

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Instrumentation

Hall's operationalization of six dimensions of bureaucracy works for this Turkish sample of teachers. The instrument resulting from this study is a useful and appropriate tool to assess organizational structure of schools in Turkey. Items that survived (60 items) the item analyses converged under seven factors in a factor analysis in both the pilot sample and the research sample. Also six of seven factors were comparable to the six dimensions of bureaucracy identified by Hall (1961). The six factors extracted from a factor analysis included 52 items. A seventh non-bureaucratic factor was also extracted that was interpreted as a measure of friendly climate. This factor included eight items. Most of the items in this factor were originally identified under the impersonality dimension. Items in the division of labor and the impersonality dimensions showed some weaknesses for this sample. Items in the hierarchy of authority, procedural specifications, and rules and regulations dimensions collectively address a common aspect of bureaucracy. Items in these three dimensions are most likely to be the best predictors of bureaucracy.

Research Question I

Bureaucracy in Turkish schools is not unidimensional. The six dimensions of bureaucracy moderately intercorrelated suggesting that the bureaucracy is a multidimensional construct for this sample. Turkish teachers report a high level of rule enforcement in their schools. Teachers in this sample tend to be informal in their interactions with each other.

The six dimensions of bureaucracy form two higher order dimensions. These two higher order dimensions were inversely correlated. The first higher-order dimension was named control. The second higher order dimension was named expertise. The hierarchy of authority, the rules and regulations, the procedural specifications, and the formality in relations formed the first higher order dimension. The second higher order dimension was formed by the division of labor

and the technical competence dimensions. As teachers perceived a high level of control in their schools, a low level of professionalism was also reported.

Teachers were classified into four distinct clusters based on their scores on control and expertise higher order dimensions. The four clusters were authoritarian, Weberian, collegial, and chaotic. Teachers in the authoritarian cluster scored high on control and low on expertise. Teachers in the Weberian cluster scored high on both control and expertise. Teachers in the collegial cluster scored low on control and high on expertise. Teachers in the chaotic cluster scored low on both control and expertise. Even though a larger number of teachers compared to other three clusters were classified in the chaotic cluster, teachers in this cluster did not report an extreme level of lack of authority in their schools. Indeed, teachers in this cluster, on average, reported a higher level of control than teachers in the collegial category. Teachers in this sample are less likely to perceive anarchy in their schools. The authoritarian cluster was the most distinctly identifiable cluster.

Research Question II

Size variables are related to only the hierarchy of authority dimension. Teachers in large schools reported a lower level of hierarchical exercise of authority than teachers in smaller schools. Teachers in two-session schools consistently reported a higher degree of rule enforcement as well as a higher degree of hierarchy of authority than teachers in one-session schools. The reason for a school to run two sessions a day is the large number of student body in the attendance area.

Teachers' training is related to how teachers perceive the school bureaucracy. Teachers who were not trained to be educators perceived less bureaucracy than regular teachers. Regular teachers, who were graduated from a teacher college, seemed to perceive higher bureaucracy and lower expertise in their schools than teachers who were trained in other occupations. These teachers who are not trained to be a teacher were younger and in higher-grade levels.

Teachers' grade level is an important indicator of the perception of bureaucracy. Teachers in lower-grade levels report higher level of bureaucracy than teachers in higher grades. Teachers in higher-grade levels tend to report higher specialization and lower rule enforcement. Teachers

in lower grades tend to perceive higher friendliness in their school climate than teachers in higher grades.

Teachers report a high level of friendliness in their school climate if they perceive a high degree of rule enforcement and a high level of exercise of hierarchical authority. Teachers also report a high level of friendliness in their school climate when they perceive high level of expertise or promotions based on technical competence. Expertise and technical competence are inversely correlated with hierarchy of authority.

Teachers tend to report more bureaucracy in their schools if they work under older and more experienced principals. They tend to report a low specialization in their schools if they work under more experienced and older principals. Teachers who work under older principals tend to perceive that promotions are not based on technical competence of staff. Teachers work for older principals also report a low level of friendliness in their school climate.

Teachers, who work at schools where percentage of male teachers are higher than female teachers, report a low level of rule enforcement and a low level of hierarchical authority. Teachers who work at such schools also report a high level of friendship with school administrators outside school hours. Female teachers are less likely to report a friendship with school administrators outside school hours. Female teachers reported a higher level of hierarchical exercise of authority than male teachers.

Research Question III

The degree of bureaucracy, as it was measured by hierarchy of authority, rule enforcement, procedural specifications, formality in relations, and control, alienates teachers in this sample. Hierarchy of authority technical competence, formality, control and expertise are the most important predictors of sense of power. Rule enforcement does not alienate as it was thought to be. It is very unlikely that teachers will be alienated if the rules and regulations are enforced in the schools. Teachers will not feel better if rules are relaxed. However, teachers feel more power if they perceive a high level of expertise in their schools. Those who work in authoritarian schools feel the most alienated. Those who work in collegial schools are the least alienated. The finding that sense of power does not vary concomitantly with socioeconomic background or demographic characteristics of teachers suggest that organizational constrains are

more important than personal backgrounds of individual teachers to explain alienation among teachers.

Teachers feel more alienated if they work in school that houses lower SES students and if they work under older principals. Schools that houses higher SES students tend to have more specialization, less procedural specifications, and more expertise. This relation does not disappear when bureaucratic dimensions are taken into consideration. Older and more experienced principals tend to alienate teachers. This relation disappears when bureaucratic variables are taken into consideration.

Teachers reporting a friendship with school administration outside school hours also tend to report a high sense of power. This relation disappears when six dimension of bureaucracy is taken into consideration. However this relation does not disappear when control and expertise taken into consideration.

Discussion

Hall's operationalization of Max Weber's ideal type bureaucracy can be used as an analytical tool to examine organizational structure of Turkish schools. A majority of the conclusions drawn from this study had been reported in the U.S. regarding the instrument and the relationships among bureaucratic dimensions. Hall (1961) reported a negative correlation between technical competence and three of three of the other dimensions, Mackay (1964), Robinson (1966), Punch (1967), and Isherwood (1971) all stated that six dimensions of bureaucracy do not form a unidimensional factor rather they form two second order factors. They all reported low or insignificant correlations between demographic variables and bureaucratic dimensions. Findings related to size variables were not consistent. However, an inverse relationship was reported more often. This study found inverse relations between size variables and hierarchy of authority. The impersonality dimension function somewhat differently in this sample. It clearly has a weak connection to bureaucratic dimensions. However, Sousa and Hoy (1981) reported similar problems.

Findings of this study regarding the sense of power and bureaucracy relationships are comparable with findings reported in the U.S. Barakat (1966), Aiken and Hage (1966), Isherwood (1971), Cox (1980), and Hoy et al (1983) all reported positive correlations between

bureaucracy and alienation. Moeller (1962) discovered the importance of the particularistic relationships between teachers and administrators to explain sense of power and bureaucracy relationship. This study support his findings that the particularistic relations with administrators is related to sense of power. One of the difference in findings in this sample is related to rule enforcement dimension. Even though an inverse relation was found, the magnitude of the relation was not strong enough to suggest that a higher degree of rule enforcement alienate teachers in this sample.

Limitations

Generalizations should be made with caution. A random sample was not possible during the data collection. Also, this study is not a replication of any study that used Hall's approach.

Division of labor and impersonality dimensions had low reliabilities. Low reliability will under estimate the strength of relationships that exists between these dimensions and other variables.

A fatigue effect might have effected the responses of teachers. Teachers complained about the length of the instruments. The time for the data collection was the end of the school year.

Recommendations for Further Research

Impersonality dimension can be considered as a non-bureaucratic variable. When calculating an overall bureaucracy score researchers may prefer to exclude this dimension. This dimension should be reworded. New items tapping equal treatment of teachers by administrators needs to be incorporated into this dimensions.

Division of labor scale is particularly useful when comparing different level of schools. If only a restricted level of school is chosen (i.e., only elementary schools), this dimension will produce a low reliability. Problems with items in this dimension are not related to the quality of their wordings. Most probably, schools exhibit a restriction in range regarding this measure because specialization, expertise and training of teachers are more alike than different. If the instrument is used to compare schools to other kinds of organizations, reliabilities of all

dimensions including division of labor will improve. Division of labor and specialization may not mean the same thing.

Replications of this study using short versions of the instruments are recommended. A confirmatory factor analysis can be used to test the instruments. A Rasch model can also be used to further develop and refine the instruments. A Rasch analysis will be helpful to identify redundant items. It also help identify item-person fit. It is possible that items in some dimensions are very easy to agree with.

An exploration of relationships between the bureaucratic dimensions and such variables as teachers' work values and teachers' job satisfaction also needed. Less frequently studied constructs in education such as organizational citizenship behavior can be studied in relation to bureaucratic dimensions.