

## The Relationship Between the Influence Tactics Used By Secondary School Principals and Teachers' Organizational Trust Levels

<sup>1</sup>Serdar Koçak

<sup>2</sup>Salih Paşa Memişoğlu

### Abstract

*The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between the influence tactics used by secondary school principals and the organizational trust levels of teachers. A correlational survey model was used in the study. The study universe of the research consisted of 780 secondary school teachers working at public and private secondary schools in the central district of Bolu province in the 2020-2021 academic year, and answers were provided from 432 teachers. As a data collection tool in the research; "Influence Tactics Scale" developed by Yukl, Seifert & Chavez (2008) and adapted to Turkish by Gözü (2012) and "Organizational Trust Scale" developed by Yılmaz (2005) were used. According to the result of the research; teachers' perceptions of the influencing tactics used by school principals; It has been concluded that they very rarely use the tactics of personal appeals, exchange, forming a coalition with others, pressure, and they occasionally use the tactics of legitimating, rational persuasion, collaboration, appreciating, consulting, inspirational appeals, apprising. It has been determined that teachers' perceptions of organizational trust are at a moderate level across the scale, with sub-dimensions of sensitivity to employees, trust in managers, openness to innovation and communication ambient. It was observed that there was a moderately significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of the Influence Tactics Scale and the Organizational Trust Scale.*

**Keywords:** School Principal, Teacher, Influence Tactics, Organizational Trust.

---

<sup>1</sup>Serdar Koçak, PhD, Teacher, Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education, Bolu, Turkey. Email: [srd1423@gmail.com](mailto:srd1423@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Salih Paşa Memişoğlu, Prof. Dr., Faculty of Education, Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey. Email: [memisoglus@hotmail.com](mailto:memisoglus@hotmail.com)

\* This article was produced from the doctoral thesis titled "The relationship between the influence tactics used by the secondary school principals and the organizational trust levels of the teachers (2022)" conducted by the first author under the supervision of the second author.

**Recommended Citation:** Koçak, S. & Memişoğlu, S.P. (2023). The Relationship Between The Influence Tactics Used By Secondary School Principals and Teachers ' Organizational Trust Level, *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 7(2)

## Introduction

Schools are the first institutions that come by when educational organizations are considered. Schools are official and original institutions, whose input and output are human and established to train these people (Uğur, 2017; Ergül, 2019). In order for educational organizations to achieve their expected goals and objectives, a significant financial resource is allocated to these organizations. However, when compared with other elements of the education system, it can be said that the main element is the teacher. It is a known fact that the power of influence of the teacher is greater with the help of his personal and professional characteristics (Koçak, 2021). The effectiveness and efficiency of schools is undoubtedly closely related to the fact that teachers working in these institutions have positive perceptions and attitudes towards the schools they work in and that they are happy with the environment they are in. One of the most important factors that determine the perception and attitudes of a person towards his job, is his thought about how he is managed (Alanoğlu, 2019). The duty of the school principal is to use the existing material and human resources in the school in the most efficient way possible, to maintain the school in accordance with its determined goals and objectives and to ensure its development. The most important source to achieve this is the management skills and power of the manager (Başaran, 2004; Karadaş, 2013).

In recent years, researchers have focused on behaviors in the process of influencing rather than power, especially as the potential to affect employees in organizations. Behaviors of a person to influence the attitudes and behaviors of another person are called influencing tactics or skills (Çetin, 2017). The concept of influencing can be defined as an externally applied motivational action to get the employee to do work in the desired quality and quantity (Başaran, 1996). Therefore, the concept of influence is intertwined with the concept of management. Influencing is the process of enabling individuals to think positively about themselves as a result of influencing the attitudes and behaviors of others (Güney, 2015). It is inevitable to use influence tactics in organizations (Robbins, 2001). Because it is necessary to influence the employees in order to make efforts towards the organizational goals. For this reason, influencing tactics are a common situation in organizations today. From the management point of view, influencing tactics are tools that create changes in the attitudes and behaviors of employees in order to fulfill and adopt decisions and wishes (Yukl, Seifert, & Chavez, 2008). Therefore, the fact that the manager can reach the desired goal and ensure the desired target behavior in his employees may mean that he has the right influence tactics and skills or uses them effectively (Güney, 2012; Tekben, 2019).

As in all organizations, organizational trust is also important in increasing efficiency and productivity in schools (Polat & Taştan, 2009). School administrators are primarily responsible for creating an environment of trust in schools. Trust in the school administrator can be explained as the confidence that school staff will do what the administrators say (Ayduğ, 2014). The school administrator's being open, fair and impartial, having effective communication and influencing skills, sharing his authority and being interested in the employees increase the trust both in the administrator and in the other employees in the organization (İnce, Bedük, & Aydoğan, 2004). Having an environment of trust among school personnel will increase the sense of commitment within the organization, as well as increase cooperation and creativity, and enable the school to reach its vision and mission easily (Tüzün, 2007).

## The Influence Tactics

Management processes are grouped into seven groups: decision making, planning, organizing, communicating, influencing, coordination and evaluation (Gregg, 1957). The concept of influence, which is accepted as one of the stages in management processes, plays an important role in increasing the success of the organization as a factor in increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations. Because managers use tactics to influence their subordinates in order to reach the determined goals of the organizations (Katlav, 2016). Influencing tactic is defined as the type of behavior that an individual uses to influence the attitudes and behaviors of the other party (Yukl, Chavez, & Seifert, 2005). Influence tactics are purposeful behaviors that individuals use to achieve desired results (Castro, Douglas, Hochwarter, Ferris, & Frink, 2003). It is inevitable to use influence tactics in organizations (Robbins, 2001). Because it is necessary for the employees to influence them in order to willingly spend effort towards the goals of the organization. From the manager's point of view, influencing tactics are tools that create changes in the attitudes and behaviors of employees in order to adopt and fulfill the decisions and demands (Yukl, Seifert, & Chavez, 2008). For this reason, influence tactics are a common phenomenon in today's organizations (Tekben, 2019).

In this research, the proactive tactics discussed by Yukl (2013) have been extensively examined. According to the classification made, rational persuasion; It is the manager's ability to help employees to achieve an important task in the organization or to express that the task to be done is important and necessary using logical arguments, concrete and valid evidence or explanations (Koşar, 2016). Exchange; it is an explicit or implicit notification that a request will be fulfilled, that an employee will be helped or rewarded in any matter, in order to fulfill a request or request or to help with that activity (Yukl, 2013). Inspirational appeals; the person trying to influence is trying to influence by trying to touch their feelings, values, ideals in order to make the other person do what they want. (Yukl, 2013). Legitimizing; it is an influencing tactic when the manager, while influencing the employees, shows that the requested activity complies with the laws, regulations, policies, traditions and rules that are the legal basis of the institution (Kuru Çetin, 2013). Apprising; information is the manager's telling how the employee will do the requested job and what benefit it will provide to the person (Yukl & Tracey, 1992). Pressure; it includes the manager's frequent reminders, constant checking or aggressive behaviors such as warning and threatening in order to persuade the target person to realize the demands of the manager (Yukl, 2010). Collaboration; collaboration in the organization can be defined as the efforts that include the unity and coordination of the employees in order to solve any problem or reach the goal (Dillenbourg et al., 1996). Collaboration is defined as the process of harmonizing the ideas of employees through interaction (Yener, 2017). Appreciating; it is to say positive things about the work or personality of the target individual before making a request or to act in this direction (Yukl, 2010). Consultation; the person who wants to impress, encourages the target person to develop suggestions or express an opinion on his/her request and encourages him/her to help him/herself. Personal appeals; it is the state of behaving in a way that appeals to the feelings of loyalty and friendship of the person who wants to impress, while asking the other person to fulfill a request. In this tactic, while asking for favors, attention is sought based on loyalty and friendship or kindness and generosity. Forming a coalitions with others; the person who wants to influence, uses the help of others to persuade the other person or uses the support of others as a reason to

change the target person's mind (Yukl & Tracy, 1992). As is seen, eleven different influencing tactics were created.

## **Organizational Trust**

After the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, trust has been widely studied (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000; Özdemir, 2019) and has found a place in the management literature, and is considered as an important condition for effective management and its maintenance (Hoy & Tarter, 2004). Changing and developing life and working conditions have brought to the fore management models in which horizontal mobility, communication and participation are more than hierarchical management models. This changing structure has made the concept of trust in organizations one of the concepts that are frequently emphasized as a necessity for organizational life (Asunakutlu, 2002; Güneş, 2020). Since the concept of trust, which is one of the determining factors in bilateral relations, has a very important place in organizational life, studies on organizational trust are increasing day by day (Yücel & Samancı, 2009).

Organizational trust is complex and has a complex structure consisting of various variables. Unlike personal trust, organizational trust is the trust that focuses on the whole organization, which has a much more collective structure than the individual. Organizational trust forms the basis of relations within the entire organization in both vertical and horizontal directions (Demircan & Ceylan, 2003). When the definitions of organizational trust are examined, it is seen that the common points are generally believing and being willing (Yıldız, 2013). They are the thoughts developed by individuals working under a certain institutional structure about the reliability of the institution (Günaydın, 2001).

Organizational trust, which is seen as an important factor for employees to reach their personal and organizational goals, has been stated to be effective in increasing organizational commitment and performance (Okudan, 2018), but also in ensuring coordination, increasing productivity and ensuring cooperation (Ouchi, 1989; Artuksi, 2009). Organizational trust; is generally examined in four dimensions as trust in organizational managers, employees, each other, the organization itself and stakeholders (Bilgiç, 2011).

## **Significance of the study**

School principals have to have special skills and take managerial actions to make them successful in order to make the necessary contribution to the conduct of educational activities in line with the interests of the country and in accordance with the modern education approach. It can be said that school principals should be aware of their roles and responsibilities and have influencing skills in order to fulfill the roles expected from them effectively and efficiently.

With the establishment of organizational trust, it is possible to increase the morale of individuals in organizations, to encourage them to share with each other, to increase their commitment to the existing organization (Yücel, 2006) and to increase their job-related performance levels (Butler, 1999). Trust in the manager is an important pillar of organizational trust. Managers who undertake the task of management should strive to gain the trust of their employees who continue their activities in the institution and to create an environment of trust (Gümüsen, 2016). The fact that managers are fair, behaving in a balanced and consistent manner towards their employees, and having the ability to manage the organization will help increase the trust of the employees in their managers and also help the formation of an organizational trust environment (Bryk & Schneider, 2003). In this direction, the correct use of influencing tactics by

school principals will ensure teachers' trust in the organization and make extra effort for the organization, and will also prevent them from developing negative attitudes and behaviors towards the organization (Çevik, 2018). Therefore, in this study, it is thought that it is important and necessary to reveal the relationship between the influence tactics used by school principals and teachers' organizational trust status and to solve administrative problems. The findings to be obtained as a result of the research will contribute to the studies to be carried out in the literature.

## **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to determine whether there is a significant relationship between the influence tactics used by school principals and teachers' organizational trust levels, according to teacher perceptions. In order to achieve this purpose, answers to the following questions will be sought.

1. What is the level of teachers' perceptions about the influence tactics used by school principals and organizational trust?
2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the influence tactics used by the school principals and organizational trust of the teachers perceptions ?

## **Method**

### **Research Design**

Correlational survey model, one of the quantitative patterns, was used in the research. In the survey model, an attempt is made to describe a situation that existed in the past or the present as it exists, and the event or objects within their own conditions. In relational studies, on the other hand, it is purposed to determine the existence or degree of the relationship between many variables (Karasar, 2012). In general, in the researches in the correlational survey model; the stages of determining the problem, defining the variables to be included in the research, selecting participants, collecting data, analyzing and interpreting the obtained data are followed (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2017).

### **Research Sample**

The universe of this study consists of 780 secondary school teachers working in public and private secondary schools in the central district of Bolu province in the 2020-2021 academic year. Since it was purposed to reach the entire universe, sampling was not done. Out of 780 active duty teachers in the study universe, 432 were reached and the return rate was 55.38%. According to Krejcie & Morgan (1970), the number of returned scales was determined to represent the universe, so the return rate of the data obtained in this study was found to be sufficient for the research.



**Table 1**

*Demographics of participants*

		N	%
School type	Public	380	88
	Private	52	12
Gender	Female	249	57.6
	Male	183	42.4
Education	Undergraduate	362	83.8
	Graduate	70	16.2
Experience	1-5	74	17.1
	6-10	111	25.7
	11-15	99	23.0
	16-20	76	17.6
	21 $\geq$	72	16.6
Total		432	100

When Table 1 is examined, 380 of the participants were working in public schools (87.97%) and 52 were in private schools (12.03%); 249 were female (57.6%) and 183 were male (42.4%). As for educational level, 362 teachers had an undergraduate (83.8%), and 70 had a graduate degree (16.2%). Finally, 74 of the participants had 1-5 years (17.1%), 111 had 6-10 years (25.7%), 99 had 11-15 years (23.0%), 76 had 16-20 years (17.6%) and 72 had 21 years or above (16.6%) experience as teachers.

## **Research Instruments**

Influence Tactics Scale and Organizational Trust Scale were used as data collection tools in the research. Detailed information about the scales is presented below.

### ***Influenced Behavior Scale for Employees***

Influenced Behavior Scale for Employees which was developed by Gary Yukl and colleagues (Yukl, G., Seifert, C. F., & Chavez, C., 2008) and adapted into Turkish by Gözü (2012) (Influence Behavior Questionnaire-Target) was used. Yukl et al. (2008) developed the scale in two types as influencing (manager) and affected (target). The target version of the scale was used in

this study. The reason for this is the assumption that those who are exposed to influencing behavior can best describe the behavior they are exposed to (İspir, 2008).

The Influenced Behavior Scale for Employees was adapted into Turkish by Gözü (2012). While adapting the scale to Turkish, it was first translated into Turkish and then back into English and checked. Some tactics and wording have been changed by Gözü (2012) to avoid misunderstanding. The internal consistency coefficient was calculated as .92 in the Turkish version and .83 in the US version of the scale. 44 statements in the Influenced Behavior Scale for Employees measure 11 influencing tactics in groups of 4. Influenced Behavior Scale for Employees; It is prepared as a 5-point Likert scale, (1) I do not remember that he/she used this tactic for me, (2) he/she rarely uses this tactic for me, (3) he/she uses this tactic for me from time to time, (4) he/she often uses this tactic for me, (5) he/she uses this tactic very often for me. In the current study, the reliability coefficient of the scale and its sub-dimensions were recalculated as; rational persuasion .89, exchange .91, inspirational appeals .90, legitimating .88, apprising .91, pressure .80, collaboration .89, appreciating .92, consulting .91, to use personal appeals .87, forming a coalition with others .88, and the Scale Total was found to be .95.

### ***Organizational Trust Scale***

The Organizational Trust Scale developed by Yılmaz (2005) includes a total of forty questions and four sub-dimensions. In the scale; a 6-point Likert scale was used, in which I never disagree, I disagree, I agree a little, I quite agree, I much agree, I completely agree. Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale created by Yılmaz (2005) is determined as .95 in the dimension of sensitivity to employees, .95 in the dimension of trust in the manager, .92 in the dimension of communication ambient, .75 in the dimension of openness to innovation, and .97 in the whole scale. In the current study, the reliability coefficient of the scale and its sub-dimensions was recalculated. It was determined as .96 in the dimension of sensitivity to employees, .96 in the dimension of trust in the manager, .96 in the dimension of communication ambient, .89 in the dimension of openness to innovation, and .98 in the whole scale. It has been concluded that the reliability values (Cronbach's Alpha) of the affected behavior scale and its sub-dimensions and the organizational trust scale and its sub-dimensions are above 0.70. The fact that the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient is between .60 and .80 indicates that the scale is reliable (Büyüköztürk, 2017; Kalaycı, 2016; Lorcu, 2015; Şencan, 2005). In line with this information, it can be concluded that the reliability coefficients of the scales are sufficient in the current study.

### **Data Collection**

An application was made to the Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Ethics Committee for research permission and permission was obtained from the Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Human Research Ethics Committee in Social Sciences with the date of 24.12.2020 and the number 2020/12 (protocol no. 2020/279). In order to collect the research data, legal permission for the use of the scale was obtained from the authors of the scale via Google forms. Online data were collected from teachers working in public and private secondary schools in the central district of Bolu, with official permission from the Governorship of Bolu.

### **Data Analysis**

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was conducted to determine which analyze tests would be used by testing the normality of the data obtained in the study. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is a test used to examine the conformity of the data to normality in cases where the group size is more

than 50 (Büyüköztürk et al., 2014). For this reason, since the study group was more than 50 (n=432) Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results were examined ( $p < 0.05$ ), and it was determined that the data did not show normal distribution (Kilmen, 2015) and nonparametric tests were used.

In the analysis of the data obtained in the research; for the first sub-problem, the standard deviation (SD) and arithmetic mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) values were calculated for the determination of the participants' influence tactics and organizational trust perceptions (Büyüköztürk, 2011; Kilmen, 2015; Pallant, 2007). For the second sub-problem, it was interpreted by performing correlation coefficient analysis in order to reveal the relationship between the variables (Büyüköztürk, 2017; Kilmen, 2015). Köklü, Büyüköztürk & Bökeoğlu (2006) correlation coefficient values; in case of 0.00 no correlation, 0.01-0.29 low; 0.30-0.70 medium; they explained it as 0.71-0.99 high and 1.00 perfect relationship. If the correlation coefficient is positive, it is interpreted that the variables increase together, and if it is negative, it is interpreted as an inverse tendency (Cited by Kandemir, 2021).

## Findings

The first sub-problem of the research is "What are the teachers' perceptions of the influence tactics used by school principals and organizational trust?". For this reason, the arithmetic mean and standard deviation findings for the data obtained from the teachers are given below.

### Findings Regarding Influence Tactics Scale and Its Sub-Dimensions

The arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of teachers' perceptions of influence tactics are given in Table 2.

**Table 2**

*Teachers' perception levels towards the scale of influence tactics and its sub-dimensions*

Scale and Dimensions	$\bar{X}$	SS
Rational persuasion	3.36	.88
Exchange	2.33	1.1
Inspirational appeals	3.06	.93
Legitimizing	3.38	.89
Apprising	2.95	1.0
Pressure	2.50	.87
Collaboration	3.20	.92
Appreciating	3.15	1.0
Consulting	3.10	.91
Personal appeals	2.26	.97
Forming a coalition with others	2.39	.93
Scale total	2.88	.64

Note. 1.00-1.79 "I don't remember ever using this tactic", 1.80-2.59 "H/S uses this tactic very rarely", 2.60-3.39 "H/S uses this tactic from time to time", 3.40-4.19 "H/S uses this tactic often", 4.20-5.00 "H/S uses this tactic very often".

When Table 2. is examined, the perception levels of teachers towards influencing tactics are rational persuasion ( $\bar{X}=3.36$ ), exchange ( $\bar{X}=2.33$ ), inspirational appeals ( $\bar{X}=3.06$ ), legitimizing



( $\bar{X}$ =3.38), apprising ( $\bar{X}$ =2.95), pressure ( $\bar{X}$ =2.50), collaboration ( $\bar{X}$ =3.20), appreciating ( $\bar{X}$ =3.15), consult ( $\bar{X}$ =3.10), personal appeals ( $\bar{X}$ =2.26), forming a coalition with others ( $\bar{X}$ =2.39) and total scale ( $\bar{X}$ =2.88) points. Based on this finding, "H/S rarely uses this tactic" in the dimensions of reciprocating, using pressure, using personal appeals, and forming coalitions with others; rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, legitimating, apprising, collaboration, appreciating, consulting, were found to be at the level of "H/S uses this tactic from time to time".

## **Findings Regarding the Organizational Trust Scale and its Sub-Dimensions**

**Table 3**

*Teachers' perceptions of organizational trust scale and its sub-dimensions*

Scale and Dimensions	$\bar{X}$	SS
Sensitivity to employees	3.88	1.08
Trust in managers	4.23	1.18
Openness to innovation	3.97	1.20
Communication ambient	4.28	1.19
Scale total	4.08	1.09

Note. 1.00-1.83 "I never disagree", 1.83-2.67 "I disagree", 2.67-3.50 "I agree a little", 3.50-4.33 "I quite agree", 4.33-5.17 "I much agree", 5.17-6.00 "I completely agree".

In Table 3, the findings regarding the arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the answers given by the teachers for the sub-dimensions of the organizational trust scale and the generality are given. According to the findings, the perception levels of teachers are 'I quite agree' in the sensitivity to employees ( $\bar{X}$ =3.88), trust in managers ( $\bar{X}$ =4.23), openness to innovation ( $\bar{X}$ =3.97), communication ambient ( $\bar{X}$ =4.28) and scale total ( $\bar{X}$ =4.08). Considering the dimensions of organizational trust, the highest value belongs to the communication ambient, then trust to the manager, openness to innovation, and the lowest average belongs to the dimension of sensitivity to employees.

## **Findings Regarding the Second Sub-Problem**

In the context of the second sub-problem of the current study, the relationship levels between the teachers' perceptions of influence tactics and their perceptions of organizational trust were discussed. In order to reveal these relationship levels, Spearman correlation coefficient values were found and the relationship levels between the variables are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4**

*Spearman rho correlation analysis results for the relationship between teachers' perceptions of influence tactics and their perceptions of organizational trust*

Scale and Dimensions	Sensitivity to employees	Trust in managers	Openness to innovation	Communication ambient	Organizational trust scale
Rational persuasion	.632**	.707**	.649**	.631**	.685**
Exchange	.288**	.188**	.252**	.146**	.225**
Inspirational appeals	.590**	.602**	.568**	.537**	.602**
Legitimizing	.429**	.468**	.397**	.454**	.461**
Apprising	.587**	.563**	.539**	.543**	.586**
Pressure	-.419**	-.456**	-.391**	-.442**	-.455**
Collaboration	.637**	.679**	.617**	.613**	.668**
Appreciating	.399**	.456**	.427**	.379**	.434**
Consulting	.620**	.606**	.630**	.584**	.636**
Personal appeals	.164**	.100**	.183**	.107**	.134**
Forming a coalition with others	.101**	-.030**	.085**	.007**	.034**
Influence Tactics Scale	.530**	.489**	.513**	.449**	.515**

\*\*p<.01 Note. correlation coefficient values; 0.00 no relationship, 0.01-0.29 low; 0.30-0.70 medium; 0.71-0.99 high, 1.00 perfect (Köklü, Büyüköztürk & Bökeoğlu, 2006).

When Table 4 is examined, according to the Spearman rho correlation coefficient, in the sub-dimension of rational persuasion of teachers' perceptions of influencing tactics between the sub-dimension of organizational trust's sensitivity to employees ( $r = .632$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the dimension of trust in the manager ( $r = .707$ ;  $p < .01$ ), openness to innovation dimension ( $r = .649$ ;  $p < .01$ ), communication ambient dimension ( $r = .631$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .685$ ;  $p < .01$ ) were found to have positive high-level statistically significant relationships.

In the sub-dimension of exchange, employee sensitivity dimension of organizational trust ( $r = .288$ ;  $p < .01$ ), trust in manager dimension ( $r = .188$ ;  $p < .01$ ), openness to innovation dimension ( $r = .252$ ;  $p < .01$ ), communication ambient dimension ( $r = .146$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .225$ ;  $p < .01$ ) were found to have positive low-level statistically significant relationships.

In the inspirational appeals sub-dimension, the employee sensitivity dimension of organizational trust ( $r = .590$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the manager trust dimension ( $r = .602$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the dimension of openness to innovation ( $r = .568$ ;  $p < .01$ ), communication ambient dimension ( $r = .537$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .602$ ;  $p < .01$ ) were found to have positive, moderate, statistically significant relationships.

In the sub-dimension of legitimating, the employee sensitivity dimension of organizational trust ( $r = .429$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the manager trust dimension ( $r = .468$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the dimension of openness to innovation ( $r = .397$ ;  $p < .01$ ), communication ambient dimension ( $r = .454$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .461$ ;  $p < .01$ ) were found to have positive, moderate, statistically significant relationships.

In the sub-dimension of appraising, the employee sensitivity dimension of organizational trust ( $r = .587$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the manager trust dimension ( $r = .563$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the dimension of openness to innovation ( $r = .539$ ;  $p < .01$ ), It was found that there were positive, moderate, statistically significant relationships between the communication ambient dimension ( $r = .543$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and the overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .586$ ;  $p < .01$ ).

In the sub-dimension of pressure, sensitivity to employees dimension of organizational trust ( $r = -.419$ ;  $p < .01$ ), trust to manager dimension ( $r = -.456$ ;  $p < .01$ ), openness to innovation dimension ( $r = -.391$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the communication ambient dimension ( $r = -.442$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and the overall organizational trust scale ( $r = -.455$ ;  $p < .01$ ) were found to have negative, moderate, statistically significant relationships.

In the sub-dimension of collaboration, the dimension of sensitivity to employees ( $r = .637$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the dimension of trust in the manager ( $r = .679$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the dimension of openness to innovation ( $r = .617$ ;  $p < .01$ ), communication ambient dimension ( $r = .613$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .668$ ;  $p < .01$ ) were found to have positive, moderate, statistically significant relationships.

In the appreciation sub-dimension, the employee sensitivity dimension of organizational trust ( $r = .399$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the manager trust dimension ( $r = .456$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the dimension of openness to innovation ( $r = .427$ ;  $p < .01$ ), communication ambient dimension ( $r = .379$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .434$ ;  $p < .01$ ) were found to have positive, moderate, statistically significant relationships.

In the consultation sub-dimension, the employee sensitivity dimension of organizational trust ( $r = .620$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the manager trust dimension ( $r = .606$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the dimension of openness to innovation ( $r = .630$ ;  $p < .01$ ), communication ambient dimension ( $r = .584$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .636$ ;  $p < .01$ ) were found to have positive, moderate, statistically significant relationships.

In the sub-dimension of using personal appeals, the employee sensitivity dimension of organizational trust ( $r = .164$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the dimension of trust in the manager ( $r = .100$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the dimension of openness to innovation ( $r = .183$ ;  $p < .01$ ), communication ambient dimension ( $r = .107$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .134$ ;  $p < .01$ ) were found to have positive low-level statistically significant relationships.

In the sub-dimension of forming a coalition with others, there are negative low-level statistically significant relationships between the organizational trust in the manager dimension ( $r = -.030$ ;  $p < .01$ ), the employee sensitivity dimension ( $r = .101$ ;  $p < .01$ ), innovation positive low-

level statistical analysis between openness dimension ( $r = .085$ ;  $p < .01$ ), communication ambient dimension ( $r = .007$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .034$ ;  $p < .01$ ) significant relationships were found.

Teachers' perceptions of the overall influencing tactics scale, and organizational trust's sensitivity to employees ( $r = .530$ ;  $p < .01$ ), trust in administrators ( $r = .489$ ;  $p < .01$ ), openness to innovation dimension ( $r = .513$ ;  $p < .01$ ). It was found that there were positive, moderate and statistically significant relationships between communication ambient dimension ( $r = .449$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and overall organizational trust scale ( $r = .515$ ;  $p < .01$ ).

## Discussion and Conclusion

### Results for Regarding the Influence Tactics Scale and Its Sub-Dimensions

According to the results of the research, it was determined that the perception levels of the teachers towards the influencing tactics used by the school principals were moderate. It was seen that the sub-dimension "personal appeals" has the lowest average according to teacher perceptions from the sub-dimensions of influencing tactics, and the sub-dimension with the highest average, is "legitimizing".

According to this result, it can be said that the perception levels of teachers towards the influencing tactics used by school principals are close to the medium level throughout the scale, but it is not at the desired level and should be increased. As it can be understood from the findings, the influence tactics used by the managers mostly include the moderate tactics. In addition, it can be expressed that harsh tactics sometimes accompany these moderate tactics. The fact that teachers' perceptions are quite high, especially in the dimensions of legitimating and rational persuasion, can be interpreted as the fact that school principals act on the axis of rules and regulations in their superior-subordinate relations. On the other hand, it can be said that the reason for the teachers' perceptions of the dimensions on exchange and using personal appeals is quite low, due to the fact that school principals generally exhibit official attitudes and manners in their relations with teachers (Marangoz, 2020). Another finding obtained from the research is that school principals rarely use the tactics of pressure, and forming coalitions with others. Based on this finding, it can be said that school principals generally avoid harsh influence tactics. In other words, it can be said that school principals avoid harsh influence tactics in order not to cause negative situations and to increase teachers' commitment to their schools; therefore they rarely resort to harsh influence tactics (Tekben, 2019). Based on the data obtained, it can be claimed that school principals do not benefit from a single influencing tactic in the in-school influencing mechanism, but rather influencing is carried out through more than one tactic. Considering the studies in the literature, Doğan (2019) in his study on influencing tactics on teachers concluded that teachers think that school principals use motivation tactics the most among the influencing tactics and that they use pressure tactics the least, and teachers' perception levels are moderate. Tükel (2018) conducted a research on the relationships between family and social policies, youth and sports club managers' perceived influence and job performance, and it was seen that managers' perceptions of influencing tactics were moderate. In his study, Marangoz (2020) examined the opinions of school principals and teachers on the influencing tactics used by school principals, and concluded that the teachers who participated in the research thought that the tactic most used by school principals was

legitimizing, and the tactics they used the least were the tactics of using personal appeals and forming coalitions with others. In his research, Bülbül (2019) found that, according to the opinions of teachers, the most frequently used influencing tactic by school principals was rational persuasion, and the least used influencing tactics were using personal appeals, inspirational appeals, and forming coalitions. Pehlivan (2018) examined the relationship between the influence tactics used by primary school administrators and teachers' organizational commitment, and it was determined that the most used influence tactics by school administrators were legitimizing, and the least used influence tactics were exchange and using personal attraction. In his study, Dağlı (2015) investigated the relationship between the influence tactics used by school principals working in primary schools and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors and school awareness, it was determined that according to the opinions of teachers, the tactic of legitimizing was used the most and the tactic of exchange was used the least. Friedman & Berkovich (2020) in their study investigating the political behavior and strategies of school administrators showed that school principals exhibit two main influence prototypes, and they have a mixed type and strategy based on soft influence tactics combining soft and hard influence tactics. Alshenaifi (2016) found that among the concepts of upward influence and social change, rational persuasion and loving approach were used the most, while tactics such as initiative, coalition and exchanging of interests were used less. Cerado & Rivera (2015) examined the effect of the influencing tactics behaviors of the administrators on the leader member change, in which the school principals' level of use of influencing tactics was at a moderate level and they frequently used behavioral influencing tactics such as inspirational appeals, rational persuasion, consultation, collaboration, and tactics that feed the emotional aspects of the employees. He found that he responded more positively. These results can be said to support the results of the research.

## **Results for Regarding the Organizational Trust Scale and its Sub-Dimensions**

In line with the data, it was concluded that teachers' views on organizational trust were at the level of "I quite agree" across the scale, on the sub-dimensions of sensitivity to employees, trust in the manager, openness to innovation, and communication environment. It has been seen that the sub-dimension with the lowest average according to the perceptions of teachers among the organizational trust sub-dimensions is 'Sensitivity to employees' and the sub-dimension with the highest average is 'Communication ambient'.

This result can be explained by the fact that there are similar findings in the sub-dimensions and the scale, and that teachers have a moderate perception of organizational trust in the schools where they work. It can be said that the level of trust in the organization is related to the behavior and attitudes of the managers in the organization, the way of communication between people, the attitudes of the employees to each other and the management styles adopted by the managers. The weakness of the Organizational trust in an organization; it may be due to the perception that they are not cared for because they do not fulfill what is promised by the manager or the organization, the managers do not comply with the principle of transparency, or the employees are not sufficiently included in the decision-making processes. It can be said that teachers are more sensitive to issues related to trust in accordance with their professional principles, and the lack of trust in the school they work in will greatly reduce the efficiency and quality of teachers' work (Bil, 2018), because organizational trust refers to the belief in the process of making and implementing fair, tolerant and ethical decisions within the organization (Kochanek, 2005;



Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Administrative activities such as involving the employees in the decision, taking their opinions, rewarding and being fair in similar decisions and practices affect organizational trust significantly (Morgan & Hunt, 1994; cited by Memduhoğlu & Zengin, 2011). For this reason, it can be said that teachers' organizational trust perceptions are not at the desired level and it should be increased. When the studies in the literature are examined; Tiryaki (2020) concluded that the physical education teachers participating in the research generally have high organizational trust levels. It has been determined that among the sub-dimensions of the scale, teachers have the highest level of participation in the communication ambient dimension. Karasu (2020) found in his study that teachers' perceptions of organizational trust are mostly at the level of agree, among the trust dimensions, teachers trust the communication ambient the most, then this dimension is followed by trust in managers and lastly, trust in sensitivity to employees. In Özdemir's (2020) study, according to the findings of the organizational trust scale, it was seen that secondary school teachers had a moderate level of organizational trust. Kandemir & Nartgün (2019) found that private school teachers' highest averages in the sub-dimensions of organizational trust scale were in the dimension of trust in the manager, and the lowest average in the dimension of sensitivity to employees. Other dimensions are communication ambient and openness to innovation, respectively. In the study of Gülay (2018), it was seen that the organizational trust levels of the teachers were mostly at the level of agree, and the trust levels of the teachers were highest in the dimensions of trust in the manager and the lowest in the dimensions of trust in stakeholders. As a result of the study conducted by Akyavuz (2017), it was found that teachers' organizational trust is at a moderate level. Ayduğ (2014) in his research, which examines the relationship between the organizational health of primary schools and the organizational trust levels of teachers, found the level of organizational trust to a large extent. As a result of the research conducted by Taşdan (2012), it was stated that teachers' perceptions of organizational trust regarding their schools were high, but that organizational trust perceptions were moderate in terms of school stakeholders. These results confirm the findings of the study.

## **Results for Relationships Between Influence Tactics and Organizational Trust**

In the context of the second sub-problem of the current research, the relationship between the variables in the research was revealed. According to the data obtained, the following conclusions were reached: There is a positive directional moderate statistically significant relationship between; influence tactics scale and its sub-dimensions (rational persuasion, exchange, inspirational appeals, legitimating, apprising, collaboration, appreciating, consulting, personal appeals, forming coalitions with others) and organizational trust scale and sub-dimensions (employee sensitivity, trust in the manager, openness to innovation, communication ambient). It was concluded that there is a moderate negative relationship between the sub-dimension pressure of influencing tactics and the organizational trust scale and its sub-dimensions (sensitivity to employees, trust in the manager, openness to innovation, communication ambient), and there is a weak negative relationship between the tactic of forming a coalition with others and trust in the manager. When the results obtained are evaluated, it is stated that as teachers' perceptions of influencing tactics increase, their perceptions of organizational trust will increase; It can be stated that as teachers' perceptions of influencing tactics decrease, their perceptions of organizational trust will also decrease.

## Recommendations

In this section, recommendations for researchers and practitioners in this field are given according to the results of the research.

### Recommendations for Practitioners

Within the scope of in-service training for managers, awareness on influencing tactics can be increased with courses and seminars.

The use of soft influence tactics by school principals may contribute to strengthening relations with teachers and increasing school success.

Influencing tactics should be suitable for their purpose and also appropriate to the expectations of the employees.

It is more effective to use influencing tactics alone, not in combination with tactics that are compatible with each other. In the use of influence tactics, the cost, risks, positive and negative consequences must be taken into account.

The success of influencing tactics depends on the choice of the appropriate tactic as well as the style of application of the influencing tactics by the manager.

Activities such as teamwork, social events, projects, ceremonies, etc., which will allow employees to get to know each other in order to ensure trust among employees can be arranged.

The rules applied to teachers and their reasons should be explained clearly, the flow of information should be conveyed accurately and regularly, resources and awards should be distributed in a fair and transparent manner.

Considering the importance of communication in increasing organizational trust, in-service activities can be given importance to improve communication skills for school administrators and teachers.

### Recommendations for Researchers

The present research was conducted for secondary school teachers. Scales can be used to conduct research in different education levels such as preschool, primary school and high school. The present research was applied in the province of Bolu. More general results can be obtained by conducting the research across Türkiye.

## References

- Akyavuz, E. K. (2017). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet ve örgütsel güven algıları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30(2), 805-831. <https://doi.org/10.19171/uefad.369242>
- Alanoğlu, M. (2019). *Algılanan okul müdürü yönetim tarzları ile öğretmenlerin karara katılma, örgütsel adalet, iş doyum ve tükenmişlik algıları arasındaki ilişkinin analizi* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Fırat Üniversitesi.
- Alshenaifi, N.I. (2016). *Follower upward influence tactics and their relationships with job performance ratings: the importance of leader-member exchange (lmx) and leader/follower gender similarity* [Thesis For The Degree Of Doctor Of Philosophy]. University Of Southampton Faculty Of Business and Law.
- Artuksı, E. (2009). *İlköğretim okullarında görevli öğretmenlerin okulun örgütsel güven düzeyine ilişkin algıları (Malatya ili örneği)* [Unpublished master's thesis]. İnönü Üniversitesi.

- Asunakutlu, T. (2002). Örgütsel güvenin oluşturulmasına ilişkin unsurlar ve bir değerlendirme. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2002(9), 1-13.
- Ayduğ, D. (2014). *İlkokulların örgüt sağlığı ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel güven düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Başaran, İ. E. (1996). *Türkiye eğitim sistemi*. Yargıcı Matbaası.
- Başaran, İ. E. (2004). *Yönetimde insan ilişkileri yönetsel davranış* (3. Baskı). Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Bil, E. (2018). *Ortaöğretim okullarının öğrenen örgüt, örgütsel güven ve iş doyum düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Bilgiç, A. (2011). "Güvenlik ikilemi"ni yeniden düşünmek; güvenlik çalışmalarında yeni bir perspektif. *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi, Özel Sayı: Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Kavramları Yeniden Düşünmek*, 123-142.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership*, 60, 40–45. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/trust-in-schools-a-core-resource-for-school-reform>
- Butler, J.K. Jr (1999). Trust expectations, information sharing, climate of trust, and negotiation effectiveness and efficiency. *Group and Organization Management*, 24 (2), 217-238.
- Bülbül, S. (2019). *Okul müdürlerinin kullandıkları etkilme taktikleri ile öğretmenlerin iş tutkunluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Uşak Üniversitesi.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2011). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Pegem Akademi.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş., ve Demirel, F. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (17. baskı). Pegem Yayınları.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2017). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* (23. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.
- Castro, S.L., Douglas, C., Hochwarter, W.A., Ferris, G.R., & Frink, D.D. (2003). The effects of positive affect and gender on the influence tactics-job performance relationship. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190301000101>
- Cerado, E.C., & Rivera, G.S. (2015). Leader-member exchange in Maguindanao Grade Schools: The role of behavioral influence tactics and adversity quotient. *Journal of Education Research and Behavioral Sciences*, 4(11), 281-287.
- Çetin, Ş. (2017). Örgütlerde güç ve politika. Sığı, Ü. ve Gürbüz, S. (Ed.), *Örgütsel davranış içerisinde* (432-435). Beta Basım.
- Çevik, A. (2018). *Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları makamsal güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel sinizm davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi.
- Dağlı, E. (2015). *İlköğretim okullarında müdürlerin kullandıkları etkilme taktiklerinin öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları ve okul farkındalığı ile ilişkisi* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Demircan, N., & Ceylan, A. (2003). Örgütsel güven kavramı: Nedenleri ve sonuçlar. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F Dergisi Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, 10 (2), 139–150. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/yonveek/issue/13679/165524>
- Dillenbourg, P., Baker, M., Blaye, A., & O'Malley, C. (1996). The evolution of research on collaborative learning. In E. Spada & P. Reiman (Eds.), *Learning In Humans And*

- Machine: Towards An Interdisciplinary Learning Science* (189-211).  
<https://tecfa.unige.ch/tecfa/publicat/dil-papers-2/Dil.7.1.10.pdf>
- Doğan, H. (2019). *Yönetici rolleri ve etkileme taktikleri ile öğretmenlerin yöneticiye güveni arasındaki ilişkiler* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Pamukkale Üniversitesi.
- Ergül, S. B. (2019). *Ortaöğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin algıladıkları örgütsel destek düzeyleri ile örgütsel adalet algıları arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Marmara Üniversitesi İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi.
- Friedman, D. & Berkovich, I. (2020). Influence tactics and “second-order” change in schools: case study research of principals' political behaviors and strategies. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35 (1), 327-339. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2020-0413>
- Gözü, C. (2012). *Influence tactics and leadership effectiveness in Turkey and USA: Mediating role of subordinate commitment*. New York: A Dissertation Submitted To The University At Albany, State University of New York.
- Gülây, S. S. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin kayırmacılık algıları ile örgütsel güven düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi.
- Gregg, R. T. (1957). *The administrative process, Administrative behavior in education* (Ed. Roald F. Campbell, Russell T. Gregg). Harper and Row Publishers.  
<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/459667>
- Günaydın, S.C. (2001). *İşletmelerde örgütsel adalet ve örgütsel güven değişkenlerinin politik davranış algısı ve işbirliği yapma eğilimine etkisini inceleyen bir çalışma* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Güneş, M. E. (2020). *Örgütsel narsisizm ve örgütsel güven arasındaki ilişkinin özel okullar ile devlet okulları açısından incelenmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi.
- Güney, S. (2012). *Liderlik*. Nobel Yayınevi.
- Güney, S., (2015), *Örgütsel davranış*. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Günüşen, Z. E. (2016). *Örgütsel güvenin örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki etkisi ve bir uygulama* [Unpublished master's thesis]. İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi.
- Gürbüz, S., & Şahin, F. (2017). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri* (4. Baskı). Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *Journal of Educational Management*, 18(4), 250-259.  
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242347737>
- İnce, Y., Bedük, S., & Aydoğan, S. (2004). Örgütlerde takım çalışmasına yönelik etkin liderlik nitelikleri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11,423-446.  
<http://dergisosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/susbed/article/view/741>
- İspir, N. B. (2008). *Yöneticilerin kullandığı etki taktikleri ve kurum kültürü: uygulama ve yönetsel etkileme için model önerisi* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Kalaycı, Ş. (2016). *SPSS Uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri*. Asil Yayın Dağıtım.



- Kandemir, A. (2021). *Öğretmenlerin toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliği, örgütsel dışlanma ve örgütsel engel algıları arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi.
- Kandemir, A., & Nartgün, Ş. S. (2019). Özel okul öğretmenlerinin örgütsel güven ve örgüt kültürü düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Turkish Studies Educational Sciences*, 14 (1), 121-147.
- Karadaş, H. (2013). *Pozitif okul yönetiminin öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığına etki düzeyi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Harran Üniversitesi.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (23. Baskı). Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Karasu, Y. (2020). *İlköğretim kurumlarında çalışan öğretmenlerin örgütsel dedikodu ve örgütsel güven algıları arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished master's thesis]. İnönü Üniversitesi.
- Katlav, E. Ö. (2016). *Algılanan etkileme taktiklerinin işgören performansı üzerindeki etkisini belirlemede kontrol odağının düzenleyici rolü: otel işletmelerinde bir uygulama* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi.
- Kilmen, S. (2015). *Eğitim Araştırmacıları için SPSS uygulamalı istatistik*. Edge Akademi.
- Kochanek, J.R. (2005). Building trust for beter schools (research-based practices). Corwin Pres. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED49557>
- Koçak, S. (2021). Relationship between teachers' professional attitudes and the student-centered teacher behaviors. *Political Economy and Management of Education* 2(1), 1-13.
- Koşar, D. (2016). Liderlerin etkileme taktikleri. Güçlü, N. (Ed.). *Eğitim yönetiminde liderlik teori, araştırma ve uygulama içinde*. Pegem Akademi.
- Köklü, N., Büyüköztürk Ş., & Bökeoğlu, Ö.Ç. (2006). *Sosyal bilimler için istatistik*. Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, (30), 607-610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- Kuru-Çetin, S. (2013). *Okul yöneticileri ve öğretmenlerin birbirlerini etkileme taktiklerinin örgütsel adalet ile ilişkisi* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Lorcu, F. (2015). *Örneklerle veri analizi SPSS uygulamalı*. Detay Yayıncılık.
- Marangoz, E. H. (2020). *Okul müdürleri tarafından kullanılan etkileme taktiklerine ilişkin öğretmen ve okul yöneticilerinin görüşlerinin incelenmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gaziantep Üniversitesi.
- Memduhoğlu, H. B., & Zengin, M. (2011). İlköğretim okullarında örgütsel güvene ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *YYÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(1), 211-217. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/yyuefd/issue/13707/165958>
- Morgan, R., & S. Hunt (1994) The Commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing, *Journal of Marketing*, 58, July, 20-38. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233894851>
- Okudan, B. (2018). *Spor genel müdürlüğü merkez ve taşra teşkilatı çalışanlarının örgütsel iklim ve örgütsel güven algıları ile örgütsel bağlılık duyguları arasındaki ilişkilerde iş yaşam dengesinin aracılık rolü* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi.
- Ouchi, W. (1989), *Z Kuramı*. İlgı Yayıncılık.
- Özdemir, R. (2019). *Örgütsel güven ve örgütsel adalet algısının işgören performansı üzerindeki etkisi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi Üniversitesi.



- Özdemir, E. (2020). *Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin mesleki doyumları ile örgütsel güven arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Trakya Üniversitesi.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual a step by step guide to data analysis using spss for windows*. McGraw Hill.
- Pehlivan, Ü. (2018). *İlköğretim kurumu yöneticilerinin kullandıkları etkileme taktikleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Polat, S., & Tastan, M. (2009). Yükseköğretim öğrencilerinin öğretim elemanlarına güven düzeyi ile akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişki. *Education Sciences*, 4 (2), 558-574. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/nwsaedu/issue/19828>
- Robbins, S.P. (2001). *Organizational behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.
- Şencan, H. (2005). *Sosyal ve davranışsal ölçümlerde güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Taşdan, K. (2012). Turkish primary school teachers' perceptions of organizational trust. *New Educational Review*, 30(4), 176-190. <https://doi.org/10.21733/ibad.882763>
- Tekben, İ. (2019). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarında görev yapan müdürlerin kullandıkları etkileme taktikleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Tiryaki, P. (2020). *Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin örgütsel sinizm ve örgütsel güven düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Selçuk Üniversitesi.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. (2000). A Multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70 (4), 547-593. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249797852>
- Tükel, Y. (2018). *Aile ve sosyal politikalar gençlik ve spor kulüpleri yöneticilerin algıladıkları etkileme taktikleri ile iş performansları arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Selçuk Üniversitesi.
- Tüzün, İ. K. (2006). *Örgütsel güven, örgütsel kimlik ve örgütsel özdeşleşme ilişkisi; uygulamalı bir çalışma* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Tüzün, İ. K. (2007). Güven, örgütsel güven ve örgütsel güven modelleri. *Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi. İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 13, 93-118. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/kmusekad/issue/10223/125677>
- Uğur, D. (2017). *Psikolojik sermaye ve örgütsel adaletin iş performansı üzerindeki etkisi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi.
- Yener, S. (2017). Psikolojik rahatlık algısının işgören sesliliği ve takım işbirliği arasındaki ilişkide aracı değişken rolü. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 19(2), 187-204. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/deusosbil/issue/36365/411266>
- Yılmaz, E. (2005). Okullarda örgütsel güven ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14, 567-580.
- Yıldız, K. (2013). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet ve örgütsel güven algıları. *BAİBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(1), 289-316. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/aibuefd/issue/1503/18220>
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organization* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson. <https://www.pearson.com/uk/educators/higher-education-educators.html>

- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.  
<https://www.pearson.com/uk/educators/higher-education-educators.html>
- Yukl, G., Chavez, C., & Seifert, C. (2005). Assessing the construct validity and utility of two new influence tactics. *Journal Of Organizational Behaviour*, 26, 705-125.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4093889>
- Yukl, G., Seifert, C. F., & Chavez, C. (2008). Validation of the extended influence behavior questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), 609–621.  
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2008-14503-012>
- Yukl, G., & Tracey, B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 525-535.  
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1992-45063-001>
- Yücel, C., & Samancı-Kalaycı, G. (2009). Örgütsel güven ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19(1), 113-132.  
<https://app.trdizin.gov.tr/makale/T0RrMk9UUTA/orgutsel-guven-ve-orgutsel-vatandaslik-davranisi->
- Yücel, P. Z. (2006). *Örgütsel güven ve iş tatmini ilişkisi ve bir araştırma* [Unpublished master's thesis]. İstanbul Üniversitesi.