in the perceptions of

teachers' policy. In support of the Findings of the research, Alp (2010), Helvacı and Kayalı (2011) and Akbaş and Bozkurt Bostancı (2019) found in their studies that the variable of years of service did not reveal any differentiation in the perceptions of teachers' policy. Unlike the Findings of the research, Gencer (2018) makes out that any differences do not appear in the games of patronise, expertise, budgeting, empire, making an alliance according to teachers' duty period, however teachers that have a long duty period at school percept higher up in the game of sponsorship. In his study, Doğan (2020) stated that the level of power center games behavior was higher in the sub-dimension of expertise of school principals with a working period of 3-6 years at school; Ayhan (2013) and Donald, Bertha and Lucia (2016) stated in their studies that the political perceptions of the employees increase according to increasing of working period in the organization. Ferris et al. (1996) and Oruç (2015), on the other hand, concluded in their studies that the political perceptions of the employees decrease as the working period in the organization increases. In his study, Erol (2014) stated that according to the variable of seniority, instructors who have worked for less than 10 years in education faculties perceive the organizational environment more politically than those who have worked for 20 years or more. The working time of the employees in an organization has an important effect on the formation of political power in the organization. Both the employees who have more working time in the organization, getting to know the work environment better and the experiences they have; As a result of our culture's respect for labor and seniority, it can be thought that employees who have more working hours have higher political competence (Demirci, 2014). In addition, the fact that opportunities of taking initiative and agreeing the decisions related to work of teachers taking place in centralize institution in system of educational are limited (Yılmaz ve Sarpkaya, 2009), the fact that teachers are not expectant for career has being directed the teachers for different things and is to provide a role as a political performer. Thus, experienced teachers can become more competent in using political games. According to the opinions of the teachers, PCFGBSP levels in terms of the school type variable; There is no significant difference for sponsorship, alliance building and expertise dimensions, but a statistically significant difference has emerged in favor of secondary school teachers according to the school type variable in the sub-dimensions of patronage, empire and budgeting. In line with this result, it can be stated that teachers working in secondary schools have a higher level of understanding of achieving organizational aims than teachers working in kindergarten, primary school and high school due to the age group they work in and the characteristics that these age groups have imposed on them in our current education system. With this result, it can be thought that the school principals working in secondary schools exhibit more power center forming games. In the statements of the teachers working in secondary school in the interviews had in the qualitative part of the research; He states that school principals have a individual system and that teachers are happy to work with this school principal. I think that the school principal organizes the distribution of work and responsibilities in reason. As for another teacher's opinion, It is stated that school

principal does not have sufficient knowledge about the legislation and whoever causes many problems, the school principal acknowledges teacher who cause problem to be right. The answers given by the teachers to the interview questions in the qualitative dimension of the study support these Findings. In the interviews with the teachers, it is seen that the perception levels of the teachers working in kindergarten, primary school and high school about the PCFGSP behaviors are lower than the teachers working in the secondary school, based on the opinions expressed for the dimensions of patronise, empire and budgeting. In support of the findings of the research, Doğan (2020), in his study, shows that secondary school principals' power center forming games behavior levels are higher in the sub-dimensions of making an alliance and budgeting, according to the variable of school type. In the study of Korucuoğlu (2016), it is seen that there is a significant difference in power play perceptions in favor of teachers working in secondary and high schools according to the school type variable. In the studies of Medwick (1996) and Uzun (2019), it is seen that there is a significant difference in the variable of school type. Unlike the Findings of this research, Yorulmaz (2014) found that there was no significant difference in terms of the type of school variable that the teachers were working in according to their perceptions. According to the opinions of the teachers, OMGMOO levels in terms of any union membership status variable; it is seen that there is no significant difference for the sub-dimensions of sponsorship, patronise, making an alliance, expertise and budgeting. In his study, Aydın (2015) concluded that there was no differentiation in the behavior of the teachers according to the union membership variable. In the study of Doğan (2020), it was found that power center forming games of school principals differ according to the variable of being a member of any union. On the other hand, in PCFGBSP behaviors, it is seen that school principals who are members of any union have higher levels of power center games behavior in the sub-dimension of expertise than school principals who are not members of the union. From this point of view, it can be stated that the preparation studies for the members of the unions before the manager selection exam held by the Ministry of National Education contributed to the formation of this difference. It can be stated that this situation, which arises by assuming that union membership can contribute to organizational solidarity, may reflect on the school administration in different ways.

5. Recommendations

According to the results obtained in the research, the following suggestions were made:

- Along with power-center forming games that can be used by school principals, research on other political games that are not covered in the research can also be conducted.
- Studies based on survey can also be conducted to reveal the effect of power-center forming games on employees selected from different sectors.
- The sample of this research consisted of teachers working in public schools in the Onikişubat and Dulkadiroğlu districts of Kahramanmaraş. Comparisons can be made by repeating the research in different populations.

- Education can be given to school principals on educational administration, management processes and organizational behavior so that they can use power-center forming games in administration.
- Within the framework of the Findings obtained from our research, by being accepted the existence in schools of power-center forming games and practices can be organized to reveal the underlying causes of these games.
- According to the result that school principals use the budgeting game, one of the power-center forming games, in the research; More resources should be allocated to schools so that school principals do not need to use this game.

References

- Akbaş, A., & Bozkurt Bostancı, A. (2019). The relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational policy and emotional labor levels. *Uşak University Journal of Educational Research*, 5(3), 44-63
- Alp, F. (2010). *A Research on The Effect of Political Behavior on Resistance to Change*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Istanbul: Marmara University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2012). The relationship between the power sources used by school administrators and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. *Educational Sciences in Theory and Practice*, pp. 1833-1852
- Atay, S. (2010). Improvable managerial skill: political skill with theoretical and empirical aspects. *Journal of Amme Administration*, 43(2), 65-80.
- Aydin, M. A. (2015). *The Relationship Between Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Opposition, Organizational Politics and Political Behavior*. Unpublished Master' Thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu: Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Ayhan, O., & Gürbüz, S. (2013, 30 May-1 June). The role of the organizational policy of emotional commitment in the effect of intention of leave of employment: A study on public and private sector employees. *Verbal Statement. 21st Management and Organization Congress, Kütaahya*.
- Büyük, Y., Erden, P., & Aydoğan, E. (2016). The relationship between employee' participation in decisions and organizational policy perception. *Journal of Business Studies*, 8(1), 100-116.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2019). *New Structure and Behavior in School Administration*. Ankara: Pegem Academy Publications, 250p.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & S. Demirel, F., (2019). *Scientific Research Method*. Pegem Academy: Ankara, 350.
- Cacciattolo, K. (2014). Defining organisational politics. *European Ecientific Journal*. August Special Edition, 238-246.
- Can, A. (2019). *Quantitative Data Analysis in Scientific Research Process With SPSS*. Ankara: Pegem Academy, 429p
- Comert, M. (2014). *Examining The Relationship Between The Organizational Commitment Levels of Teachers and The Organizational Power Sources Used by School Principals*. Unpublished Master' Thesis. Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Institute of Social Sciences, Kahramanmaraş.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2014). *Mixed Methods Research: Design and Execution*. Ankara: Anı Publishing, 376p.
- Davey, K. M. (2008). Women's accounts of organizational politics as a gendering process. *Gender, Work And Organization*, 15(6), 650-671.
- Dogan, M. (2020). Examination of school principals' power center forming games behaviors according to demographic variables. *Journal of Mustafa Kemal University Faculty of Education*, 4(6), 160-178.
- Donald, M. F., Bertha, L. & Lucia, M. E. (2016). Perceived organzational politics influences on organizational commitment among supporting staff members at a selected higher education institution. *The 2016 Wei International Academic Conference Proceedings*, Vienna, Austria.

- Erol, E. (2014). *The Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Organizational Policy Perception in Education Faculties*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Denizli: Pamukkale University Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Ersoy, S. (2020). *The Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Power Sources Used by School Administrators and Organizational Justice Perceptions*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Kahramanmaraş: Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Ertem, M. (2011). *Organizational Culture and Political Behavior Perceptions: A Research to Identify Differences and Relationships*. Unpublished Master' Thesis, Kayseri: Erciyes University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Eryilmaz, I. (2014). *The Effect of Organizational Climate on Perceived Organizational Policy: A Research in The Public Sector*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Manisa: Celal Bayar University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational politics. *Journal of Management*, 18(1), 93-116.
- Eryilmaz, İ. (2014). *The effect of organizational climate on perceived organizational policy: A research in the public sector*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Manisa: Celal Bayar University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Ferris, G. R., Dwight, D. Frink, M. C. G. , Jing Z., Kacmar, K. M. & Howard, J. L. (1996). Perceptions of organizational politics: prediction. *Stress-Related Implications, And Outcomes. Human Relations*, 49(2), 233–266.
- Gencer, M. (2018). *The Effect of Power Center Forming Games on Organizational Silence and Organizational Socialization*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Denizli: Pamukkale University Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Gencer, M., Tok, T. N., & Ordu, A. (2018). Developing the power center forming games scale used by school principals: validity and reliability study. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 5 (2), 274–288
- Gibson, J. G., Ivancevich, J. M. & Donnelly, J. H. (1988). *Organizations*. (Six Edition). Illinois: Business Publications.
- Harris, K. J., Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). The moderating effects of justice on the relationship between organizational politics and workplace attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(2), 135-144.
- Helvacı, M. A., and Kayalı, M. (2011). Examination of organizational power sources used by school principals in terms of some variables. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Faculty of Education Journal*, 255 - 279.
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (2015). *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice* (from 7th Edition Trans.Ed. S. Turan). Ankara: Nobel Academy Publishing, 494p.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: a research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Kahramanmaraş Mem., (2020). "2020-2021 provincial-wide statistical information", K.Maraş provincial directorate of national education strategy development unit. https://kmaras.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2020_03/01165312_2020_YSTATYS.pdf (30.07.2020).
- Karademir, M. & Çillioğlu Karademir, A. (2015). Political behavior and mintzberg's political games: example of organized criminal Enstitutions with godfather film analysis. *European Scientific Journal*, 11 (14), 1-22.

- Kayali, M., (2011). Power sources used by school principals (Uşak province example). Unpublished Master Thesis, Uşak University Institute of Social Sciences, Uşak.
- Kesgen, J. (1999). *Organizational Policy and Implications*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Korucuoglu, T. (2016). *The Relationship Between Organizational Power Games and Organizational Opposition*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Eskişehir: Eskişehir Osmangazi University Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Korucuoğlu, T., & Şentürk, İ. (2018). The relationship between organizational power games and organizational opposition (in the context of teachers working in primary and secondary schools). *Hacettepe University Faculty of Education Journal*, 35(2), 428-447.
- Mann, S. (1995). Politics and power in organizations: why women lose out. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 16(2).
- Medwick, J. (1996). *An Analysis of The Political Games Played Between and Among Faculty at The K-5 or K-6 Elementary School Levels*. Northern Illinois University.
- Mehtap, O. (2011). *The Effect of Organizational Political Behaviors on Organizational Citizenship Behavior*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Istanbul: Istanbul University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Memduhoğlu, H. B., & Turan, M. (2016). The level of use of organizational power resources by primary school principals according to teachers' opinions. *Marmara University Atatürk Education Faculty Journal of Educational Sciences*. 44:73-89.
- Memduhoğlu, H. & Yılmaz, K. (2017). *New Approaches in Management*. Ankara: Pagem Academy, 556p.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and Around Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prenticehall, INJ. [Electronic Version]. Obtained from <http://www.mintzberg.Org/> (06.07.2021)
- Mintzberg, H. (1985). The organization as political arena. *Journal of Management Studies*, 22(2), 133-154.
- Mohan Bursali, Y. (2008). *The Functioning of Organizational Politics: The Relationships Between Organizational Policy Perception and Political Behavior*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Mohan Bursali, Y., Kızıloğlu, M. & Bayrak Kök, S. (2018). *Power and Politics in Organizational Life*. Ankara: Night Academy, 248p.
- Morrison, E.W. & Milliken, F.J. (2000). Organizational silence: a barrier to change and development in a pluralistic World. *Academy of Management Review*, 25 (4), 706- 725.
- Oruc, E. (2015). *The Effect of Positive Psychological Capital on Political Behavior: A Study on Academics*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Adapazarı: Sakarya University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Şahin, A. (2004). Relationship between management theories and motivation. *Selçuk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 11, 523-547.
- Robbins, S. P. & Judge T. A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior* (trans. ed. Erdem, İ.). Ankara: Nobel Publishing, 666p.
- Rousseau, J. J. (2012). *Social Contract*. (Vedat Gunyol, ed.). (9th ed.). Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Publications. [Electronic version]. Obtained from <https://ismetparlak.files.wordpress.com/2013/10/jean-jacques-rousseau-toplumsozlesmesi.pdf>.
- Shaloot, A. (2016). *The Effect of Organizational Climate, Trust, Desire For Control, and Knowledge Distribution on Perceived Organizational Policy*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Istanbul: Marmara University Institute of Social Sciences.

- Shaver, S. P. (2003). *Organizational Power and Politics: More Than Meets The Eye in Program Planning*. National-Louis University.
- Terzioğlu, F. & Taşkın, L. (2008). Reflections of women's gender role on leadership behaviors and nursing profession. *C.U. Journal of the School of Nursing*, 12(2), 62-67.
- Turabik, T. (2019). *The Relationship Between Organizational Democracy and Political Behaviors in Higher Education Organizations*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ankara: Hacettepe University Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Uğurlu, Z. Kiral, E. & Aksoy, İ. G. (2011). Organizational socialization strategies and tactics used by teachers in their socialization according to the opinions of primary school administrators. *Oral Presentation, 2nd International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, Antalya.
- Long, M. (2019). *The Relationship Between The Organizational Power Sources Used by The Administrators and The Teachers' Dedication to Work (The Case of Kahramanmaraş Province)*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Kahramanmaraş: Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Vigoda, E. (2000). The relationship between organizational politics, job attitudes, and work outcomes: exploration and implications for the public sector. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57, 326-347.
- Yazıcı, E., Nartgün, Ş. S. & Özhan, T. (2015). Political games in universities: a case study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 2700–2712.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2016). *Qualitative Research Methods in The Social Sciences* (10th Edition). Ankara: Seçkin Publishing, 446p.
- Yılmaz, S. (2008). *Power and Politics*. Istanbul Alfa Printing Publishing Distribution Ltd. Sti, 624p.
- Yorulmaz, A. (2014). *Organizational Power Sources and Usage Levels of School Administrators in Secondary Education Institutions*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara: Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (**CC BY-NC-ND**) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)