# Power Types Used in Classroom Management

## *Remzi Yıldırım

**Abstract:** In this study it is aimed to examine the usage of power types during the classroom management process. Its scope is which power types used and how these power types used by teaching staff at higher education. In this study general survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods, was used. The data was collected with power types scale which is developed especially for higher education. The population of the study is MCBU Faculty of Education in 2021 Spring Term and reached about 348 prospective teachers as the sample of study. According to the findings of the study it can be said that the usage of individual power, the charismatic power, the knowledge power, the expert power, and the tolerance power are used at high level, the usage of legitimate power is at a lower level than the usage of other powers. And the usage of coercive power has been seen at the lowest level. The results support the literature, and especially it can be said that the usage of individual powers creates positive learning environment. There has been meaningful differs according to the gender and the departments of prospective teachers. Usage of power types shows meaningful differ, in favour of female prospective teachers. Also, Turkish Language Teaching Department shows meaningful differ in usage of power types.

**Keywords.** Power types, classroom management, prospective teachers, teaching staff.

**\*(Responsible Author).** Dr., Manisa Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Education, Manisa, Turkey

e-mail: yildirimremzi@hotmail.com

People come together to achieve their common goals and establish some structures which are called as organizations. Classroom is an educational organization which is established around educational goals and classroom management needs good management skills. There are some ways of influence that managers use to direct and coordinate the behavior of individuals in organizations (Aydın, 2010). It can be said that the most crucial point during the classroom management process is influencing others. Influencing or making an impact during the classroom management can help the teaching staff and the learners to reach the success of the learning process. Classical organization theory puts power in the center of the management process (Pondy, 1966). According to Greenberg & Baron (1997) power is the ability of influencing others. In other words, power is the ability to lead others to the goal. Researches show that there is a senior relationship between using power sources and influencing others or making impact on individuals (Mintzberg, 1983; Hoy & Miskel, 2012; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tiacey, 1992). The essence of organizational success is recorded in power and organizations need power (Clegg, Courpasson & Phillips, 2006).

There are some power sources. Power sources can be classified in many ways (Nesler, et al., 1999). French and Raven's classification as coercive, rewarding, legitimate, expert, and charismatic power was created because of theoretical and experimental research (Koşar, 2012). Legitimate power is authority based on the leader's position; reward power is the leader's control over the employee's desired reward; coercive power is punishment as opposed to rewarding; expert power is the leader's special talents, knowledge and skills; charismatic power is the strong influence of the leader (Can, 2010). These power sources can be summarized as like this; legal power is a source of power given by laws to the authority, reward power creates positive effect on the members of the organization and should be used fairly, coercive power must be applied under law and explanations about the usage of this power should be given before, expert power is based on knowledge and has a significant influence in persuasion others, charismatic power is an inspire source and it changes from one to other. Another classification about power sources has also made by Aslanargun & Eriş (2013). They have continued their research about power sources in higher education and they have tried to explain the power sources used by the teaching staff during the classroom management. They had carried their study about power sources used in higher education with adult learners and they had reached seven dimensions which are named as; individual power, coercive power, charismatic power, knowledge power, expert power, legitimate power and tolerance power.

Higher education is also one of the educational organizations and it can be said that the higher education process has a unique structure. It has also classroom management processes which is

done by teaching staff with different titles. Considering the fact that the participants who continue higher education are adult learners, considering which power sources applied in the higher education process and considering the effect of the usage these power sources have occurred a problem situation that needs to be evaluated. Adult learners need different motivational tools and adult learners' priorities may show differences from other educational processes. According to Akkoyunlu (2008) adult learners have capabilities of using technology, learning in different ways, asking questions, looking critically, doing researches, distinguishing the valuable one, recognizing what needs to be learned and acting in a planned learning process. So, the effecting adult learners or in other saying motivating adult learners during the learning processes brings some special education necessities for teaching staff who takes roles as an educator dealing with adult learners. Usage the power sources as an effective tool for upgrading the qualities of the learning process makes the adult educator training process compulsory. Ültanır and Ültanır (2005) pointed out this issue as the lack of an institution that trains adult educators in our country. And, Kurt (2008) also stated out this situation as the shortage of qualified personnel in adult education.

These kinds of cases; the power sources used in classroom management process at higher education process, higher education properties as including adult learners in its structure and the capability of teaching staff in adult education give the importance of the research. The targeted aim of the study is exposing which power types are used in higher education and what are the sense of their effect on adult learners. This situation attracted the attention of the researcher and in this sense, the research problem situation and sub-problems were formed as follows.

*Problem statement:*

What are the power types used in classroom management process at higher education?

*Sub – problem statements:*

1.  What are the descriptive statistics about the power types used in classroom management process at higher education?
2.  Is there a meaningful differ about the power types used in classroom management process according to the gender of the participants?
3.  Is there a meaningful differ about the power types used in classroom management process according to the department of the participants?

## Method

In method part the research model, study group, data collection tool, process and data analysis has been explained and information about these sub parts has been given.

### Research Model

Quantitative research methods with general survey model were used in this study. Quantitative research methods are evaluated as positive opinion and the subject of the study can be observed, measured, and analyzed in an objective and independent way (Büyüköztürk, et al., 2013). The subject studied in the researches can be applied with the whole population or with the sample represents the population by the help of general survey model (Şimşek, 2012; Karasar, 2012). General survey model can reflect the reality as it is in real.

### Study Group

Manisa Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Education was determined as the population of this research. In 2021 spring term 1733 prospective teachers were having education in MCBU Faculty of Education and they were determined as the population of the research. According to 95% confidence level and 5% error margin calculation as Şahin (2012) pointed out, it was tried to reach at least 315 prospective teachers in this meaning. The sampling was done first by using stratified sampling method according to department and gender of the prospective teachers, then random sampling method was used for creating the sample of the study. In this way 348 prospective teachers were reached as the sample of the study as shown in Table 1.

Table 1.

*Population and the sample status of the study*

| Department | N (Female) | N (Male) | N (Total) | n (female) | n (male) | n (total) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Teaching | 182 | 95 | 277 | 37 | 19 | 56 |
| Mathematics at Primary School Level Teaching | 121 | 66 | 187 | 24 | 13 | 37 |
| Guidance and Psychological Counseling | 175 | 116 | 291 | 35 | 23 | 58 |
| Primary School Level Teaching | 258 | 110 | 368 | 52 | 22 | 74 |
| Social Studies Teaching | 209 | 110 | 319 | 42 | 22 | 64 |
| Turkish Language Teaching | 118 | 173 | 291 | 24 | 35 | 59 |
| **Total** | **1063** | **670** | **1733** | **214** | **134** | **348** |

**Data Collection Tool**

In this study the **Power Sources Scale** that lecturers applied in class management at higher education (Aslanargun & Eriş, 2013) were used. It was developed with the joining of 273 graduates from the Düzce University, Faculty of Technical Education, Teaching Departments of Computing, Electric, Design, Construction, Furniture and Decoration. Final form of the scale has been formed within 33 items which had 40 items at the beginning. As the researchers of the scale reported the KMO value of AFM scale is. 894 which is meaningful above than critical level of 70 and the value of Barlett test is meaningful on the level of 01. They have also reported that the scale provided 53.318% of total variance after factor analysis had been applied. They have found 7 dimensions at the final form of the scale and these 7 dimensions were named as Individual Power, Coercive Power, Charismatic Power, Knowledge Power, Expert Power, Legitimate Power and Tolerance Power.

**Process**

Data collection process were followed in this way: First usage permission of the scale was requested from the developers of the scale. After getting the usage permission of the scale, the applying permission of the scale was requested from MCBU Faculty of Education. Following the completion of the permission procedures collecting data process has been started. The data was collected from prospective teachers having education at six different department as told in study group part. Especially volunteer participant joining has been cared and supplied during the data collection process. The data was collected with the help of Microsoft Forms application. During the data collection process, 365 data were collected, 17 data were canceled due to some deficiencies and the data collection process was completed with 348 participants.

**Data Analysis**

The collected data within the scope of the study was analyzed by SPSS 23 program and significance level was taken as .05. Firstly, the collected data was tested to see if the data set is distributing normally or not. The normality test was done with the Kolmogorov Smirnov Test by using SPPS 23 program. The results of the normality test have showed that the collected data hadn't distributed normally (p=.00). For all subdimensions and for whole of the scale the data hadn't distributed normally, and usage of nonparametric test were decided according to the normality tests. So nonparametric tests were applied while analyzing the data.

During the evaluation process of descriptive statistics as mentioned at the first sub – problem minimum, maximum, arithmetic mean and standard deviation values were used. While dealing with second sub – problem which is about if there is a meaningful difference according to the gender of the prospective teachers or not, Mann Whitney U Analysis was used as a necessity of nonparametric tests. Kruskal Wallis Analysis were used for the third sub – problem to see the meaningful differ of prospective teachers' departments. And by the help of Dunn Analysis the direction of the meaningful differs according to the department of prospective teachers has been revealed.

## Results

In results chapter the findings have been presented according to the analyses of the data. The findings have been presented in order of the sub – problem statements.

**Findings about First Sub – Problem Statement**

First sub – problem statement of the study is what the descriptive statistics about the power types used in classroom management process are at higher education. The findings, about first sub – problem statement, are as shown in Table 2.

Table 2.

*Descriptive statistics about the power types used in classroom management process at higher education*

| Dimensions | n | Minimum | Maximum | $\bar{x}$ | sd |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Power Sources / Individual Power | 348 | 15 | 43 | 31.28 | 6.385 |
| Power Sources / Coercive Power | 348 | 6 | 16 | 11.78 | 2.036 |
| Power Sources / Charismatic Power | 348 | 12 | 33 | 23.32 | 3.821 |
| Power Sources / Knowledge Power | 348 | 7 | 20 | 14.20 | 2.188 |
| Power Sources / Expert Power | 348 | 5 | 15 | 9.88 | 1.916 |
| Power Sources / Legitimate Power | 348 | 2 | 10 | 5.97 | 1.321 |
| Power Sources / Tolerance Power | 348 | 3 | 10 | 6.77 | 1.398 |
| Power Sources / Whole | 348 | 78 | 132 | 103.19 | 91.150 |

The arithmetic means of the power types used in classroom management process at higher education is 103.19 points which means as "often" and can be qualified as high score as expected. According to the prospective teachers the usage of power types during the classroom management

is high and it can be said that the teaching staff is sufficient in using power sources for the benefit of teaching process.

When the arithmetic means of the sub – dimensions are reviewed it can be said that individual power ($\bar{x}$=31.28), charismatic power ($\bar{x}$=23.32), knowledge power ($\bar{x}$=14.20), expert power ($\bar{x}$=9.88) and tolerance power ($\bar{x}$=6.77) scores are qualified as having high scores (often) while legitimate power ($\bar{x}$=5.97) is a little bit lower (sometimes) as expected. The data shows that teaching staff is good at using power sources for the benefit of prospective teachers' learning process. In addition to this, it can be said that they sometimes use legitimate power as a requirement of their responsibilities. Another satisfactory result is that the use of coercive power ($\bar{x}$=11.78) remains low (rarely). According to the results retrieved from the data of the study, teaching staff rarely needs to use coercive power in classroom management process. So whole data and sub – dimensions show that the usage of power sources has a positive atmosphere in classroom management and learning process.

In the whole scale the minimum mean scored item belongs to coercive power dimension. The item which is about behaving inconsistently has got the lowest mean point ($\bar{x}$=1.71) according to the prospective teachers. The highest mean scored ($\bar{x}$=4.11) item belongs to tolerance power dimension. The item which is about showing tolerance about attendance has got the highest mean point according to the prospective teachers.

**Findings about Second Sub – Problem Statement**

Second sub – problem statement of the study if there is a meaningful differ about the power types used in classroom management process according to the gender of the participants or not. The findings, about second sub – problem statement, are as shown in Table 3.

By the help of the findings shown in Table 3, the total scores of the prospective teachers' perceptions on power sources used by teaching staff and the dimensions of individual and coercive power have significant differs by gender, in favor of female prospective teachers (p <.05). No significant differs by gender have been detected in other subdimensions as charismatic, knowledge, expert, legitimate and tolerance powers (p> .05).

Table 3.

*Mann Whitney U Analysis about the power types used in classroom management process at higher education according to the gender of the prospective teachers*

| Dimensions | Gender | n | Mean Rank | Rank Sum | U | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Power Sources / Individual Power | Female | 214 | 191.82 | 41048.50 | 10632.50 | .000 |
| | Male | 134 | 146.85 | 19677.50 | | |
| Power Sources / Coercive Power | Female | 214 | 188.35 | 40307.50 | 11373.50 | .001 |
| | Male | 134 | 152.38 | 20418.50 | | |
| Power Sources / Charismatic Power | Female | 214 | 170.65 | 36520.00 | 13515.00 | .366 |
| | Male | 134 | 180.64 | 24206.00 | | |
| Power Sources / Knowledge Power | Female | 214 | 169.13 | 36194.00 | 13189.00 | .204 |
| | Male | 134 | 183.07 | 24532.00 | | |
| Power Sources / Expert Power | Female | 214 | 169.32 | 36235.00 | 13230.00 | .219 |
| | Male | 134 | 182.77 | 24491.00 | | |
| Power Sources / Legitimate Power | Female | 214 | 172.86 | 36991.50 | 13986.50 | .691 |
| | Male | 134 | 177.12 | 23734.50 | | |
| Power Sources / Tolerance Power | Female | 214 | 169.91 | 36360.00 | 13355.00 | .267 |
| | Male | 134 | 181.84 | 24366.00 | | |
| Power Sources / Whole | Female | 214 | 185.58 | 39714.50 | 11966.50 | .009 |
| | Male | 134 | 156.80 | 21011.50 | | |

## Findings about Third Sub – Problem Statement

Third sub – problem statement of the study if there is a meaningful differ about the power types used in classroom management process according to the department of the participants or not. The findings, about third sub – problem statement, are as shown in Table 4.

By the help of the findings shown in Table 4, the total scores of the prospective teachers' perceptions; on whole power sources ($X^2$=68.44, *df*=5, *p*=.000), on individual power dimension ($X^2$=185.57, *df*=5, *p*=.000) and on charismatic power dimension ($X^2$=12.85, *df*=5, *p*=.025) have significant differs by their departments. No significant differs by their departments have been detected in other subdimensions; coercive power ($X^2$=8.33, *df*=5, *p*=.139), knowledge power ($X^2$=5.21, *df*=5, *p*=.390), expert power ($X^2$=5.15, *df*=5, *p*=.397), legitimate power ($X^2$=3.87, *df*=5, *p*=.568) and tolerance power ($X^2$=10.66, *df*=5, *p*=.059).

Table 4.

*Kruskal Wallis Analysis about the power types used in classroom management process at higher education according to the department of the prospective teachers*

| Dimensions | Department | n | Mean Rank | X² | df | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Power Sources / Individual Power | Science Teaching | 56 | 245.36 | 185.57 | 5 | .000 |
| | Math. at Primary School Level Teaching | 37 | 228.01 | | | |
| | Guidance and Psychological Counseling | 58 | 224.81 | | | |
| | Primary School Level Teaching | 74 | 202.80 | | | |
| | Social Studies Teaching | 64 | 133.02 | | | |
| | Turkish Language Teaching | 59 | 33.74 | | | |
| Power Sources / Coercive Power | Science Teaching | 56 | 180.47 | 8.33 | 5 | .139 |
| | Math. at Primary School Level Teaching | 37 | 190.86 | | | |
| | Guidance and Psychological Counseling | 58 | 183.31 | | | |
| | Primary School Level Teaching | 74 | 179.32 | | | |
| | Social Studies Teaching | 64 | 176.87 | | | |
| | Turkish Language Teaching | 59 | 141.29 | | | |
| Power Sources / Charismatic Power | Science Teaching | 56 | 142.29 | 12.85 | 5 | .025 |
| | Math. at Primary School Level Teaching | 37 | 187.47 | | | |
| | Guidance and Psychological Counseling | 58 | 184.41 | | | |
| | Primary School Level Teaching | 74 | 157.92 | | | |
| | Social Studies Teaching | 64 | 183.29 | | | |
| | Turkish Language Teaching | 59 | 198.47 | | | |
| Power Sources / Knowledge Power | Science Teaching | 56 | 177.32 | 5.21 | 5 | .390 |
| | Math. at Primary School Level Teaching | 37 | 185.70 | | | |
| | Guidance and Psychological Counseling | 58 | 162.80 | | | |
| | Primary School Level Teaching | 74 | 161.08 | | | |
| | Social Studies Teaching | 64 | 172.63 | | | |
| | Turkish Language Teaching | 59 | 195.16 | | | |
| Power Sources / Expert Power | Science Teaching | 56 | 185.79 | 5.15 | 5 | .397 |
| | Math. at Primary School Level Teaching | 37 | 179.66 | | | |
| | Guidance and Psychological Counseling | 58 | 186.76 | | | |
| | Primary School Level Teaching | 74 | 159.76 | | | |
| | Social Studies Teaching | 64 | 159.83 | | | |
| | Turkish Language Teaching | 59 | 182.90 | | | |
| Power Sources / Legitimate Power | Science Teaching | 56 | 181.55 | 3.87 | 5 | .568 |
| | Math. at Primary School Level Teaching | 37 | 165.38 | | | |
| | Guidance and Psychological Counseling | 58 | 161.47 | | | |
| | Primary School Level Teaching | 74 | 187.17 | | | |
| | Social Studies Teaching | 64 | 180.58 | | | |
| | Turkish Language Teaching | 59 | 163.86 | | | |
| Power Sources / Tolerance Power | Science Teaching | 56 | 156.47 | 10.66 | 5 | .059 |
| | Math. at Primary School Level Teaching | 37 | 144.32 | | | |
| | Guidance and Psychological Counseling | 58 | 166.27 | | | |
| | Primary School Level Teaching | 74 | 181.85 | | | |
| | Social Studies Teaching | 64 | 198.52 | | | |
| | Turkish Language Teaching | 59 | 183.36 | | | |
| Power Sources / Whole | Science Teaching | 56 | 208.68 | 68.44 | 5 | .000 |
| | Math. at Primary School Level Teaching | 37 | 211.55 | | | |
| | Guidance and Psychological Counseling | 58 | 209.65 | | | |
| | Primary School Level Teaching | 74 | 187.02 | | | |
| | Social Studies Teaching | 64 | 159.91 | | | |
| | Turkish Language Teaching | 59 | 84.40 | | | |

The direction of the meaningful differ about the total scores of the prospective teachers' perceptions on whole power sources has been found by Dunn Analysis as shown in Table 5.

Table 5.

*Dunn Analysis showing the groups differing the scores received by prospective teachers within the scope of the whole of power sources scale*

| Groups having differ | P |
|---|---|
| Turkish Language Teaching-Social Studies Teaching | .000 |
| Turkish Language Teaching-Primary School Level Teaching | .000 |
| Turkish Language Teaching-Science Teaching | .000 |
| Turkish Language Teaching-Guidance and Psychological Counseling | .000 |
| Turkish Language Teaching-Mathematics at Primary School Level Teaching | .000 |

As seen by the help of Dunn Analysis shown on Table 5, Turkish Language Teaching Department scores shows meaningful differ (p<.05) in using power sources during the classroom management process. Turkish Language Teaching has meaningful differs from other departments in teaching staff power source usage.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Organizations have managements, and the foremost task of management is to motivate the members of the organization to mobilize around common goals. While doing that, some power sources can be used. Power sources are divided into two main categories named as individual power and authority power (Karaman, 1999; Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborn. 2000). It can be said that individual power sources get more effective responses from the on stakeholders of the organizations (Navandi ve Malekzadeh, 1999). Schools are the educational organizations and classroom management is the core of these organizations. The power sources usage in classroom management process at higher education can be mentioned as successful as the result of the study based on the findings. Findings show that power sources have been used properly by teaching staff. The details about the usage of power sources could be seen at the findings part of the study as mentioned. In that meaning it can be said that teaching staff is especially good at using individual powers which have more effects on audiences. In this study it can be summarized like that the individual power, the charismatic power, the knowledge power, the expert power, and the tolerance power are used at high level as the result of the study. And while the usage of legitimate power is at a lower level than the usage of other powers, the usage of coercive power is at the lowest level. The results of the study show similarities with the results of Uzun and Özdem's (2018) study.

As Bağcı (2015) mentioned the usage of coercive power lowers the motivation of the organization participants. Considering that educational organizations have predominantly informal structures, it can be said that this situation becomes more important. While the usage of legitimate power and coercive power reducing the motivation of participants, usage of other power types especially related with individual powers which are known as charismatic power, knowledge power, expertise power rise the motivation of the organization members. According to Warren (1968) there is a strong relationship between expert power and charismatic power while a weak relationship is observed between legitimate power and coercive power. Usage of legitimate power and coercive power strains relationships between the members of the organizations. Hoy & Miskel (2012) states that avoiding from using coercive power, supplies a positive environment for the process.

Besides the results of the study as supported the literature about usage of power types, the results of the study show that some meaningful differs according to the genders and the departments of prospective teachers. But it must be said that explaining these differs is far away because of the limitations of this research, or not having data in this way for explaining these differs.

## Recommendations

It can be recommended for researchers to conduct further research into the significant differences that occur in the use of power supplies by gender and by department.

For the classroom management process, trainings to increase the awareness of teaching staff in the use of power resources and creating platforms where information exchange can be provided in this direction can be recommended.

## About Author

**Author:** Remzi Yıldırım is a member of Manisa Celal Bayar University. He works at the Faculty of Education. He is currently working at the Educational Sciences Department. He completed his doctorate at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University and his subject is on Educational Administration. He mainly works in the fields of Educational Administration, Lifelong Learning and Adult Learning.

## Conflict of Interest

It has been reported by the author that there is no conflict of interest.

## Funding

## Ethical Standards

I have carried out the research within the framework of the Helsinki Declaration; the participants were volunteers, informed consent has been obtained, etc. All measures have been taken regarding ethics.

## ORCID

Remzi Yıldırım https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6918-5416

# References

Akkoyunlu, B. (2008). Bilgi okuryazarlığı ve yaşam boyu öğrenme. *International Educational Technology Conference (IECT2008)*, May 6th, 2008. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Aslanargun, E. ve Eriş, H., M. (2013). Öğretim elemanlarının sınıf yönetiminde kullandıkları güç türleri ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17 (2), 207 – 220.

Aydın, M. (2010). *Eğitim Yönetimi* (9th Ed.). Ankara: Hatipoğlu Yayınları.

Bağcı, Z. (2015). The effect of managers' power bases on employees' job satisfaction: a study in the textile industry. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13 (3), 416 – 434.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2013). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri* (14th Ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Can, N. (2010). *Öğretmen Liderliği* (2nd Ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Clegg, S. R., Courpasson, D., & Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and Organizations*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (1997). *Behavior in Organizations* (6th Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice – Hall, Inc.

Hoy, W., K., & Miskel, C., G. (2012). *Eğitim Yönetimi: Teori, Araştırma ve Uygulama* (Trans. Ed. Turan, S.). Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

Karaman, A. (1999). *Profesyonel Yöneticilerde Güç Kullanımı*. İstanbul: Türkmen.

Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi* (24th Ed.) (in 79). Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

Koşar, S. (2012). Okul yönetiminde dinamikler: güç, politika ve etkileme. Özdemir, S. (Ed.), *Türk Eğitim Sistemi ve Okul Yönetimi* (1st Ed.) (in 96 – 123). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Kurt, İ. (2008). *Yetişkin Eğitimi* (1st Ed.). Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in And Around Organizations*. USA: Prentice – Hall, Inc.

Nahavandi, A., & Malekzadeh, A. R. (1999). *Organizational Behavior*. Newjersey: Prentice – Hall, Inc.

Nesler, M.S., Quigley, B.M., Aguinis, H, Lee, S.J. & Tedeschi, J.T. (1999). The development and validation of a scale measuring global social power based on French and Raven's power taxonomy, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29 (4), 750 – 771.

Pondy, L. R. (1966). A systems theory of organizational conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 9: 246 – 256.

Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2000). Organizational Behaviour (7th Ed.). USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Şahin, B. (2012). Metodoloji. Tanrıöğen, A. (Ed.), *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri* (3rd Ed.) (in 109 – 130). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Şimşek, A. (2012). *Araştırma modelleri*. Şimşek, A. (Ed.), Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri (1st Ed.) (in 80 – 107). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Uzun, T. & Özdem, G. (2018). Öğretim elemanlarının sınıf yönetiminde kullandıkları güç türlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *3rd International Symposium on Philosophy, Education, Art and History of Science*, 10th – 13th October 2018, Giresun.

Ültanır, E. ve Ültanır, G. (2005). Estonya, İngiltere ve Türkiye'de yetişkinler eğitiminde profesyonel standartlar. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1 (1), 1 – 23.

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychologly*, 75 (2), 132 – 140.

Yukl, G., & Tracey, B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (4), 525 – 535.