CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature on bureaucracy in schools is presented starting from the 1940s. Studies identified as the Hall (1961) approach were the main focus. Studies using other approaches to study school bureaucracy were mentioned. Research findings on relationships between bureaucratic dimensions and other organizational variables are summarized.

Bureaucracy

Measuring Bureaucracy

According to Max Weber (Blau & Scott, 1962)

Organizational tasks are distributed among the various positions as official duties. The positions or offices are organized into a hierarchical authority structure. A formally established system of rules and regulations govern official decisions and actions. Officials are expected to assume an impersonal orientation in their contacts with clients and with other officials. Employment by the organization constitutes a career for officials. (pp. 32-33)

Unitary Approach

Bureaucracy was assessed as a dichotomous variable until the 1960s.According to the unitary approach, an organization is either bureaucratic or not. Researchers used this approach believed that in order to classify an organization a bureaucracy, all characteristics of bureaucracy must be observed in a high degree. This kind of conceptualization was common among researchers who used the unitary approach. Alvin Gouldner (1950) was among them, but he changed his earlier unidimensional belief that organizations were either bureaucratic or not and suggested that not every organization would possess all the characteristics to the same degree. He suggested that organizations vary in their degree of bureaucratization. Berger (1957) utilized a questionnaire to measure an overall score for Western bureaucratization among Egyptian civil servants. Udy (1959) labeled an organization as bureaucratic if it had more than three authority

levels, and all members on one level are subordinate to at least one member on the next highest level.

In education, Moeller (1962) can be considered the first researcher to empirically assess bureaucracy in school systems. His approach can be classified as a unitary approach. Moeller (1962) used analysis of dichotomous ratings by judges to classify school systems as high or low on bureaucratization. His rating system conceptualized the bureaucratic dimensions as present or absent attributes rather than as continuous variables. During the 1960s, the unitary approach, which defined bureaucracy as a single dimension and as an absent-present dichotomy, was almost abandoned.

Dimensional Approach

According to the dimensional approach, an organization can be bureaucratic in number of ways. An organization can posses a high degree of bureaucratization in some areas but not in some other areas. Dimensional studies can be classified according to the instrument used. The most widely used instruments are the modifications of Hall's (1961) Organizational Inventory. MacKay (1964) modified Hall's inventory first to measure bureaucratization in schools. In this study, the focus is on the Hall approach. The second widely used instrument is the Structural Properties Inventory of Aiken and Hage (1966), which was modified by Bishop (1975) for use in educational organizations. A third rarely used instrument is the Aston Interview Schedule of Pugh and his associates (1963). It was modified by Sackney (1976) for use in schools.

Hall's dimensional approach. Hall (1961) developed an instrument to measure six bureaucratic dimensions after an extensive literature review on bureaucratic characteristics. Hall's work in developing "the Organizational Inventory represents the most systematic attempt to measure organizational bureaucratization" (Punch, 1969, p. 49). From an extensive literature review, Hall (1961) was able to derive a composite picture of the characteristics of the ideal-type bureaucratic organization. He identified six dimensions of an ideal bureaucracy. Hall developed his six dimensions based on the previous research provided in Table 1.

Hall (1961) integrated the list provided in Table 1 and identified six most cited dimensions of the construct: Hierarchy of Authority (HA), Rules for Incumbents (RR), Specialization (DL), Procedural Specifications (PS), Impersonality (IM), and Technical

Table 1 Hall's Integration of Literature to Identify Dimensions of Bureaucracy.

Researcher	Dimension of Bureaucracy
Robert Michels (1949)	Differentiation of functions
	Specialization of labor
	Strict observation of hierarchical rules
	Emergence of a definite hierarchy
K Merton (1949)	Hierarchy
	Role defining rules
	Procedural specifications
	Formalized relationships between incumbents
	Objectivity in dealing with situations and persons
Carl J. Fredrick (1952)	Centralization of control and supervision
	Differentiation of functions
	Qualifications for office
	Objectivity Precision and continuity
	Secrecy (discretion)
Peter Blau (1956)	Specialization
	Hierarchy
	Impersonality
	Rules
Morroe Berger (1957)	Rationality
	Recruitment based on competency
	Hierarchy
	Discretion
Marshall E. Dimock (1959)	Hierarchy
	Specialization
	Rules
	Impersonality
Ferrel Heady (1959)	A rational orientation toward goal attainment
	Hierarchy of authority
	Work specialization
	Profesionalization
	Systematic rules as the basis of operation
Stanley Udy Jr. (1959)	Hierarchy of authority
	Specialized administrative staff
	Differentiated rewards by office
	Organization with limited objectives
	Performance emphasis
	Compensatory rewards

Qualifications or Competence (TC). The dimensions were measured by means of Likert-type scales incorporating a total of sixty-two items. Data were collected from the employees of 10 organizations. In each organization a random sample of employees was selected that was designed to include members of both "management" and "worker."Respondents from the various departments of the organizations were similarly involved to avoid departmental bias. Organizations ranged in size from 63 to 3096 employees and in age from 4 to 65 years. Hypotheses were tested with Spearman rank- order correlation coefficients. A rank was assigned to each organization on each dimension. Hall's (1961) work became the foundation of the research approach on bureaucratization known as the dimensional approach or simply the Hall Approach. His hypotheses were: (1)."bureaucracy is a condition that does not exist in a present-absent dichotomy; rather it exists in degrees along the six dimensions," (2) "the degree of bureaucratization may not vary concomitantly among all dimensions," and (3) "certain pairs of the dimensions may vary concomitantly, independent of the rest"(1961, p. 27).

Hall's (1961) instrument is scored on a five-point Likert-type scale. Responses to appropriate items are summed to find the respondent's six scale scores. To obtain an organization's scale scores those totals are summed and averaged over all of the respondents in the organization. Hall (1961) noted that the perception of participants of their organization could be at variance with the officially prescribed structure. He believed that "official structure is…only as important as the degree to which it is adhered to" (p. 35). Accurate measurement of participant perceptions should, therefore, yield a reliable and valid representation of the actual organizational structure.

Hall's Organization Inventory has been used and modified by many researchers. MacKay (1964) was the first to use Hall's instrument. He concluded that the six dimension of bureaucracy could be measured on continua along the six dimensions. An organization that is highly bureaucratic on one or more dimensions is not necessarily highly bureaucratic on all six dimensions. Although, the six dimensions were not completely independent, each of the six dimensions was clearly measuring a different aspect of the organizational structure. Berger (1956-1957) and Hall (1961) also reported little concomitant variation among bureaucratic variables.

Robinson (1966), with his dissertation chair MacKay, improved the instrument and created the School Organization Inventory. Robinson found that hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, procedural specifications, and impersonality were positively intercorrelated as were division of labor, and technical competence. However the first four dimensions were inversely correlated with the last two. Kolesar (1967) reconstructed Hall's six-dimension instrument into two-dimension instrument. Punch (1967) adapted Hall's instrument and concluded that bureaucracy is unitary if it constitutes only hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, procedural specifications, and impersonality dimensions. Punch (1967) identified two distinct factors that he called "Authority," composed of hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, procedural specifications, and impersonality dimensions, and "Expertise," composed of division of labor, and technical competence dimensions. Expertise is a partial index of professionalism. Hall (1961) found negative correlations between technical competence and three of the other dimensions. Hall (1968) warned that technical competence might not be in the bureaucratic framework. Anderson (1970), Isherwood (1971), and Sousa (1980) also tested and modified the School Organizational Inventory-SOI. Anderson used a variation of items from SOI and also found two-second order factors. He found a non-significant inverse correlation between the two higher order factors.

Punch (1967) suggested researchers to drop the dimensions of division of labor and technical competence when they were measuring bureaucratization. Sousa and Hoy (1981) dropped impersonality dimension due to a low reliability of this dimension. Following Punch's suggestion, they also dropped technical competence and division of labor dimensions. They suggested that impersonality dimension was not a structural variable. Merton (1957) labeled impersonality as a dysfunction of bureaucratization. He claimed that impersonality resulted in low morale. Hall (1963) concluded that hierarchy of authority might be the central dimension in the determination of the overall degree of bureaucratization. MacKay (1964) reported relatively high correlations between HA, RR, and PS. He found that technical competence dimension was not discriminating among schools. McKenna (1974) noted that promotional opportunity in schools is an ambiguous aspect to assess. Researchers usually cite reliabilities of scales which were provided by Hall (Split half reliabilities HA=.90, DL=.80, RR=.83, PS=.83, IM=.81,

TC=.80). Punch (1967) provided reliabilities of dimensions in his own study: HA: 83, DL: 24, RR: 59, PS: 64, IM: 56, TC: 71(split-halves).

 Hage's dimensional approach. The axiomatic theory of organizations developed by Hage (1965) contains eight characteristic properties of formal organization; four representing the organizational ends and four representing the organizational means (structure). The organizational means were also dimensions of bureaucracy: complexity, centralization, formalization and stratification. His work influenced the work of Bishop and George (1973). They produced the Structural Properties Questionnaire measuring the four dimensions. Sousa and Hoy (1981) modified the instrument and conceptualized four dimensions: centralization, formalization, specialization, and standardization. Sousa and Hoy (1981) found support for their hypotheses that regardless of the measurement used, bureaucratization is a multi-dimensional construct. They suggested that centralization was similar to the hierarchy of authority dimension, specialization was similar to the technical competence dimension, formalization was similar to the rules and regulations dimension, and standardization was similar to the procedural specifications.

 The Aston dimensional approach. Pugh and his associates at Aston University, England, developed another approach, the Aston Interview Schedule, to study bureaucratization (Pugh, Hinnings, MacDonald, Turner, & Luptzon, 1963). In this approach, interviews and documentary evidence were used. The Aston approach challenged the unitary, Weberian, concept of bureaucracy. Specialization, standardization, formalization, centralization and configuration, and flexibility were the dimensions. Newbery (1971) demonstrated that the Aston approach could be used in studying post-secondary educational institutions. Kelsey (1973) and later Sackney (1976) adopted the Aston interview method for use in secondary schools in England and Canada. Research with the Aston approach in education is limited.

Higher Order Dimensions

 Before Hall's operationalization of bureaucracy, researchers such as Stinchcombe (1959), Udy (1959), and Gouldner (1954) reported that characteristics of bureaucracy identified by Max Weber did not converge together. Stinchcombe (1959) and Udy (1959) both found two clusters of organizational attributes: bureaucratic and rational. Udy (1959) dichotomized seven

bureaucratic dimensions as being either present or absent in a sample of 150 organizations. He found that the model of bureaucracy explained by Weber contained bureaucratic elements and rational elements and that the two groups of elements were negatively related. Gouldner (1954) defined three types of bureaucracies: two stemming from the Weberian and one from outside the Weberian characteristics. The first of these may be termed the representative form of bureaucracy, based on rules established by agreement, rules which are technically justified, and administration by specially qualified personnel to whom consent is given voluntarily. A second pattern that may be called punishment-centered bureaucracy and is based on the imposition of rules and obedience for its own sake. The third type is mock bureaucracy where rules are merely safety devices and are ignored. Administration does not enforce organizational control devices; workers feel management was lenient.

Barakat (1966) defined bureaucracy in terms of two variables: over-control and under-control. Over-control tapped three concepts: (1) centralization of power, (2) demand for conformity, and (3) formalization of interpersonal relationships. Under-control tapped uncertainty about goals and lack of cohesive interpersonal relationships.

Hall (1961) suggested that technical competence (TC) was not a bureaucratic dimension. Kolesar (1967) place characteristics of Weberian bureaucracy into two categories: (1) expertise (composed of technical competence and division of labor dimensions) and (2) authority (composed of hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and impersonality). Punch (1967) adapted Hall's instrument and concluded that bureaucracy is unitary if it constitutes only hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, procedural specifications, and impersonality dimensions. Isherwood (1971) concluded that school bureaucratic structure could be conceptualized as a unitary, bipolar factor.

Researchers consistently report two distinct second order factors. Usually, the first factor, composed of hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, procedural specifications, and impersonality dimensions, and the second factor, composed of technical competence and division of labor dimensions, are inversely correlated. First factor is accepted as the measure of bureaucratization by most researchers. The second factor is either discarded or analyzed separately. The second factor is accepted as a partial measure of professionalism.

Isherwood and Hoy (1973) developed a four-fold typology of school bureaucracy by using Hall's instrument. They named the first factor "control" (bureaucratic pattern), which included hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, procedural specifications, and impersonality. They named the second factor "expertise" (professional pattern), which included division of labor and technical competence. According to Hoy and Miskel (1996), "to lump together the bureaucratic and professional patterns in a single model obscures important differences among schools" (p. 61). Isherwood and Hoy (1973) calculated the means of two factors for each school. Then, they compared each school's means on the two factors to the grand means of all schools on the two factors. They named a school "chaotic" if the school had a low degree of control and a low degree of expertise relative to the grand means of all schools on the two factors. In chaotic schools, confusion and conflict are evident. Schools of this type are unstable and the desire to move toward another model is strong. The dominant source of power is political connections. Decisions are made in an irrational way. There is a lack of coordination of activities. They named a school "authoritarian" if the school had a high degree of control and a low degree of expertise relative to the grand means of all schools on the two factors. In this model bureaucratic authority is exercised at the expense of professional considerations. Rules are enforced to assure compliance. Power is centralized at the higher hierarchical positions. Rules are enforced in an impersonal way. Those who are loyal to superiors are promoted or recognized. Goals are clear and known. Decisions are overly rational. Obedience is emphasized. This model is similar to what Gouldner (1954) described as a punishment-centered bureaucracy. Isherwood and Hoy (1973) named a school "collegial" if the school had a low degree of control and a high degree of expertise relative to grand means of all schools on the two factors. In this model decision-making is delegated to the organizational members. Rules and regulations are viewed as guidelines. People are trusted. Goals are unimportant. They named a school "Weberian" if the school had a high degree of control and a high degree of expertise relative to grand means of all schools on the two factors. In this model bureaucratic and professional characteristics are complementary as Weber claimed. The four-fold typology can serve as a useful analytical tool to understand schools. Table 2 is an illustration of two factors and four types of bureaucracies.

Table 2 The Classification of Teachers' Perceptions of School Bureaucracy

HIGH CONTROL	**AUTHORITARIAN**	**WEBERIAN**
LOW CONTROL	**CHAOTIC**	**COLLEGIAL**
	LOW EXPERTISE	**HIGH EXPERTISE**

Note. Adapted from Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p. 61

Sense of Power

One of the most frequently studied constructs with relation to bureaucratization is "alienation." Alienation is an umbrella concept. "Alienation can refer to feelings of anomie, loss of self, despair, loneliness, powerlessness, disengagement, indifference, anxiety, isolation, meaninglessness, dissatisfaction, disaffection and depersonalization" (Hoy et al., 1983, p. 110). It includes variables such as alienation from work, alienation from expressive relationships, and sense of powerlessness. "Alienation from work reflects a feeling of disappointment with career and professional development, as well as disappointment over the inability to fulfill professional norms" (Hoy et al., 1983, p. 110). "Alienation from expressive relations reflects disappointment in social relations with superiors and fellow workers" (Hoy et al., 1983, p. 110).

Seeman (1959) defined sense of powerlessness as "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks" (p. 784). He stated that people learn poorly under circumstances where they have limited control over the conditions. He cited studies that found that alienated patients demonstrated a low level of knowledge concerning health matters and workers low in sense of power demonstrated a low level of political knowledge. He acknowledged the belief that alienation can cause people to learn the dependence, the lack of self-control, passivity, and low self-esteem that they apply elsewhere. He cited Toch who stated that if a person becomes alienated he would see new situations he faces with an alienated eye.

Studies of bureaucracy and sense of power in the school setting were pioneered by Moeller in 1962. Teachers' sense of power was measured with a questionnaire administered to 662 classroom teachers in 20 school systems. Moeller and Charters (1966) hypothesized that teachers in bureaucratized systems have a much lower "sense of power" than teachers in less bureaucratized systems. "The hypothesis assumed that the teacher, constrained by rules and regulations in whose establishment he had but a small voice, would respond to the impersonality, the magnitude, and the complexity of the bureaucratic system with a distinct feeling of impotence to control events which would affect his interest" (p. 448). They also hypothesized that the difference in sense of power between teachers in highly bureaucratic school systems and less bureaucratic systems would increase with the length of exposure to their environments. They

acknowledged that "teachers who hold positions of substantial responsibility in the system might well manifest higher scores on sense of power than their colleagues without such assignments" (p. 454). They warned that teachers might have personal access to some other influential people by virtue of extra-school friendship ties, which could enhance their feeling of power. They argued that "teachers who remain in the system for extensive periods of time should find themselves favorably situated in the informal if not the formal power structure" (p. 454). In their study teachers' sex and social class were also introduced as control variables since they were known to correlate with alienation.

A great majority of research findings suggests that highly bureaucratized organizations alienate their workers. Cox (1980) stated that theoretical and empirical work of organizational sociologists shows that teachers' alienation derives from the type of organization in which they work

> Scott suggests that professionals should find "autonomous" organizations a more congenial work setting than "heteronomous" organizations. Administrators in autonomous organizations delegate control of most professional activities to professional staff. In heteronomous organizations, on the other hand, the administration retains control over most professional activities. Schools exemplify this type of organization. (cited in Cox, 1980, p. 2)

Cox (1980) argued that bureaucratic schools are disturbing work-settings for professional teachers. He noted that researchers like Hall, Glaser, Hornhouser, and Scott have agreed that professionals find bureaucratic characteristics frustrating. Gross (1953) noted that organizations that put extensive emphasis on rules resulted in workers feeling that work was meaningless. Aiken and Hage (1966) hypothesized that alienation from work and from expressive relations to be greater in organizations which place too much reliance on codification of tasks and observation of rules. Hoy et al. (1983) noted that highly centralized and highly formalized schools had greater work alienation. Alienation from work was strongly related to the lack of opportunity to participate in decisions, hierarchical control over assigned tasks, an abundance of rules, and rigid enforcement of rules. They failed to find a relationship between alienation from expressive relationships and rules and regulations. However, Moeller (1962) and Moeller and

Charters (1966) reported that sense of power was greater, not less, in highly bureaucratized school systems. On the other hand, Barakat (1966) and Isherwood (1971) found positive relationships between degree of hierarchical control in schools and sense of powerlessness of teachers. Isherwood (1971) found that teachers in authoritarian schools had greater sense of powerlessness than teachers in collegial schools where the expertise is higher and control is lower. Similarly, Kolesar (1967) found that the higher the hierarchy of authority and the lower the expertise in the school, the greater the pupil powerlessness and total alienation. However, Anderson (1970) found that the factors (control and status maintenance) of bureaucratic structure account for only a small amount of the variance in alienation. Meyer (1971) reported that there was no relationship between sense of power and bureaucratization of a school district. In Meyers' study (1972), specialization was inversely correlated ($r = -.338$) to sense of power. This finding was the opposite of what was hypothesized. Aiken & Hage (1966) reported that the correlation between hierarchy of authority and alienation from work was .49 and the correlation between hierarchy of authority and alienation from relations was .45. The correlation between job codification and alienation from work was .51 and the correlation between job codification and alienation from relations was .23. The correlation between rule observation and alienation from work was .55 and the correlation between rule observation and alienation from relations was .65. Hoy et al. (1983) found that hierarchy of authority and alienation from work had a correlation coefficient of .73, while hierarchy of authority and alienation from expressive relationships had a correlation coefficient of .47. They also found a correlation of .63 between rule observation and alienation from work in addition to a correlation of .31 between rule observation and alienation from expressive relations. They reported that job codification and alienation from work had a correlation of .46 while job codification and alienation from expressive relations had a correlation of .18. They concluded that highly centralized and formalized school organizations are characterized by greater work alienation.

Research examining bureaucracy in relation to such constructs as job satisfaction, conflict, or morale can be helpful in understanding the relationship between bureaucracy and sense of power. Eddy (1968) found that teachers in bureaucratic schools are more satisfied than teachers in less bureaucratic schools. Gerhardt (1971) reported that the higher the perceived level

of bureaucracy in the school, the higher the intensity of conflict teachers reported, and as the level of bureaucracy in each dimension increased there was a corresponding increase in types of conflict they experienced. Teachers who were satisfied experienced less conflict than those who were less satisfied. As the perceived level of bureaucracy in the school increased the level of satisfaction reported by teachers decreased. McKenna (1974) found positive correlation coefficients between job satisfaction and division of labor and technical competence. Division of labor and technical competence were the best predictors of job satisfaction. But when technical competence and division of labor were combined as a scale, the new scale was not the best predictor of job satisfaction. Hoy, Newman, and Blazowsky (1977) reported a negative correlation coefficients between hierarchy of authority and morale as well as between hierarchy of authority and loyalty to the principal.

<div align="center">Demographic and Organizational Background Variables</div>

<div align="center">Size</div>

Bureaucracy and Size

Size is an unresolved issue in organizational research. Research consistently reveals inconsistent results. Size is usually operationalized as the number of people in the organization. Gouldner (1962) suggested that relationships between bureaucratic characteristics and size could be misleading. Size might be related to other things. According to Max Weber (in Gerth & Mills, 1946), size is a cause of bureaucratization. As the size of an organization increases, its bureaucratization is expected to increase. Research findings related to bureaucracy and size relationship are inconclusive. Moeller and Charters (1966) reported a .43 rank order correlation between bureaucracy and size. Robinson (1966), Anderson (1971), and Joo (1981) concluded that there was no relation between bureaucratization and school size. However, Punch (1967) reported that as the size increased, an a decrease in bureaucratization was observed ($r = -.37$).

MacKay (1964) found that large schools were more bureaucratic than small schools. He reported that larger schools demonstrated higher hierarchy of authority, higher rule enforcement, higher procedural specifications, and higher bureaucratization. He found that small schools and large schools had a similar degree of specialization, technical competence, and impersonality.

Anderson (1964) noted that the larger the number of students and the larger the number of teachers, the higher the perceived impersonality in the school. He also found that medium size schools scored higher on a rule enforcement scale than small and large schools while small schools and large schools did not differ on the rule enforcement scale. Kolesar (1967) found that larger schools tend to be more like the collegial or representative type than like any other type. Moore (1984) reported that two of the three largest schools were in the chaotic category.

Sackney (1976) reported a -.51 correlation between centralization(similar to hierarchy of authority) and number of students. Similarly, Goodwin (1979) found a -.41 correlation coefficient between size and centralization. Sousa (1980) found size unrelated to hierarchy of authority and centralization. Guidette (1982) found near zero correlations between size and centralization. Roache (1993) also failed to find any relationship between size and system centralization.

Sackney (1976) reported a positive correlation between specialization and number of students (r = .31). Outside the education sector, Goodwin (1979) found a .75 correlation coefficient between size and specialization. Sousa (1980) found size unrelated to technical competence and specialization.

Sackney (1976) reported a .37 correlation between number of students and formalization (similar to rules and regulations). Goodwin (1979) and Sousa (1980) both found a .17 correlation coefficient between size and formalization. Sousa (1980) reported a .19 correlation coefficient between size and procedural specifications. He also found size unrelated to rules and regulations. Roache (1993) failed to find a significant correlation between size and formalization. Guidette (1982) a near zero correlation between size and standardization.

Anderson (1964) noted that the larger the number of students and the larger the number of teachers, the higher the perceived impersonality in the school. However, Sackney (1976) found a -.43 correlation coefficient between number of students and aloofness (impersonality) of principal.

Sense of Power and Size

Moeller (1962) noted that size would reduce sense of power among teachers because large numbers of personnel and large number of administrative levels make individual teacher

insignificant. Meyers (1971) reported an inverse relationship between sense of power and number of students (r = -.36). Guidette (1982) found a negative relationship between percentage of administrators and teacher sense of power in the system (r = -.25), but the number of students and the number of teachers were not related to teachers' sense of power. Newland (1976) found a -.20 correlation coefficient between morale and school size and a .04 correlation coefficient between motivation and school size. Blazovsky (1977) found a positive relationship between alienation from work and number of students (r = .35) and a small positive correlation between alienation from expressive relations and number of students (r = .18). Joo (1981) reported no relationship between job satisfaction and school size. Sackney (1976) reported a .25 correlation coefficient between esprit (morale) and number of students.

<div align="center">Experience of Teacher</div>

MacKay (1964) found that years of experience in education is positively related to division of labor (r = .12). Similarly older teachers perceived more specialization (r =.13) and more impersonality (r = .15). Gerhardt (1971) reported that total service years of teachers had near zero correlations with hierarchy of authority, impersonality, and total bureaucratization while total service years of teachers had a -.10 correlation with rule enforcement. He reported near zero correlations between age of teacher and perceived bureaucratization. Magee (1977) noted that teachers in "closed schools" tended to be older and had more years in their present positions. Joo (1981) reported a -.19 correlation between age of teacher and bureaucratization, a -.18 correlation between service years of teacher and bureaucratization, and a -.12 correlation between service years of teacher in the present district and bureaucratization.

Moeller (1962) found that "teachers in positions of responsibility showed significantly higher scores in sense of power than teachers without such responsibility" (p. 456). He concluded that teachers who hold or held an administrative responsibility demonstrate higher sense of power. Meyers (1971) found a .07 correlation between teachers' sense of power and teachers' years in administrative experience in the district. He reported a -.38 correlation between teachers' total years of administrative experience and sense of power. Moeller (1962) also noted that tenure increases sense of power. He reasoned that teachers develop friendships with citizens in the community that provide them with a large reservoir of power. He stated that when teachers

stayed in the community longer than the principal, they can use their connections in the community to protect themselves from administrators. Moeller found a higher sense of power in highly bureaucratized systems and reasoned that teachers in such systems have longer service years.

Moeller (1962) did not find any difference in the proportions of teachers who held administrative authority in high bureaucratic systems and low bureaucratic systems. He added that position of authority and sense of power was related to each other only in highly bureaucratized systems. In both high and low bureaucratic systems length of service was related to sense of power; however, a substantially larger proportion of teachers in high bureaucratic systems were found to have longer service years than in low bureaucratic systems. He showed that friendship with school officials increased as the length of the service years of teachers increased. Because bureaucratic systems had more teachers with seniority, teachers in such systems developed friendships with administrators. By this line of reasoning, he justified why he found a positive relationship between bureaucratization and teachers' sense of power even though he hypothesized that the relationship would be negative.

Total service years of teachers is unlikely to be associated with sense of power. Gerhardt (1971) reported a -.17 correlation between job satisfaction and service years of teachers and a -.11 correlation between service years of teachers and perceived conflict in the school. Meyers (1971) found that the correlation between total service years of teacher in the present district and sense of power was -.16. Newland (1976) found a small positive association between morale and service years of teacher(r = .16). Joo (1981) reported that as the service years in teaching increased, teachers' job satisfaction increased (r = .28). Guidette (1982) hypothesized that teachers with longer tenure would have higher sense of power but found non-significant positive correlation coefficients between sense of power and percent of tenured staff in the system (r = .08) and average years of experience (r = .10). Newland (1976) found a small positive association between morale and years in the district (r = .12). Blazovsky (1977) also reported a near zero correlation between alienation from work and years in the present district while reporting a small negative correlation (r = -.16) between alienation from expressive relations and years in the present district. Joo (1981) service years in the district increased, teachers' job

satisfaction increased and (r = .15). Newland (1976) found a near zero correlation between morale total years with the present school. Blazovsky (1977) The correlation between alienation from expressive relations and years in the present school was .-09 while the correlation between alienation from work and years in the present school was .04.

Age of teacher is unlikely to be associated with sense of power. Gerhardt (1971) reported a negative correlations between age and job satisfaction (r = -.22) and age and conflict in school (r = -.20). Meyers (1972) found that sense of power was weakly related to age of teacher (r = -.11). Newland (1976) The correlation between motivation and percentage of teachers 35 or under was -.13. Blazovsky (1977) found a .16 correlation between alienation from expressive relations and percentage of teachers 35 or younger while he found a near zero correlation between alienation from work and this age variable. Guidette (1982) found a non-significant positive correlation between sense of power and percentage of staff 50 years and older (r = .17)

Newland (1976) found a near zero correlation between morale and total years with the school principal. He reported a -.20 correlation between motivation and total years with the school principal. Blazovsky (1977) found a small positive correlation between alienation from work and years spend under the same principal (r = .13) and a small positive correlation between alienation from expressive relations and years spend under the same principal (r = .12).

Experience of Administrator

Literature suggests that schools led by older and more experienced administrators tend to be more bureaucratic and less professional than schools led by younger principals. Sackney (1976) reported a .37 correlation coefficient between administrative experience of principal and aloofness of principal. He reported that as the administrative experience of the principal increased, specialization (r = .-18), standardization (r = -.19), centralization (r = -.18), and formalization (r = -.29) decreased. Sousa (1980) found that as the administrative experience of the principal increased, perceived level of specialization decreased (r = -.27) while hierarchy of authority (r = .12), procedural specifications (r = .16), rule enforcement (r = .16), and centralization (r = .24) increased. Guidette (1982) The correlation between total service years of principal and specialization was -.27 while the correlation between service years of principal and centralization was .24. The correlation between experience of principal in the present school and

centralization was .21 while experience of principal in the present school and specialization was -.11.

It is unlikely that experience or age of principals is associated with sense of power. Sackney (1976) found that the principal became more experienced, intimacy in the climate, esprit, and consideration tended to decrease. Guidette (1982) found that total service years of principals (r = -.05), and service years of the principal in the present school (r = -.13) were not related to teachers' sense of power.

School Level

Moeller (1962) reported that while teaching level of teachers were similar across high and low bureaucratic systems, teachers' sense of power was found to be related to teaching level. Elementary teachers felt greater power than secondary teachers regardless of the level of the bureaucratization. Elementary male teachers reported higher sense of power than secondary male teachers. Robinson (1966) reported that the higher the teaching level, the higher the bureaucratization. Cloyd (1972) reported that students in high, junior high, and elementary schools did not perceive their schools' bureaucratization differently; however, the 13-14 age group perceived more bureaucracy than the 15-16 and 11-12 age groups.

Teacher Training

MacKay (1964) found that teachers who received more education tend to perceive less hierarchy of authority (r= -.11), less procedural specifications (r -.23), and less total bureaucracy in their schools (r = -.14). Joo (1981) found no association between academic degree and perceived bureaucratization, He also found a -.20 correlation between academic degree and bureaucratic orientation.

Meyers (1971) found that training was related to sense of power (r = .23). Newland (1976) found a .11 correlation between morale and percentage of faculty with masters and higher degrees. Blazovsky (1977) found a -.12 correlation between percentage of faculty with masters or higher degrees and alienation from work. Cox and Wood (1980) noted that if teachers became more competent and more educated while the structure of schools remained the same, teacher alienation would likely increase. Joo (1981) found a -.16 correlation between academic degree of

teacher and job satisfaction. Seeman (1975) claimed that variables like extent of education would not explain a significant portion of variance in sense of powerlessness.

Location

Sackney's (1976) findings suggested that as the location of school became more rural, esprit among teachers (r = -.25, coded urban to rural) decreased, intimacy in climate (r = -.26) decreased and aloofness of principal (r = .52) increased. As the locality became more urban perceived specialization increased (r = -.38). While centralization (r = .69) and standardization (r = .37) increased, formalization (r = -.29) decreased as the locality became more rural. Magee (1977) reported that the suburban school was the most closed school followed by the urban and the rural school.

Moeller (1962) suggested that teachers in small communities might feel more power due to the fact that in such communities teachers stay longer and develop friendship ties in the community that in turn become a source of power for them. Similarly, he argued that if the teacher teaches in the same community where he grew up, he might feel more power than outsiders. He found no difference in the sense of power of locals and outsiders. The proportion of outsiders and locals did not differ between high bureaucratic systems and low bureaucratic systems. Moeller (1962) stated that schools in small traditional communities are less likely to be highly bureaucratized. In urban areas, teachers may feel less power, and schools in such places may be more bureaucratized. Newland (1976) reported a .20 correlation between morale and population density. Blazovsky (1977) found a near zero relationship between population density and alienation from work (r = -.08) while the correlation between the density and alienation from expressive relations was -.18. Seeman (1975) suggested that location might be relevant in explaining sense of power.

Particularistic Relations with School Officials

In Moeller's study (1962) friendship ties of teachers was one of the central variables in the explanation of sense of power. Friendship mediates between sense of power and variables such as locality, age, and tenure. This variable should be controlled when sense of power is studied. Moeller and Charters (1966) reported that teacher with friendship relations with school

officials also scored higher on sense of power than those lacking such relations. "The particularistic relationships with school officials were reported more frequently in less bureaucratic than in the highly bureaucratic systems" (p. 456).

Socioeconomic Status of Students

Anderson (1971) found that schools were run differently for higher SES and lower SES students. He reported that the higher the SES and the higher the sense of power of teachers and the lower the perceived bureaucracy. The higher rule enforcement, the lower the SES of students attend. Cloyd (1972) reported that high SES and low SES students did not perceive their school bureaucracy differently.

Socioeconomic Status of Teachers

Moeller (1962) reported that low bureaucratic systems had a higher percentage of teachers from farm families, labor families, and clerical families while high bureaucratic systems had a higher percentage of teachers from professional homes and business managerial families. He reasoned that teachers in high bureaucratic systems felt more power. He added that regardless of the bureaucratization of the school system, the socioeconomic status of teachers was related to sense of power. He acknowledged that teachers from professional homes were highest in sense of power, followed by farm, business-managerial, clerical and other white-collar, and labor in this order. He warned that even though the SES of teachers was related to sense of power, this relation was not strong enough to disregard the bureaucratization. Meyers (1971) reported a -.08 correlation between SES of teachers and sense of power. Seeman (1971) suggested that variables like income, occupation, and education would not explain much variance in sense of power.

Gender

Moeller (1962) reported that percentage of males and females did not differ across high bureaucratic and low bureaucratic systems. He found that male teachers reported more sense of power than female teachers. MacKay (1964) reported that female teachers perceived higher rule enforcement and higher procedural specifications in their schools than male teachers. Anderson (1964) reported that females perceived higher rule enforcement than males while males

perceived higher impersonality than females. Meyers (1971) found that percentage of male teachers was not related to sense of power of teachers. Gerhardt's (1971) findings suggested that males feel less conflict in organizations (r = -.22, coded female to male) while males and females do not perceive different degrees of hierarchy of authority, rule enforcement, impersonality, and total bureaucratization. Blazovsky (1977) found that as the percentage of females increased, alienation from work among teachers also increased (r = .31). He also found a small correlation between alienation from expressive relations (r = .12) and percentage of female teachers. Joo (1981) reported that as the percentage of females increased, morale of staff decreased (r = -.21). He also reported a -.27 correlation between job satisfaction and gender (males coded higher). He reported a near zero correlation between gender and perceived bureaucratization (r = -.09). Guidette (1982) reported that as the percentage of male teachers increased sense of power increased (r = .18). Moore (1984) reported that schools that were categorized as authoritarian were all led by female principals (three schools).

In sum, the literature suggests that almost all of the background variables are either not related to bureaucracy and sense of power or these variables have very low associations with bureaucracy and sense of power. These background variables will be examined with relation to bureaucratic variables and teachers' sense of power to see whether low or non-significant relationships also exist in this Turkish sample.