



## The Role of Leader Empowering Behaviours in Psychological Contract at High Schools \*

Seval Koçak <sup>1</sup>, Berrin Burgaz <sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

This research aims to identify the role of leader empowering behaviours in high school teachers' perceptions of psychological contract. The population of the study is composed of 21 high schools and 913 teachers in Usak. The stratification sampling method is employed, and 280 teachers from 21 school participated in the study. Teachers' perceptions of psychological contract at school is determined through the "Teachers' Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract Scale" and "School Principals' Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract" scale developed by Koçak (2016). The "Leader Empowering Behaviour Questionnaire" developed by Konczak, Stelly, and Trusty (2000) is used to identify teachers' perceptions regarding empowerment. Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation are used in data analysis. Additionally, Pearson Correlation Coefficient is used to measure the relationship between the variables, and hierarchal regression technique is employed for predictive analysis. The findings show that, there is a significant correlation between the levels of compliance with psychological contract of school principals and teachers. Thus, it was confirmed that psychological contract at schools is based on exchange theory. Further findings show that the Leader Empowering Behaviour subscales of coaching for innovative performance, skill development, information sharing and delegation of authority and accountability are positive predictors of teachers' level of compliance with psychological contract.

### Keywords

Psychological contract  
Compliance with psychological contact  
Mutual expectations at school  
Employee empowerment  
Leader empowering behaviours

### Article Info

Received: 01.23.2017  
Accepted: 07.04.2016  
Online Published: 08.20.2017

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2017.7101

\* This article is derived from Seval Koçak's PhD dissertation entitled "Comparison of the methods and their effectiveness levels used at between teachers and administrator-teacher conflicts: Example of Uşak province", conducted under the supervision of Berrin Burgaz. This article is also an extended version of the paper titled "The Role of Leader Empowering Behaviours in Psychological Contract at High Schools" and presented at the "III<sup>rd</sup> International Eurasian Educational Research Congress".

<sup>1</sup> Uşak University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational, Turkey, [sevalkocak85@gmail.com](mailto:sevalkocak85@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational, Turkey, [burgaz@hacettepe.edu.tr](mailto:burgaz@hacettepe.edu.tr)

## Introduction

The relationship between teacher productivity and school effectiveness increases the importance given to the job satisfaction of teachers. Maintaining teachers' job satisfaction and ensuring that they work effectively is related with the capacity of responding to their expectations and desires. Therefore, it is important to pay attention to the concept of psychological contract, which includes mutual obligations between teacher and manager, and the leadership behaviours that empower the teacher at school. This section provides an explanation of concepts which form the framework of the study and states the aim and importance of this research.

### *Psychological Contract*

Psychological contract was first introduced by Argyris (1960, p. 96) under the name of psychological work contract. Argyris argued that employees will perform well when managers respect the employees' culture and values and provide them with autonomy at work. Later, the concept was described by Levinson, Price, Munden, Mandl, and Solley (1962) as written and implicit expectations prior to starting work. Schein (1965, pp. 11-15) emphasized that this contract, which directs non-written and occupational behavior between employee-management, has a spiritual meaning, unlike economic expectations. On the other hand, Kotter (1973, p. 93) addresses the concept within the context of the contribution provided by the employer to the employees.

Employment relations have been the scene of significant changes and developments in terms of employees' and organizations' mutual obligations in 1980s (Baker, 2009). Especially with these individual-centered shifts, the concept has begun to be discussed on the basis of individual perceptions of mutual expectations from the perspective of Rousseau (1995). The idea that the psychological contract may differ according to the occupational perception and subjective situation forms the basis for the definitions made thereafter (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Herriot, Manning, & Kidd, 1997; Millward & Herriot, 2000). An example of such a definition is the individual perceptions that employees develop in their minds based on their interactions in the work environment and that determine mutual obligations in business relationships (Clutterbuck, 2005).

All these definitions argue that the psychological contract is based on individual perception of whether the promises are fulfilled or not. (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Lastly, the psychological contract is an advanced concept based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), which is described as the one's willingness to fulfill what is expected from him/her, and the reciprocity norm (Gouldner, 1960), which advocates the idea that individuals will provide benefit to the extent they benefit from the other party. Therefore, as Vroom (1964) stated in his theory of expectation, the individual should first believe that s/he will have a payoff or a prize that s/he prefers in return for the service. In this context, teachers' fulfillment of the obligations under the psychological contract seem to be related to the school management's fulfillment of the obligations.

Özdemir (2014, p. 6) states that effective human resource management at school may be possible with the *highest level of employee expectations of the school*. Rong (2009) argues that these expectations are more social-based rather than economic. When expectations such as career opportunities, material-nonmaterial rewards, and status or development opportunities are met, then the individual can make additional efforts, use his/her skills efficiently, and show loyalty and commitment to the organisation (Griffin & Moorhead, 2014, p. 64). Kotter (1973) offers a broader perspective and lists the expectations of employees from the organisation as follows: personal development opportunities, job enrichment, acquiring a variety of skills, status and prestige, collaborative work environment, disciplined, just and organised job structure, and effective feedback system. At the same time, the expectations of the organisation from the individuals are reaching the expected result by working efficiently and effectively, developing the knowledge and skills required by the job, efficient use of time, self-development for the benefit of the organisation, internalising the aims of the organisation, working effectively with everyone (senior and junior employees), and showing loyalty and commitment to the organisation.

This study focuses on psychological contract at schools and on school managers' and teachers' mutual expectations. Accordingly, teachers expect schools to care about their personal happiness; to be more just and understanding; to understand their education and development demands; to respond to guidance requests; to appreciate and reward their efforts; and to include them in the decision-making processes. On the other hand, school's expectations from teachers are addressed under the subscales of "efforts towards institutional development", "loyalty" and "extra performance". The effort towards institutional development is related to the use of professional knowledge and skills by teachers to increase school success and respect. The dimension of loyalty is assessed on the basis of emotions, such as continuing to work until retirement, seeing school problems as their own problems, and advocating the interests of schools. Extra performance is explained by the teachers' willingness to work extra in addition to what is expected of them or the legally assigned duties.

Studies show that psychological contract is an important tool in understanding human behavior in organizations. For example, studies examining the relationship between psychological contract perceptions and organizational commitment and citizenship behaviors emphasize the importance of psychological contract in organizations (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Doğan & Demiral, 2009; Hui, Lee, & Rousseau, 2004; Karcioğlu ve Türker, 2010; Lapointe, Vandenberghe, & Boudrias, 2013). Moreover, psychological contract and organizational trust (Atkinson, 2007; Kingshott, 2006; Yılmaz, 2012), job satisfaction (Dikili & Bayraktaroğlu, 2013; Gerber, Grote, Geiser, & Raeder, 2012; Özler & Ünver, 2012) and job performance (Turnley, Bolino, Lester, & Bloodgood, 2003) suggests that these behaviors within the organization are related to the psychological contract.

Although there are several research on the importance of the psychological contract in explaining human behavior in different organizations, there has been a relatively limited number of studies in school organizations. In one of the theoretical studies in the literature, the significance of positive perceptions towards psychological contract in terms of school productivity and effectiveness is stressed (Demirkasımoğlu, 2012a). Another research that looked into the teachers' psychological contact perceptions found out that mutual responsibilities displayed by teachers are at a high level whereas it was at a moderate level for school administration (Yılmaz & Altınkurt, 2012). On the other hand, Özdemir and Demircioğlu (2015) indicated that teachers tend to conform to the psychological contract moderately. As seen, teachers' expectations within the scope of psychological contract are not met at a sufficient level, and various problems emerge in teachers' perceptions towards psychological contract.

Studies looking into the correlation of psychological contract perceptions with different leadership behaviours are quite limited. Research examining the relationship of psychological contract with distributed leadership, leader-member interaction and teacher and school/manager rapport reveals that these variables have an effect on psychological contract (Özdemir & Demircioğlu, 2014; Gemalmaz, 2014; Demirkasımoğlu, 2012b). Related studies emphasize the importance of leadership behaviours on psychological contract. Therefore, it is important that other leadership behaviours that may affect psychological contract perceptions in a positive way are examined. In particular, it is necessary to examine whether *leader empowering behaviours* have an effect on psychological contract.

#### ***Leader Empowering Behaviours***

The concept of *employee empowerment*, which is associated with support provided by management to employees, was originally proposed by Block (1986). Employee empowerment is defined primarily as an employee's ability to make decisions on matters that concerns him/her without ever requiring orders or approval from a manager or senior employer. (Bowen & Lawler, 1992; Luthans, 2011). In another definition, it is expressed as providing employees with the authority in order motivate them to work in the most effective way for the organization (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

Erstad (1997) states that employee empowerment should not be seen as disempowerment of the leader, emphasizing that empowerment is an important tool for more effective use of organizational potential. In this context, there are important elements that leaders can take into consideration when empowering employees. Doğan (2003) emphasizes some of the elements as participation in management and decision making, transfer of authority and responsibility, information sharing process, innovation and education and training.

Participation in management is defined as the identification of the actions that employees should participate to work for organisational goals, determination of the progress of the institution, and partaking in various managerial actions (Rodrigues, 1994). In different definitions in the literature, it is associated with the employees' active role in the decision making process, their contribution to this process and their taking responsibility for the decisions taken (Eren, 2008; Koçel, 2007). Organizational benefits of employees' participation in decision making process are expressed as; easy adoption of new decisions and ensuring effective harmony, reinforcement of entrepreneurial sentiments, prevention of dysfunctional conflicts, feeling self-respect and confident, use of all potential (Mihçioğlu, 1983).

Delegation of authority is the transfer of the manager's rights to the employee, but the employee is still held accountable for the outcomes of the work they do (Yüksel & Erkutlu, 2003). In this way, employees' tendencies to take responsibility for the results of their own work can be improved. If they do not have the power to use initiative, the employees' reluctance to take responsibility can be regarded as a natural reaction.

Information sharing, as another empowering factor, is important in that the outcomes achieved are in line with the goals set at the beginning. In other words, the fact that the difference between the output and criterion is not big is related to the ability of employees to access all necessary information about their work. Within this context, if seniors transfer the full information to the juniors, they will have an opportunity to create a climate of confidence and can encourage employees to take responsibility and produce innovative ideas (Rothstein, 1995).

One of the key empowering elements that managers can use is to encourage their employees to use their talent, skills, points of view and entrepreneurial potentials for the organisational benefits and innovation (Gebert, Boerner, & Kearney, 2006). However, what is important here is that the managers should not approach the innovations with prejudice and support innovative ideas despite the risk of failure (Coleman, 1996; Özgen & Türk, 1997). Indeed, the ability of organizations to adapt to a rapidly changing world would be possible by embracing innovation in their organizational actions (Köhler et al., 2010).

An important element to be taken into account in the empowerment of employees is providing training facilities that will enable individuals to perform their tasks in the most efficient way. In this regard, Lincoln, Travers, Ackers, and Wilkinson (2002) consider education and training as one of the most powerful elements in empowering employees. As a matter of fact, education and training are of great importance in terms of developing skills to solve problems and access knowledge. In addition, leading employees within the framework of all these empowering elements is considered as a necessity for the effectiveness of the organization. Therefore, today's employees need empowering leadership behaviors in their organizations.

Konczak et al. (2000) classify empowering leadership behaviours as *delegation of authority, self-directed decision-making, information sharing, skill development, and coaching for innovative performance*. In terms of school effectiveness, it is important that teachers are authorised to take responsibility for the educational activities; are given the opportunity to use their own initiative to make their own decisions within the teaching process; are provided with the opportunities for personal and professional development and are encouraged innovative behaviour, and that principals share information about school functioning with them. It is stated that in schools with high levels of success, leaders are actively

involved in the development and empowerment of teachers, and play active role in the allocation of authority and leadership roles (Pont, Nusche, & Hopkins, 2012).

The studies show that there is a relationship between leaders' empowerment behaviors and human behaviors in the organization. For example, studies that examine the relationship between employee empowerment and organizational justice perception and citizenship behaviors have shown positive relationships between these variables (Akgündüz, Kale, & Pazarbaşı, 2014; Bolat, Bolat, & Seymen, 2009; Dijke, Cremer, Mayer, & Quaquebeke, 2012; Yücel & Demirel, 2012; Yürür & Demir, 2011). However, some studies have found that the empowerment behaviors demonstrated by leaders has positive influence on organizational trust, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and job performance (Çekmecelioglu & Eren, 2007; Hassan, Glenn, Mahsud, Yukl, & Prussia, 2013; Raub & Robert, 2012; Tekin & Köksal, 2012; Vecchio, Justin, & Pearce, 2010).

Studies addressing how empowering leadership behaviors are reflected to schools found that there is a positive relationship between empowerment perceived by teachers and organizational citizenship behaviors (Günbayı, Dağlı, & Kalkan, 2013), affecting commitment and job performance positively (Somech, 2005; Şama & Kolamaz, 2011; Gümüş, 2013). A qualitative study conducted in parallel with these findings revealed that empowering leadership behaviors had a positive influence on teachers' interaction at school, development of teacher attitudes and emotions towards the profession (Argon, 2014). However, Parlar (2012) argued that despite the positive outputs of the teacher empowerment, the empowerment of the teachers in the schools is neglected or its importance is not understood sufficiently (Parlar, 2012). Likewise, Cerit (2007) found moderate levels of empowering leadership perceived by teachers in his work.

#### *Aim and Importance of the Study*

Qualitative and quantitative studies on empowering leadership behaviors and psychological contract show that both topics are important for developing organizational effectiveness and positive organizational behavior patterns. However, studies revealing the teachers perceptions of psychological contracts show that there are problems in this issue and that school administrations are inadequate to respond to teacher expectations (Güneş, 2007; Güzelce, 2009; Özdemir & Demircioğlu, 2015; Yılmaz & Altinkurt, 2012). Therefore, research on psychological contract that aim to explore what needs to be done to meet the expectation of teachers and to improve perceptions of the psychological contract is important. In this context, it is significant to study whether empowering leadership behaviors influence teachers' perceptions of psychological contracts and if so, which behaviors are influential. Although there are attempts to examine the relationship between the psychological contract and the empowerment of the staff in literature (Kun, Hai-yan, & Lin-li, 2007; Paul, Niehoff, & Turnley, 2000), no study has been found on the relationship between these two variables in terms of school organizations. For these reasons, it was necessary to carry out such a study, in which the perceptions of teachers on psychological contracts and empowering leadership behaviors were examined.

This research aims to reveal the role of leader empowering behaviours in teachers' psychological contract perceptions. Therefore, this study has examined teachers and school managers' mutual perceptions of the level of psychological contract and has tried to identify the role that leader empowering behaviour plays in these perceptions. The study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are teachers' perceptions of
  - a) school principals' level of compliance with psychological contract;
  - b) school principals' level of leader empowering behaviours
  - c) their own level of compliance with psychological contract?
2. According to the perceptions of teachers, is there a significant relationship between school managers' level of compliance with psychological contract and teachers' level of compliance with psychological contract?

3. According to the perceptions of teachers, are school managers' levels of compliance with psychological contract and leader empowering behaviours significant predictors of teachers' level of compliance with psychological contract?

#### *The Limitations of the research*

These findings of this research were limited with the answers provided by secondary school teachers in Uşak provincial central districts during 2015-2016 academic year and with data collections tools employed for the study. In addition, the teachers' views on school principals are also limited to opinions on 'school principals.'

### **Method**

This study focuses on relationships between variables and therefore it is designed according to the correlational survey model, and the data is analysed by using quantitative techniques.

#### *Sampling*

This survey was conducted with teachers working in 21 public high schools in the central district of Uşak. The population of this research are 913 teachers working in these schools during the academic year of 2015-2016.

A 95 % confidence interval (with a standard deviation of  $\alpha = .05$ ) is selected as the base in calculating the sampling size that could represent the population (Balçı, 2010; as cited in Cochran, 1962), and this calculation necessitated that the sample size should be composed of at least 270 teachers. Stratified sampling is used, and data was collected from 21 schools. The number of teachers in the sample has been calculated according to the ratio of the number of teachers working in the relevant high schools within the population. Subsequently, the high schools were categorized under the categories of "General High School" and "Vocational and Technical Anatolian High Schools". The researcher distributed 300 questionnaire and 280 of them were returned and taken into consideration for analysis. The demographic information of these 280 teachers is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** The Demographic Information of Teachers

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Female	131	46.8
Male	149	53.2
<b>Type of school</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
General High School	185	66.1
Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School	95	33.9
<b>Experience</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1-10 years	78	27.9
11 years and above	202	72.1
<b>Level of Education</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Bachelor Degree	231	82.5
Postgraduate Degree	49	17.5
<b>Number of teachers at school</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Teachers working at a school with a population of 10 to 40 teachers	67	23.9
Teachers working at a school with 40 to 70 teachers population	154	55.0
Teachers working at a school with more than 70 teachers population	59	21.1

As seen in Table 1, 46.8% of the teachers are women and 53.2% of them are men. 66.1 % percent of teachers are working at a 'General High School' (Anatolian High School, Science High School, Fine Arts High School, Sports High School and Imam Hatip (Religious Vocational High School) whereas 33.9 % of them are working at Vocational and Technical High Schools. 27.9% of the teachers have experience between 1 and 10 years while 72% of them have more than 11 years of experience. In terms of the level of education, 82.5% of teachers hold a bachelor's degree and 17.5 % of them have a postgraduate degree.

### **Data Collection Tools**

The “*School Principals’ Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract*” (*Okul Yöneticilerinin Psikolojik Sözleşmeye Uyuma Düzeyi Ölçeği*) and “*Teachers’ Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract*” (*Öğretmenlerin Psikolojik Sözleşmeye Uyuma Düzeyi Ölçeği*) scales which were developed by Koçak (2016) are used in order to identify the teachers and school principals’ level of compliance with psychological contract according to teachers’ perceptions. Teachers’ perceptions of principals’ level of leadership behaviours are measured by using the Leader Empowering Behaviour Questionnaire (LEBQ) developed by Konczak et al. (2000) and adapted into the Turkish context by Aras (2013). All scales are 5-point Likert type scales.

In the process of developing *School Principals’ Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract*, 40 items were formed on the basis of the relevant literature and these were given to 6 field experts, 2 measurement and evaluation experts and 2 language experts for scope and language validity. The 28-item scale, which is expected to be collected in one subscale was prepared for pilot study. The scales were 5-point Likert scale and it was administered to 370 teachers working at high schools during 2014-2015 academic year. In the analysis of the explanatory factor, it was observed that factor loads of 3 items were low and therefore they were removed from the scale. Thus, a 25-item, one-factor scale was formed; factor loadings ranged from .66 to .82; and it explained 57% of the total variance. According to the t-test values obtained at the end of substance discrimination analysis, it was found that the difference of the averages between the upper and lower groups for each question was statistically significant. When the item-total correlation coefficient values were examined, it was determined that the values changed between .79 and .61. As a result of the reliability analysis, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the one-factor scale was calculated as .96. Examples of items of the scale are as follows: "School management takes the necessary actions to ensure long-term satisfaction," and "School management takes into account how I will be affected when making decisions."

The Validity and Reliability of the study was also conducted. Goodness of fit in Confirmatory Factor Analysis is calculated as [ $\chi^2 = 1187.65$ ; Sd = 274;  $\chi^2 / Sd = 4.33$ ; AGFI = 0.79; GFI = 0.83; NFI = 0.98; CFI = 0.98; IFI = 0.98; RMR = 0.034; RMSEA = 0.08]. Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) of the scale is .97. The Goodness of fit and Reliability Co-efficient show that *School Principals’ Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract Scale* is a valid and reliable tool for this research (Çelik & Yılmaz, 2013).

In the process of developing *Teachers’ Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract* 40 items were created drawing from the literature and 6 field experts, 2 measurement and evaluation experts and 2 language experts assessed them for scope and language validity. The scale has three subscales and 30 items and it is 5-point Likert scale. It was administered to 370 teachers working at high schools during 2014-2015 academic year. In the analysis of the explanatory factor, it was observed that factor loads of 4 items were low and therefore they were removed from the scale. Thus a 26-item, three-factor scale was formed with factor loads ranging between .47 and .72. The scale explained 53% of the total variance. According to the t-test values obtained at the end of substance discrimination analysis, it was found that the difference of the averages between the upper and lower groups for each question was statistically significant. When the item-total correlation coefficient values were examined, it was determined that the values changed between .79 and .61. As a result of the reliability analysis, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the three factor scale was calculated as .89 for effort towards institutional development factor (11 items), .84 for extra performance (9 items); .90 for loyalty (6 items); and .93 for the scale. Example items for effort towards institutional development, extra performance and loyalty are as follows: "I am willing to take on the tasks that could improve the reputation of this school"; "I can enthusiastically work in the school, if necessary, outside of class hours" and "Even if a better opportunity is given, I want to stay at this school until I retire. "

Regarding Teachers' Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract Scale, the goodness of fit in Confirmatory Factor Analysis is calculated as [ $\chi^2= 788.44$ ; Sd = 295;  $\chi^2 /Sd = 2.67$ ; AGFI=0.80; GFI=0.82; NFI=0.98; CFI =0.99; IFI=0.99; RMR=0.037; RMSEA=0.07]. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale is 0.95. Cronbach's alpha for the sub-scales of "effort towards institutional development", "extra performance" and "loyalty" it is calculated as .93; .85; and .85 respectively. The Goodness of fit and Reliability Co-efficient show that this scale is a valid and reliable tool for this research (Çelik, & Yılmaz, 2013).

The Empowering Leadership Behaviour Scale was adapted to Turkish by Aras (2013) and consists of 18 items and 5 subscales. The subscales are "Delegation of Authority and Accountability", "Encouragement of Self-Directed Decisions", "Information sharing", "Skill Development" and "Coaching for Innovative Performance." The tests of validity and reliability of Turkish adaptation showed that the scale is a valid and a reliable scale ( $\chi^2/df =2.710$  ( $p>05$ ); CFI= .908; TLI=.885; RMSEA=0.068). The reliability co-efficient is calculated as .67, .64, .71, .77 and .73 respectively for each subscale and the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale is .89 (Aras, 2013).

The validity and reliability of the scales used in this research were also tested. Goodness of fit in Confirmatory Factor Analysis is calculated as [ $\chi^2=323.41$ ; Sd=124;  $\chi^2 /Sd= 2.60$ ; AGFI= 0.84; GFI=0.89; NFI=0.98; CFI=0.99; IFI=0.99; RMR= 0.03; RMSEA=0.07]. Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ) for the subscales of "Delegation of Authority and Accountability", "Encouragement of Self-Directed Decisions", "Information sharing", "Skill Development" and "Coaching for Innovative Performance" are calculated as .90, .86, .87, .90 and .92 respectively. Cronbach's alpha for the scale is .93. The Goodness of fit and Reliability Co-efficient tests show that the Leader Empowering Behaviour Questionnaire is a valid and reliable tool for the relevant sample in this research.

#### ***Processes and Data Analysis***

The necessary consents and permissions were taken by the researcher who developed the Leader Empowering Behaviour Questionnaire. The approval from the Ethics committee and the required permission from the Uşak Provincial Directorate of National Education were also received, and only the teachers who volunteered participated in the study. Univariate and multivariate extreme value analysis were performed, and it was examined whether the data showed normal distribution. Distribution graphs showed that the coefficients of kurtosis and skewness had normal distributions of the data, and thus multivariate analysis could be used. Therefore, it was determined that the variables do not show the problem of multi-connectivity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 253).

Descriptive statistics are employed to calculate the standard deviation and mean of the data. Additionally, Pearson Correlation Coefficients are used to measure the relationship between the variables, and hierarchical regression techniques are used for predictive analysis. The absolute value of correlation coefficient is interpreted as *high* if it is between 0.71 and 1.00, as *medium* if it is between 0.70 and 0.31, and as *low* if it is between 0.30 and 0.00 (Büyüköztürk, 2007, p. 32). As for the mean, it is regarded as very low if the range is between 1.00 and 1.79, as low if it is between 1.80 and 2.59; as medium if it is between 2.60 and 3.39, as high if it is between 3.40 and 4.19; and very high if it is between 4.20 and 5.00.



## Results

### *Findings related to Compliance of School Managers with Psychological Contract, their Display of Leader Empowering Behaviours and Teachers' Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract*

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of psychological contract and leader empowering behaviours based on teachers' perceptions.

**Table 2.** Descriptive Statistics of Variables

	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
<b>1. SPLCPC</b>	280	<b>3.32</b>	.73
<b>2. TLCPC</b>	280	<b>3.49</b>	.65
Efforts towards Institutional Development	280	3.72	.68
Loyalty	280	3.36	.79
Extra Performance	280	3.30	.68
<b>3. LEB</b>	280	<b>3.41</b>	.73
Delegation of Authority and Accountability	280	3.44	.75
Self- Directed Decision Making	280	3.43	.82
Information Sharing	280	3.46	.79
Skill Development	280	3.39	.82
Coaching for Innovative Performance	280	3.35	.82

SPLCPC: School Principals' Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract

TLCPC: Teachers' Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract

LEB: Leader Empowering Behaviours

As seen in Table 2, teachers' perceptions of school principals' level of compliance with psychological contract (SPLCPC) are at a *medium* level ( $\bar{x}=3.32$ ), and teachers' level of compliance with psychological contract (TLCPC) is *high* ( $\bar{x}=3.49$ ). On the other hand, teachers' perceptions of school principals' display of leader empowering behaviours (LEB) are *high* ( $\bar{x}=3.41$ ). Teachers' behaviours regarding the level of compliance with psychological contract had the highest score in the subscale of *efforts towards institutional development* ( $\bar{x}=3.72$ ) and the lowest in the subscale of *extra performance* ( $\bar{x}=3.30$ ). According to teachers' perceptions, the school principals have the lowest mean in the subscales of *coaching for innovative performance* ( $\bar{x}=3.35$ ) and *skill development* ( $\bar{x}=3.39$ ).

### *Findings Related to the Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of School Principals' Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract and Teachers' Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract*

Table 3 shows the results of correlations between teacher perceptions of school administrators' and teachers' compliance with psychological contracts.

**Table 3.** Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
<b>1. SPLCPC</b>	-				
<b>2. TLCPC</b>	,77*	-			
<b>3. Efforts towards Institutional Development</b>	,71*	,94*	-		
<b>4. Loyalty</b>	,69*	,91*	,80*	-	
<b>5. Extra Performance</b>	,70*	,90*	,75*	,72*	-

N= 280, \*p<.001

When the correlation coefficients in table 3 are analysed a significant correlation between SPLCPC and TLCPC is identified. High, significant and positive correlation is found between SPLCPC and TLCPC scores [ $(r_{OYPSUD \times ÖPSUD} = .77; p < .001)$ ]. Medium, significant and positive correlation is found between the loyalty and extra performance subscales of SPLCPC and TLCPC [ $(r_{OYPSUD \times s} = .69; p < .001)$ ],

[( $r_{OYPSUD \times ep} = .70; p < .001$ )]; whereas a high, positive and significant correlation is identified in efforts towards institutional development subscale of SPLCPC and TLCPC. [( $r_{OYPSUD \times kgic} = .71; p < .001$ )].

**Findings related to how Teachers' Perceptions of School Principals' Level of Psychological contract and Level of Displaying Leader Empowering Behaviour predict teachers' level of Compliance with psychological contract**

Table 4 shows the results of hierarchical regression analysis to determine variables that predict teachers' compliance with psychological contract.

**Table 4.** Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Predictor Variables	Teachers' Level of Compliance with Psychological Contract													
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t	$\beta$	t
<b>Model 1</b>														
Gender	,172	2,825*	,068	1,537	,029	,741	,034	,900	,033	,868	,046	1,213	,045	1,198
Level of education	-,083	-1,407	-,003	-,073	,034	,895	,038	1,027	,045	1,214	,048	1,324	,048	1,319
Experience	,033	,534	,060	1,348	,062	1,581	,043	1,107	,054	1,396	,053	1,376	,053	1,377
Type of school	-,168	-2,527*	-,023	-,466	-,021	-,494	-,033	-,782	-,032	-,777	-,052	-1,262	-,052	-1,259
Num. of teachers work. at school	-,131	-2,001*	,002	,043	-,032	-,762	-,031	-,750	-,035	-,850	-,022	-,544	-,023	-,554
<b>Model 2</b>														
SPLCPS			,709	16,042*	,366	6,792*	,304	5,450*	,286	5,086*	,255	4,537*	,255	4,517*
<b>Model 3</b>														
Coaching for inno. perf.					,478	9,126*	,314	4,531*	,280	3,922*	,231	3,211*	,228	3,077*
<b>Model 4</b>														
Skill development							,246	3,506*	,155	1,844	,133	1,595	,131	1,560
<b>Model 5</b>														
Inform. sharing									,150	1,912*	,081	1,002	,077	,932
<b>Model 6</b>														
Deleg. of authority and accountability											,191	3,153*	,188	2,941*
<b>Model 7</b>														
Self-directed decision making													,013	,176
R <sup>2</sup>	,110		,542		,649		,665		,676		,681		,681	
R <sup>2</sup> difference	,110		,432		,107		,016		,011		,005		,000	
F	6,793*		53,846*		67,298*		62,380*		58,446*		54,519*		51,983	

As seen in Table 4, the variance explained in all the steps increases and the regression coefficients become significant except for the 7th model [F = 51.983,  $p > .001$ ,  $R^2 = .681$ ]. According to Model 1, variables of *gender*, *education*, *experience*, *type of school*, *number of teachers working at school* account for 11% of variance of TLCPC. In Model 2, SPLCPC predicts TLCPC and explains 43% of variance ( $\Delta R^2 = .432$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Model 3 showed that the coaching for innovative performance dimension of LEB had the highest predictive value ( $\Delta R^2 = .107$ ,  $p < .001$ ). (This is followed by skills development ( $\Delta R^2 = .016$ ,  $p < .001$ ), information sharing ( $\Delta R^2 = .011$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and delegating authority and responsibility ( $\Delta R^2 = .005$ ,  $p < .001$ ). In Model 7, self-directed decision making is not a significant predictor of the TLCPC. In general, the findings of the control variables, SPLCPC and LEB reveal that they account for 68% of the variance in TLCPC.

## Discussion

This research examined firstly teachers' perceptions regarding psychological contract and leader empowering behaviours. Accordingly, teachers think that their level of compliance with psychological contract is higher than the level of school principals. Yılmaz and Altinkurt (2012) argued that according to teacher perceptions, teachers were found to be more effective than school administrations in fulfilling their obligations on them. In another study, the relationship between teacher and school management was analysed based on exchange theory and it was revealed that teachers felt a high level of responsibility towards their schools but the administrations responded moderately to these services (Çildir, 2008). The high tendency to adapt to the psychological contract may be related to the nature of the teaching profession, even though problems are encountered in meeting teacher expectations. Likewise, Demirkasımoğlu (2012a) indicated that the level of compliance of teachers with "transactional contract", which envisaged the profession as a mechanical work for a certain profit, was very low (Demirkasımoğlu, 2012a). Therefore, these findings may be evidence that teachers do not relate this profession only to gains from school management.

An important point about the first research question is that despite teachers' high level of compliance with psychological contract perceptions regarding the "extra performance" and "loyalty" subscales are at a medium level and the subscale of "efforts towards the institutional development" increases the overall average. In other words, teachers are most active in the behaviors towards institutional development, which consists of the development of students and the enhancement of their success. On the contrary, they are less likely to make more effort than expected for the school and less feel attached to school. This can be regarded as a response of teachers to principals' inadequate compliance with psychological contracts. According to Gouldner's (1960) norm of reciprocity and Blau's (1964) social exchange theory individuals are ready to give or contribute only when they get the thing they expect to receive. Ensuring that employees are able to perform their tasks in the most efficient way is associated with providing conditions or incentives they expect (Huffington, Cole, & Brunning, 1997). In this case, teachers make a high level of effort for institutional development, which is closely related to student achievement; but they may be lowering their tendency to show extra performance and loyalty because they think school administrators fulfill their obligations at moderate level.

Within the context of the same research question, it can be seen that principals show a high level of leader empowering behaviour. Yet Cerit's research (2007) shows that the principals exhibit a medium level of empowering behaviour according to teachers' perceptions. These two findings present different views.

The mean of skill development and coaching for innovative performance subscales of LEB are lower than other subscales of LEB. One reason for this may be that school leaders lack sufficient knowledge and awareness on how to help teachers develop their skills. As a matter of fact, it is stated that there is not enough awareness about the importance of teachers' enrichment and development of activity areas within the school (Parlar, 2012). The reason why school administrators cannot be effective in the coaching subscale for innovative performance may be related to the decentralized nature of the Turkish National Education System and its inability to take risks due to rigid rule commitment. Innovation requires taking risks in the face of the possibility of failure (Coleman, 1996). In the same way, encouraging employees to produce innovative ideas and to show innovative behaviours by taking chances of failure is seen important in terms of constant change and development. This emphasizes the need for school managers to develop their skills to embrace innovation and take risks.

Secondly, this research found a significant and positive correlation between the levels of compliance of teachers and principals with psychological contract. The concept of psychological contract was built on the basis of mutual satisfaction of employee and employer obligations (Rousseau, 1989, 1995). The expectation theory (Vroom, 1964), which expresses the belief that individual will gain a price they desire in return for their efforts, forms the theoretical underpinning of the concept. According to this theory, teachers are expected to have a management approach that will respond to

their material and spiritual needs from school management in return for the services they provide. Otherwise, if any of the parties perceives that their expectations are not met and that they will not be met in the future, they may tend to reduce or withdraw the effort they provide. In this study, the positive relationship between the levels of compliance of the parties with the psychological contract confirms the basic foundations of the psychological contract.

Thirdly, the research examined whether different variables, such as SPLCPC and LEB, predict TLCPC. Accordingly, gender, experience, educational level, school type, and number of teachers working at schools predict 11% of TLCPC. These variables predict TLCPC significantly which shows that individual perceptions about psychological contract can be affected by such variables. Hence, Guest (2004) argues that personal variables such as age, gender, level of education, experience and ethnic identity have a role in the formation of psychological contract. The research findings are parallel with this theoretical explanation. In addition to this, the highest predictor of perception regarding TLCPC is teachers' perceptions of SPLCPC. This can be explained within the principles of social exchange theory. Otherwise, if any of the parties perceive that their expectations have not been met and that they will not be met from now on, they will have a tendency to reduce or withdraw the effort.

Concerning the third research question, the findings show that coaching for innovative performance and skills development are the highest predictors. De Vos, Buyens, and Schalk (2003) express that providing opportunities for education and development is significant for a positive psychological contract. Guest (2006), however, argues that enrichment of the work and career / development opportunities should be provided to enable the development of skills to create a positive atmosphere in psychological contractual perceptions. Çankaya (1996) indicates that valuing employees' new ideas is a significant social exchange criterion, and employees feel content and happy when they see that their ideas are given importance and they enthusiastically meet their responsibilities in return. The findings of this research support the above explanations in the literature. In other words, school administrators tend to follow psychological contracts as long as they receive the support they need to improve themselves in changing teaching profession under the influence of globalization and technological developments. As a matter of fact, one of the behaviours expected from school administrators is to address teachers' development needs (Can, 2002). Therefore, a human resources management is required to ensure that the expectations of the teachers are met at the highest level (Özdemir, 2014).

Another important finding regarding the predictors of empowering leadership behaviours on teachers' compliance with psychological contracts is that Delegation of Authority and Accountability subscale is the least predictor. This can be explained by the centralised education in Turkey and teachers' internalisation of its requirements; and therefore, they refrain from taking accountability. This is confirmed by the research of Özdemir and Demircioğlu (2014) which argues that the centralist structure in the Turkish National Education System is an obstacle for teachers to take authority and responsibility within the school. On the other hand, it is stated that the hierarchy of contemporary school structures around the world shifted to a structure in which the authority is functionally distributed and human resource is based on (Gümüşeli, 2001).

According to another research, the dimension of self-directed decision making dimension of empowering leadership behaviors does not explain the level of teachers' compliance with the psychological contract. On the basis of this, it can be said that teachers consider self-directed decision making within the class as a nature of teaching profession and therefore they do not consider it as an exchange asset. As Öztürk (2011) argues teachers should be autonomous in their classroom practices as it is in the nature of the profession, and teachers are the most authorized person in the class.

One more finding draws our attention in the third research question. Although the leadership behaviours displayed within the coaching framework for innovative performance are the highest predictors of teachers' compliance with the psychological contract, this subscale has the lowest mean. This suggests that the expectations of today's managers are getting different. Therefore, it can be said that leadership behaviors that can release teachers from routine tasks may have a significant effect on their level of compliance with the psychological contract. Moreover, it can be argued that the factors fostering motivation of teachers cannot be explained by only economic means. Rong (2009) states that the expectations of school organizations are based not only on economic but also on a basis for social values. In this context, it is important for school administrators to develop an innovative and dynamic school culture in which teachers' knowledge and skills are developed.

### **Conclusion and Suggestions**

The findings of the research which aims to determine the role of leader empowering behaviours in psychological contract are presented below.

Teachers' perceptions of compliance with psychological contract are higher than their perceptions of school managers' level of compliance with psychological contract. Accordingly, school managers are perceived as incapable of including teachers into the decision-making process. Moreover, teachers' perceptions show that there is a problem in school managers' fair appreciation and rewarding of teachers' achievements. In the level of compliance of teachers with psychological contract, "efforts towards institutional development" behaviors are higher than "loyalty" and "extra performance" behaviors. Teachers, on the other hand, have the lowest tendency to perform extra, except for their legal obligations.

Teachers think that school managers are most effective in "information sharing" dimension of empowering leadership behaviors. Findings, however, show that the lowest level of empowering leadership behavior is in the "skill development" and "coaching for innovative performance" dimensions. In other words, Teachers are not as effective as school administrators in promoting risk taking and innovative behaviors and other empowering leadership behaviors in providing opportunities for developing teacher skills.

When teachers think that school managers meet the psychological contract obligations, they also have the tendency to fulfil their responsibilities. The teachers' perceptions of psychological contract between teachers and school managers support the hypothesis of the social exchange theory.

Findings have shown that the level of teachers' compliance with psychological contracts is largely explained by the level of school management's compliance with the psychological contract. The variables of gender, experience, education, type of school, and number of teachers at a school influence teachers' perceptions of psychological contracts. In addition, all empowering leadership behaviors except for self-directed decision making are predictors of teachers' compliance with the psychological contract.

The research has several implications for both researchers and practitioners. In terms of practice, school principals could coach for innovative performance and help teachers take seminars, go to conferences or receive in-service training that could help them develop their skills. In providing opportunities for education, principals should encourage teachers who want to develop their skills and take postgraduate education and provide the necessary convenience in terms of teaching hours. Teachers could be encouraged towards new facilities and projects. Principals can interview teachers to identify their expectations and the problems they face. On the basis of the results obtained from these interviews, they can make the necessary arrangements to strengthen teachers' motivation.

This study also brings some suggestions for researchers. Carrying out similar studies with principals can be effective in reaching different findings. Qualitative research could be conducted to identify the negative situations that make teachers' perceptions regarding the psychological contract negative. A qualitative study in this field can elicit the situations and reasons that make it difficult for principals to display empowering behaviours and psychological contract. Lastly, a further study can examine the mutual perceptions regarding the psychological contract and can look into the different leadership behaviours that are influential in these perceptions.

## References

- Akgündüz, Y., Kale, A., & Pazarbaşı, G. (2014). Futbol turizmüne hizmet eden otel çalışanlarının psikolojik güçlendirme algularının örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına etkisi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11(28), 1-15.
- Aras, G. (2013). *Personel güçlendirme yönetiminde güçlendirici liderlik davranışları uygulaması: Kemer bölgesi beş yıldızlı otel işletmeleri örneği* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gümüşhane University, Institute of Social Sciences, Gümüşhane.
- Argon, T. (2014). Eğitim kurumlarında insan kaynaklarının desteklenmesi: Yönetici desteğine yönelik öğretmen görüşleri. *International Journal of Human Science*, 11(2), 691-729.
- Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behavior*. Dorsey Press: Homewood, IL.
- Atkinson, C. (2007). Trust and the psychological contract. *Employee Relations*, 29(3), 227-246.
- Baker, T. (2009). Towards a new employment relationship model: Aligning the changing needs of individual and organization. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30(3), 197-223.
- Balcı, A. (2010). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma: Yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New Jersey: John & Wiley Sons, Inc.
- Block, P. (1986). *Empowered manager. Positive political skills at work*. London: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Bolat, O. İ., Bolat, T., & Seymen, O. A. (2009). Güçlendirici lider davranışları ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı arasındaki ilişkinin sosyal mübadele kuramından hareketle incelenmesi. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12(21), 215-239.
- Bowen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. (1992). The empowerment of service workers: What, why, how and when. *Sloan Management Review*, 33(3), 31-9.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2007). *Veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Can, N. (2002). Değişim sürecinde eğitim yönetimi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 155-156. Retrieved from [http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli\\_Egitim\\_Dergisi/155-156/can.htm](http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimlar/dergiler/Milli_Egitim_Dergisi/155-156/can.htm)
- Cerit, Y. (2007). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin hizmet yönelimli liderlik rollerini gerçekleştirme düzeyleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 88-98.
- Clutterbuck, D. (2005). Communication and the psychological contract. *Journal of Communication Management*, 9(4), 359-364.
- Coleman, H. J. (1996). Why employee empowerment is not just a fad. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(4), 29-36.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. (2002). A psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(8), 927-946.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J., & Kessler, I. (2000). Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: A large scale survey. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(7), 903-930.
- Çankaya, İ. (1996). Takas kuramının okul yönetimince uygulanması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 2(4), 539-546.
- Çelik, H. E., & Yılmaz, V. (2013). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesi*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Çekmecelioğlu, H. G., & Eren, E. (2007). Psikolojik güçlendirme, örgütsel bağlılık ve yaratıcı davranış arasındaki ilişkilerin değerlendirilmesi. *Yönetim*, 18(57), 12-25.
- Çildir, T. K. (2008). *Ankara ilköğretim okullarında çalışan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin takas kuramının algılanmasına ilişkin algıları* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences. Ankara.
- De Vos, A., Buyens, D., & Schalk, R. (2003). Psychological contract development during organizational socialization: Adaptation to reality and the role of reciprocity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 537-559.

- Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2012a). Eğitim örgütlerinde çalışma ilişkilerini anlamada analitik bir araç olarak psikolojik sözleşme kavramı. *Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi*, 1(1), 76-90.
- Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2012b). *Kamu ve özel ilköğretim okulu sınıf öğretmenlerinin psikolojik sözleşme algıları ve iş çevresine uyum düzeyleri ile ilişkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Dijke, M. V., Cremer, D. D., Mayer, D. M., & Quaakebeke, N. M. (2012). When does procedural fairness promote organizational citizenship behavior? Integrating empowering leadership types in relational justice models. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 117, 235-248.
- Dikili, A., & Bayraktaroğlu, S. (2013). Psikolojik sözleşme ile iştatmini ilişkisine yönelik bir araştırma. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 8(2), 205-227.
- Doğan, S. (2003). *Personel güçlendirme (Empowerment)* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). İnsan Kaynakları Dizisi. Sistem Yayıncılık: İstanbul.
- Doğan, S., & Demiral, Ö. (2009). Örgütsel bağlılığın sağlanmasında personel güçlendirme ve psikolojik sözleşmenin etkisine ilişkin bir araştırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32, 47-80.
- Eren, E. (2008). *Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi*. Beta Yayıncılık: İstanbul.
- Erstad, M. (1997). Empowerment and organizational change. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 9(7), 325-333.
- Gebert, D., Boerner, S., & Kearney, E. (2006). Cross functionality and innovation in new product development teams: A dilemmatic structure and its consequences for the management of diversity. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15, 431-458
- Gemalmaz, N. (2014). *İlkokul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları motivasyonel dilin öğretmenlerin psikolojik sözleşme ve lider-üye etkileşimine algıları üzerine etkisi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Zirve University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Gerber, M., Grote, G., Geiser, C., & Raeder, S. (2012). Managing psychological contracts in the era of the "new" career. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 21(2), 195-221.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2), 161-178.
- Griffin, R. W., & Moorhead, G. (2014). *Organizational behavior managing people and organizations* (11th ed.). Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, USA.
- Guest, D. (2004). The psychology of the employment relationship: An analysis based on the psychological contract. *Applied Psychology*, 53, 541-555.
- Guest, D. (2006). How an evolving-psychological contract is changing workforce flexibility. In R. Gandossy, E. Tucker, & N. Verma (Eds.), *Workforce wake-up call: Your workforce is changing, are you?* (pp. 87-94). USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Günbayı, İ., Dağlı, E., & Kalkan, F. (2013). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin destekleyici davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 19(4), 575-602.
- Güneş, K. (2007). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin okul müdürlerinin iletişim ve motivasyon becerileri ile ilgili algı ve beklentileri (İstanbul ili Avrupa Yakası örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Gümüş, A. (2013). *İlkokul yöneticilerinde güçlendirici liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi: Psikolojik güçlendirmenin aracılık rolü. (Ankara ili örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences.
- Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2001). Çağdaş okul müdürünün liderlik alanları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 28, 531-548.



- Güzelce, A. (2009). *İlköğretim okullarında öğretmenlerin, yöneticilerin karar alma süreçlerine ilişkin algıları ve beklentileri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Maltepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Hassan, S., Glenn, J., Mahsud, R., Yukl, G., & Prussia, G. E. (2013). Ethical and empowering leadership and leader effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(2), 133-146.
- Herriot, P., Manning, W. E. G., & Kidd, J. M. (1997). The content of the psychological contract. *British Journal of Management*, 8, 151-162.
- Huffington, C., Cole, C., & Brunning, H. (1997). *A manuel of organizational development: The psychology of change*. Karnac Books: London.
- Hui, C., Lee, C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior in China: Investigating generalizability and instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(2), 311-321.
- Karcioğlu, F., & Türker, E. (2010). Psikolojik sözleşme ile örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi: Sağlık çalışanları üzerine bir uygulama. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 24(2), 121-140.
- Kingshott, R. P. J. (2006). The impact of psychological contracts upon trust and commitment within supplier-buyer relationships: A social exchange view. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35, 724-739.
- Koçak, S. (2016). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki psikolojik sözleşme üzerinde güçlendirici liderlik davranışlarının rolü* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Koçel, T. (2007). *İşletme yöneticiliği*. Arıkan Yayıncılık İstanbul.
- Konczak, L. J., Stelly, D. J., & Trusty, M. L. (2000). Defining and measuring empowering leader behaviors: Development of an upward feedback instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(2), 301-313.
- Kotter, J. (1973). The psychological contract: Managing the joining-up process. *California Management Review*, 15(9), 91-99.
- Köhler, T., Janben, C., Plath, S. C., Reese, J. P., Lay, J., Steinhausen, S., ... Pfaff, H., (2010). Communication, social capital and workplace health management as determinants of the innovative climate in German banks. *International Journal of Public Health*, 55(6), 561-570. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00038-010-0195-7>
- Kun, Q., Hai-yan, S., & Lin-li, L. (2007). *The effect of empowerment on employees' organizational commitment: psychological contract as mediator*. International Conference on Management Science & Engineering, China.
- Lapointe, E., Vandenberghe, C., & Boudrias, J. S. (2013). Psychological contract breach, affective commitment to organization and supervisor, and newcomer adjustment: A three-wave moderated mediation model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 528-538.
- Levinson, H., Price, C., Munden, K., Mandl, H., & Solley, C. (1962). *Men, management and mental health*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press.
- Lincoln, N. D., Travers, C., Ackers, P., & Wilkinson, A. (2002). The meaning of empowerment: The interdisciplinary etymology of a new management concept. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 4(3), 271-290.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Mıhçıoğlu, C. (1983). Türkiye'de yönetime katılma. Retrieved May 17, 2016, from [http://www.politics.ankara.edu.tr/dergi/pdf/38/1/cemal\\_mihcioglu.pdf](http://www.politics.ankara.edu.tr/dergi/pdf/38/1/cemal_mihcioglu.pdf)
- Millward, L. J., & Herriot, P. (2000). Psychological contracts in the UK. In D. M. Rousseau, & R. Schalk (Eds.), *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross national perspectives*, (pp. 231-248). New York: Sage.
- Özdemir, M. (2014). *Eğitim örgütlerinde insan kaynakları yönetimi: Kuram uygulama, teknik*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

- Özdemir, M., & Demircioğlu, E. (2014). Distributed leadership and contract relations: Evidence from Turkish high schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(6), 918-938
- Özdemir, M., & Demircioğlu, E. (2015). The relationship between counterproductive work behaviours and psychological contracts in public high schools. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 45(1), 41-60.
- Özgen, H., & Türk, M. (1997). Hizmet sektöründe başarının anahtarı: Personel güçlendirme. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 30(4), 75-86.
- Özler, D. E., & Ünver, E. (2012). Psikolojik sözleşmenin iş tatmini üzerindeki etkisini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(2), 325-351.
- Öztürk, İ. H. (2011). Öğretmen özerkliği konusu üzerine kuramsal bir inceleme. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(35), 82-99.
- Parlar, H. (2012). Özel okullarda, özel okul sahiplerinin ve üst düzey yöneticilerinin güçlendirilmiş bir iş çevresi yaratmaya ne kadar istekli ve hazır olduklarının tespitine ilişkin bir araştırma. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 21(1), 127-146.
- Paul, R. J., Niehoff, B. R., & Turnley, W. H. (2000). Empowerment, expectations, and the psychological contract—managing the dilemmas and gaining the advantages. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 29, 471-485.
- Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Hopkins, D. (2012). *Improving school leadership. Volume 2: Case Studies on Systems Leadership*. Paris: OECD.
- Raub, S., & Robert, C. (2012). Empowerment, organizational commitment, and voice behavior in the hospitality industry: Evidence from a multinational sample. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 54(2), 136-148.
- Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 245-259.
- Rodrigues, C. A. (1994). Employee participation and empowerment programs. *Empowerment in Organizations*, 2(2), 29-40.
- Rong, W. (2009). Management of college and university teachers based on psychological contract. Retrieved from <http://www.seiofbluemountain.com/upload/product/200909/2009jyhy04a49.pdf>
- Rothstein, L. R. (1995). The empowerment effort that came undone. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(1). Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1995/01/the-empowerment-effort-that-came-undone#>
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organisations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2(2), 121-139.
- Rousseau, D.M. (1995), *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. London: Sage Publications.
- Schein, E. H. (1965). *Organizational psychology*. Printice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
- Somech, A. (2005). Teachers' personal and team empowerment and their relations to organizational outcomes: Contradictory or compatible constructs? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(2), 237-266.
- Şama, E., & Kolamaz, C. (2011). Destekleyici ve geliştirici liderlik özellikleri ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(2), 313-342.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Tekin, Y., & Köksal, C. D. (2012). Otel işletmelerinde personeli güçlendirme uygulamaları: Antalya'da beş yıldızlı konaklama işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *Journal of Yasar University*, 25(7), 4241-4267.
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An 'interpretive' model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 666-681.

- Turnley, W. H., Bolino, M. C., Lester, S. W., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2003). The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 29(2), 187-206.
- Vecchio, R. P., Justin, J. E., & Pearce, C. L. (2010). Empowering leadership: An examination of mediating mechanisms within a hierarchical structure. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 530-542.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Yılmaz, A. (2012). *Psikolojik sözleşme ve örgütsel güven arasındaki ilişkinin analizi: Teorik ve uygulamalı bir çalışma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Selçuk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Konya.
- Yılmaz, K., & Altinkurt, Y. (2012). Özel dersane öğretmenlerinin psikolojik sözleşmeleri. *EJEDUS Elektronik Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2.
- Yücel, İ., & Demirel, Y. (2012). Psikolojik güçlendirmenin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışına etkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 23,19-48.
- Yüksel, Ö., & Erkutlu, H. (2003). Personel güçlendirme. *G.Ü. İktisadi İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 1, 131-142.
- Yürür, S., & Demir, K. (2011). Örgütsel adalet ve psikolojik güçlendirme: Karşılıklı etkileri üzerine bir araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(3), 311-335.