

## **The Relationship Between Power Sources Used by Lecturers and The Belonging to University Status of Prospective Pre-School Teachers**

**Serhat Gündoğdu<sup>i</sup>**

Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University

### **Abstract**

The aim of this study is to investigate the effects of the power sources used by lecturers on the belonging to university levels of the prospective pre-school teachers. This study was carried out with quantitative method and correlational screening model. The participants of the study consisted of 300 prospective pre-school teachers (262 female, 38 male) who were studying at 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year of pre-school teaching departments of universities in seven different provinces of Turkey and were accepted to participate voluntarily in this study. Teacher Power Use Scale and The Belonging to the University Scale were used in the study as data collection instrument. The data were analyzed by LISREL 8.7 and IBM SPSS Statistics 22 programs. Pearson's correlation analysis was performed to determine the relationship between power resources and the belonging to university levels. Regression Analysis was carried out to determine whether power sources used by lecturers are predictors of the belonging to university levels. The result of the study revealed that while expert power was the most used, coercive power was the least used power sources by the lecturers. In addition, prospective pre-school teachers have a high level of belonging to university, and there is a significant relationship between the power sources used by lecturers and the belonging to university levels of prospective pre-school teachers. Furthermore, coercive, reward, referent, and expert powers were found to be significant predictors of the belonging to university levels of prospective pre-school teachers. The findings of the study were discussed and suggestions were offered.

**Keywords:** Belonging, Lecturer, Power Sources, Prospective Pre-School Teacher

**DOI:** 10.29329/ijpe.2022.431.20

-----  
<sup>i</sup> **Serhat Gündoğdu**, Assist. Prof. Dr., Primary Education, Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, ORCID: 0000-0001-6841-8890

**Email:** gundogduserhat50@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

University education is one of the most important periods affecting the future of individuals. In this process, students encounter a new physical and social environment. Students who spend an important period of their lives in this new environment ensure their personal development as well as their academic development. In addition to the factors such as family, environment, school and etc., it is also important to meet the psychological needs of university students in reaching their educational goals, ensuring their personal development and being happy. One of these needs is their belonging to university where they study.

According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, identity and, accordingly, belonging needs follow the physiological and safety needs of humans. The sense of belonging that comes innate aims to establish a bond with others in the ways of being together, sharing, solidarity, friendship, establishing a family, joining groups and associations, and etc. (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). It is stated by many researchers that positive results will emerge if the sense of belonging, which is a basic psychological need, is met. If the sense of belonging is met, cognitive processes, emotional patterns, social relations, behaviors, mental health and well-being are positively affected. In cases where the sense of belonging cannot be met, cognitive processes, social relations, emotional patterns, behaviors, mental health and well-being are negatively affected (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Duru, 2008a; Duru, 2008b; Ersanlı & Koçyigit, 2013; Guiffida, Lynch, Wall & Abel, 2013; Hill, 2006; King, Vidourek, Davis & McClellan, 2002; Malone, Pillow & Osman, 2012; Osterman, 2000; Pittman & Richmond, 2007).

Sense of belonging to a person, institution, group, culture, place, and such other factors can develop in different ways (Duru, 2015). One of them, the sense of belonging to university, is that the students assume themselves as a valuable part of the university and think that they are important for the university (Arslan & Duru, 2017). Meeting the needs of students by the university (Brown & Burdsal, 2012; Tinto, 1993), social environment where social and academic support is provided, learning experiences outside of school, being a member of the learning community, establishing strong relationships with peers, developing healthy relationships with school staff and administrators (Brown & Burdsal, 2012; Slaten et al., 2014), classroom environment, life opportunities, intrinsic motivation (Slaten et al., 2014), and frequency and quality of communication with lecturers (Tinto 1993) are the factors that can affect the students' sense of belonging to university

An important factor for students to develop a sense of belonging to university is the teaching staff. The interaction of teaching staff with students (Tinto, 1993), their pedagogical interests and competences, their acceptance of students, their informal interactions with students (Freeman, Anderman & Jensen, 2007), their closeness to students (Creasey, Jarvis & Gadke, 2009), their cheerfulness and coolness, and pedagogical skills (Pichon, 2016) have an effect on students' sense of belonging to university. In addition to these, it can be said that the power sources used by the teaching staff can affect the students' sense of belonging to university.

Lecturers have a significant power over prospective teachers. However, it should be emphasized that this power should be used in a positive way and that it should contribute to the relations with the prospective teachers because people with power may not use their power rationally and fairly (Bolman & Deal, 2008; cited in Hoşgörür & Yorulmaz, 2016). In general sense, power refers to the ability to make others do things they otherwise would not do and the capacity to influence others (Dahl, 2001). Power sources, on the other hand, express what gives power to the person who uses it. What a person controls in order to direct the behavior of others in line with his own wishes is a source of power for the person (Bayrak, 2001). Due to the existence of various power sources, many classifications of power sources have been made in social sciences until today. The most widely used and most popular one is the classification made by French and Raven (1959). This classification consists of legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, referent power and expert power.

Legitimate power, also known as positional power and official authority, refers to the authoritative power provided by the official position of a person (Hitt, Black, & Porter, 2005).

Teaching staffs who use this power source create an impact on students by getting strength from their official positions. In order for lecturers to use legitimate power, students must acknowledge that there is a hierarchy between them and lecturers, and that lecturers have the right to direct their own behavior (Schrodt, Witt & Turman, 2007). However, legitimate power should not be used too often by the lecturers. Hence, legitimate power causes the productivity and satisfaction level be negatively affected, resistance and conflicting situations (Başaran, 2000), and a low level of obedience to lecturers (Çelik, 2005).

Reward power refers to the ability of giving out or controlling awards (Çelik, 2003). This power source can be used when the person has the ability and resources to reward others. One of the reasons why lecturers reward students in return for demonstrating desired behaviors by students is an indication that lecturers use their reward power (Özdemir, 2013). For this, students must have perceptions that they can receive an award if they show the expected behavior (Schrodt et al., 2007). However, using reward power also has negative effects. Using too much reward power can negatively affect emotional relationships and satisfaction among students (Bakan & Büyükbeşe, 2010) and reduce the motivation of those who cannot receive a reward or find the reward insufficient (Hitt, Black & Porter, 2005).

Coercive power referring to material and moral constraints uses intimidation and bullying (Altinkurt & Yılmaz, 2012). This power arises in situations where a person has the ability to punish or cause physical and psychological harm to another person (Güney, 2015). Criticizing students in front of their friends, withdrawing support from students when necessary, and punishing them with disciplinary offenses and threats are indicators of the lecturers' use of coercive power (Özdemir, 2013). In order for the coercive power to be effective, students should be aware that lecturers use coercive power (Schrodt et al., 2007). Using coercive power also carries some risks because it causes students' unhappiness and hostility. In addition, power corrupts the user, which is one of the frequently mentioned issues in the literature (Dahl, 2001).

Referent power is basically a power related to personality traits and expresses the totality of the qualities and possibilities desired to be in a person. In this power, the personal traits of people who are taken as role-models and admired are at the forefront (Robbins & Judge, 2013). Some people can have an impact on others due to their personality traits. People over whom power is used try to act like power holder and thus, imitate him/her (Dahl, 2001). Lecturers with referent power are admired, respected and taken as role-models. Lecturers with this power become a source of inspiration to their students, set goals that students cannot even imagine, and create an impact on students in line with these goals (Güney, 2015).

Expert power comes from one's knowledge, skills, abilities and experiences (Bayrak, 2001). According to Schermerhorn et al. (2000), expert power manifests itself when people believe that power holder have the knowledge and experience they do not have but need to have (Koşar & Çalık, 2011). For this, those over whom power is used must perceive the expertise of the power holder in order for the expert power to be effective. That is, they should realize or assume that power holder is superior to themselves in terms of knowledge and skills (Başaran, 2000; Lee, Luthans & Hodgetts, 1992). The knowledge, skills, abilities and experiences of the lecturers are effective on students.

There are studies in the literature regarding the power sources used by lecturers (Aslanargun & Eriş 2013; Jamieson & Thomas, 1974; McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Schrodt et al., 2007). In addition, there are studies investigating the relationship between the power sources used by the lecturers and perceived teacher confirmation behaviors (Turman & Schrodt, 2006), organizational identification of prospective teachers (Özdemir, 2013), teacher credibility and student satisfaction (Teven & Herring, 2005), and classroom justice (Paulsel, Chory-Assad & Dunleavy, 2005). Besides, there are studies on university students' sense of belonging (Alptekin, 2011; Banat & Rimawi, 2017; Freeman et al., 2007; Hoffman, Richmond, Morrow & Salomone, 2002; Karaman, 2013; Karaman & Çırak, 2018; van Gijn-Grosvenor & Huisman, 2020). Moreover, there are studies in the literature investigating the relationship between sense of belonging of university students and the variables such

as nomophobia (Aşık, 2018), perceptions of the community of inquiry (Keskin & Seferoğlu, 2017), inferiority feeling (Kılıç & Öksüz, 2020), smartphone addiction and happiness (Özteke Kozan, Kavaklı, Ak & Bıçak, 2019), perceptions of higher education service quality (Yokuş, Ayçiçek & Yelken, 2017), academic achievement (Sarwar & Ashrafi, 2014), academic and psychological functioning (Pittman & Richmond, 2007), nomophobia and life satisfaction (Büyükalim, 2020), sense of community and student success (Brown & Burdsal, 2012), and existential anxiety (Kourou, 2019). However, no study has been found on the relationship between the power sources used by lecturers and the belonging to university levels of prospective teachers.

The belonging to university levels of prospective teachers may be affected by the power sources used by the lecturers. However, there is no data about which of the power sources used by the lecturers positively or negatively affect the belonging to university levels of prospective teachers and the degree of influence of these power sources. This study aimed to determine the effect of the power sources used by the lecturers on the belonging to university levels of prospective pre-school teachers. For this purpose, answers of the following questions were sought:

1. What are the power sources used by the lecturers on the prospective pre-school teachers?
2. What is the belonging to university status of the prospective pre-school teachers?
3. Is there any statistically significant relationship between power sources used by the lecturers and the belonging to university status of the prospective pre-school teachers?
4. Do the power sources used by the lecturers significantly predict the belonging to university status of the prospective pre-school teachers?

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Model**

This study which aims to determine the relationship between the power sources used by the lecturers and the belonging to university status of the prospective pre-school teachers employed correlational screening model. In correlational screening model, it is aimed to determine the existence and/or degree of change between two or more variables (Karasar, 2005). In this study, the predicted variable (dependent variable) is the status of the belonging to university, while the predictive variable (independent variable) is the power sources used by the lecturers.

### **Population and the Sample**

The population of the research consists of prospective pre-school teachers studying at the department of the pre-school teaching at state universities in Turkey in the 2020-2021 academic year. The maximum variation sampling method, which is one of the non-random sampling methods, was chosen as the sampling method of this study. This method refers to working on varied situations that share patterns relevant to the problem examined in the population (Büyüköztürk et al., 2014). In this context, in order to ensure maximum variability, 300 prospective pre-school teachers who were studying at the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year of the pre-school teaching department of universities in seven different provinces of Turkey (Atatürk, Çukurova, Hacettepe, İnönü, Kırıkkale, Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli and Sinop) and accepted to participate voluntarily in the research were chosen as the sample of this study. 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year of prospective teachers were chosen as the sample of this study on grounds that they interacted with the lecturers for a longer period of time. Demographic information of the participants is as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Demographic Information of the Participants**

University	N	%	Year		Gender	
			3 (N)	4 (N)	Female (N)	Male (N)
Atatürk University	56	18,7	42	14	49	7
Çukurova University	38	12,7	15	23	29	9
Hacettepe University	43	14,3	29	14	41	2
İnönü University	25	8,3	9	16	22	3
Kırıkkale University	37	12,3	19	18	35	2
Nevşehir University	61	20,3	22	39	55	6
Sinop University	40	13,3	11	29	31	9
Total	300	100,0	147	153	262	38

As seen in Table 1, 56 (18.7%) prospective teachers from Atatürk University, 38 (12.7%) from Çukurova University, 43 (14.3%) from Hacettepe University, 25 (8.3%) from İnönü University, 37 (12.3%) from Kırıkkale University, 61 (20.3%) from Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, and 40 (13.3%) from Sinop University participated in this study. While 147 (49%) of the participants were studying at the 3<sup>rd</sup> year, 153 (51%) of them were 4<sup>th</sup> year students. 262 (87.3%) of the participants were female and 38 (12.7%) of them were male.

### Data Collection Tools

'Teacher Power Use Scale' developed by Schrodt et al. (2007) and adapted into Turkish by Özdemir (2013) and 'The Belonging to the University Scale' developed by Karaman (2013) were used as data collection instruments in this study.

*Teacher Power Use Scale:* The scale developed by Schrodt et al. (2007) to determine the power sources used by the lecturers was adapted into Turkish by Özdemir (2013). The scale is a five-point Likert type with the options ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree. The scale consists of a total of 30 items and five dimensions. These dimensions are; coercive power, reward power, legitimate power, referent power, and expert power. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) performed in order to test the construct validity of the scale; chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 935.78,  $sd = 395$  [ $\chi^2/sd = 2.37$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ] and fit indices [RMSEA = 0.068, GFI = 0.83, AGFI = 0.80, NFI = 0.92, NNFI = 0.95, CFI = 0.95] were calculated. A  $\chi^2/sd$  ratio of less than 3 is an excellent fit, a rate of less than 5 to a moderate agreement; RMSEA less than .5 is excellent fit, less than .8 is good fit; GFI, AGFI, NFI, NNFI and CFI values above .95 are considered as perfect fit, and above .90 as good fit. However, GFI  $\geq .85$ , AGFI  $\geq .80$  and RMSEA  $< .10$  values are also acceptable in the evaluation of model fit (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2021). As a result of the analysis, it is seen that the GFI value is .83. As a result of the analysis, two items from the coercive power dimension and one item from the expert power dimension with factor loads below .30 were removed from the scale. Modifications were made between the two items from the reward power dimension. As a result of repeated analysis; chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 696.75,  $sd = 313$  [ $\chi^2/sd = 2.22$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ] and fit indices [RMSEA = 0.064, GFI = 0.85, AGFI = 0.82, NFI = 0.92, NNFI = 0.95, CFI = 0.95] were calculated. It is understood that the calculated values are at an acceptable level. As a result, the 5-dimensional structure modeled by confirmatory factor analysis was confirmed. Özdemir (2013) determined the Cronbach alpha values of the scale's dimensions for coercive power, reward power, legitimate power, referent power and expert power as .88, .86, .71, .90 and .93, respectively. Factor loads of these dimensions are between .62-.80, .60-.78, .56-.74, .68-.86 and 72-.88, respectively. Cronbach's alpha coefficients for coercive power, reward power, legitimate power, referent power and expert power was calculated as .81, .72, .74, .86 and .77, respectively in this study. These results show that coercive power and referent power dimensions of the scale are highly reliable, while reward power, legitimate power and expert power dimensions are at reliable levels. A total score of the scale cannot be calculated due to the different content of the power sources used by the lecturers, and the score of each dimension was calculated separately.

*The Belonging to the University Scale:* It was developed by Karaman (2013) in order to determine the university students' levels of the belonging to university where they study. The scale is a five-point Likert type with the options ranging from (1) Never to (5) Always. The scale consists of

14 items, five of which are negative, and three dimensions. These dimensions are expectation, motivation, and identification. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis performed in order to test the construct validity of the scale; chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 449.57,  $sd = 74$  [ $\chi^2/sd = 6.07$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ] and fit indices [RMSEA = 0.12, GFI = 0.82, AGFI = 0.75, NFI = 0.90, NNFI = 0.89, CFI = 0.91] were calculated. As a result of the analysis; It was found that  $\chi^2/sd$  (6.07), RMSEA (.12), GFI (.83), AGFI (.75) and NNFI (.89) values were not in the appropriate range. The results of the analysis were examined and one item from the factor-loaded expectation dimension below .30 was removed from the scale. Modifications were made between the two items from the identification dimension. As a result of repeated analysis, chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 203.48  $sd = 61$  [ $\chi^2/sd = 3.33$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ] and fit indices [RMSEA = 0.074, GFI = 0.91, AGFI = 0.86, NFI = 0.94, NNFI = 0.94, CFI = 0.95] were calculated. It is understood that the calculated values are at an acceptable level. As a result, the 3-dimensional structure modeled by confirmatory factor analysis was confirmed. Karaman (2013) determined the Cronbach's alpha values of the scale in the dimensions of expectation, motivation, identification and for the whole scale as .76, .73, .74 and .83, respectively. The factor loads of the scale are between 0.59-0.76, 0.50-0.80 and 0.52-0.85 for the dimensions of expectation, motivation and identification, respectively. While the Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated as .86 for all items, they were calculated as .74, .77 and .74 for the expectation, motivation and identification dimensions, respectively in this study. These results show that the whole scale is highly reliable, and the expectation, motivation and identification dimensions are at a reliable level.

### Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected from prospective teachers studying at the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year of the Education Faculty Pre-school Education Departments of Atatürk, Çukurova, Hacettepe, İnönü, Kırıkkale, Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli and Sinop Universities. LISREL 8.7 and IBM SPSS Statistics 22 programs were used for data analysis. Demographic information of the participants was shown by frequency and percentage values. The mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) and standard deviation ( $sd$ ) values of the dimensions of the scales were calculated. Normality test was performed to decide which statistical method would be applied in the analysis of the data. The conformity of the data to the normal distribution was examined with the skewness and kurtosis values. As a result of the examination, skewness values in coercive power, reward power, legitimate power, referent power, expert power, expectation, motivation and identification dimensions were calculated as .302, -.282, .098, -.487, -.238, -.202, -.702, -.487 respectively and -.380 for the total value of The Belonging to University Scale. The kurtosis values were calculated as -.096, .067, -.209, .481, -.030, -.680, .307 and -.242 respectively, and .24 for the total value of The Belonging to University Scale. The ideal statistical value range for the normal distribution of skewness and kurtosis is accepted between -1 and +1 (Büyüköztürk et al., 2014). According to the results of the analysis, the data show a normal distribution. While the 'Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient' was used to determine the relationships between the variables, the 'Multiple Linear Regression Analysis' was used to examine the predictive variables.

In order to obtain accurate results in multiple linear regression analysis, the variables need to show a normal distribution. The skewness and kurtosis values show that the data are normally distributed. In addition, there should not be multicollinearity between the predictor variables. Therefore, the correlation between the variables should be lower than -.8 and +.8 as absolute values (Can, 2013). While there is a positive and moderate relationship between coercive power and legitimate power ( $r = .61$ ;  $p < .01$ ), and between referent power and expert power ( $r = .61$ ;  $p < .01$ ), there is a negative and moderate relationship between coercive power and referent power ( $r = -.62$ ;  $p < .01$ ), coercive power and expert power ( $r = -.44$ ;  $p < .01$ ), referent power and legitimate power ( $r = -.52$ ;  $p < .01$ ), and legitimate power and expert power ( $r = -.31$ ;  $p < .01$ ). The analysis also showed that while there is a positive and low correlation between reward power and referent power ( $r = .28$ ;  $p < .01$ ), and reward power and expert power ( $r = .19$ ;  $p < .01$ ), there is a negative and low correlation between coercive power and reward power ( $r = -.17$ ;  $p < .05$ ), and reward power and legitimate power ( $r = -.09$ ;  $p < .05$ ) (Büyüköztürk, 2002). These results show that there is no multicollinearity between the variables. In addition, tolerance and VIF values were examined to check multicollinearity. It was determined that tolerance values for all variables were greater than .20 and VIF values were less than

.10. In this case, it can be said that there is no multicollinearity between the predictive variables (Field, 2005).

## FINDINGS

In this section, analysis results regarding the research questions are given. The mean and standard deviation values of the 'Teacher Power Use Scale' dimensions of prospective pre-school teachers are given in Table 2.

**Table 2. Power Sources Used by Lecturers**

	Mean ( $\bar{X}$ )	Standard Deviation
Coercive Power	2.59	.88
Reward Power	3.40	.60
Referent Power	3.43	.72
Legitimate Power	3.12	.71
Expert Power	3.89	.57

As seen in Table 2, according to prospective pre-school teachers, while teaching staffs use coercive power ( $\bar{X} = 2.59$ ) at a low level and legitimate power ( $\bar{X} = 3.12$ ) at a moderate level, they use reward ( $\bar{X} = 3.40$ ), referent ( $\bar{X} = 3.43$ ) and expert power ( $\bar{X} = 3.89$ ) at a high level. The standard deviation values show that the most homogeneous distribution among the dimensions occurs in the reward and expert power dimensions ( $sd = .57$ ).

The mean and standard deviation values of the whole scale of 'The Belonging to University Scale' and its sub-dimensions are given in Table 3.

**Table 3. Belonging to the University Levels of Prospective Pre-School Teachers**

	Mean ( $\bar{X}$ )	Standard Deviation
Expectation	3.26	.86
Identification	3.42	.82
Motivation	3.87	.76
Total Belonging	3.56	.67

According to Table 3, prospective pre-school teachers' belonging in the expectation dimension ( $\bar{X} = 3.26$ ) is at a moderate level, while it is at a high level in the identification ( $\bar{X} = 3.42$ ) and motivation dimension ( $X = 3.87$ ). It is seen that the total belonging status of prospective pre-school teachers ( $\bar{X} = 3.56$ ) is at a high level. According to the standard deviation values, the most homogeneous distribution among the dimensions occurs in the motivation dimension ( $sd = .76$ ).

The results of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient analysis, which was conducted to determine the relationships between the power sources used by the lecturers and the sub-dimensions of belonging to the university status of the prospective pre-school teachers, are given in Table 4.

**Table 4. The Correlation Between Power Sources Used by Lecturers and the Belonging to the University Status of Prospective Pre-School Teachers**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Coercive Power	1	-.17*	-.62**	.61**	-.44**	-.37**	-.63**	-.64**	-.65**
2. Reward Power		1	.28**	-.09*	.19**	.23**	.32**	.14*	.26**
3. Referent Power			1	-.52**	.61**	.40**	.61**	.58**	.63**
4. Legitimate Power				1	-.31**	-.22**	-.44**	-.48**	-.45**
5. Expert Power					1	.40**	.40**	.45**	.50**
6. Expectation						1	.45**	.51**	.81**
7. Identification							1	.63**	.79**
8. Motivation								1	.88**
9. Total Belonging									1

\*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*  $p < .05$

When Table 4 is examined, various relationships were found between the sub-dimensions of the power sources used by the lecturers and the sub-dimensions and the total of the belonging to the university status of prospective pre-school teachers. The absolute value of the correlation coefficients was considered as high relationship between 0.70 – 1.00, medium relationship between 0.69 – 0.30 and low relationship between 0.29 – 0.00. (Büyüköztürk, 2002). As table shows, there is a positive and medium relationship between the variables of referent power and expectation ( $r = .40$ ), referent power and identification ( $r = .61$ ), referent power and motivation ( $r = .58$ ), referent power and total belonging ( $r = .63$ ), expert power and expectation ( $r = .40$ ), expert power and identification ( $r = .40$ ), expert power and motivation ( $r = .45$ ), expert power and total belonging ( $r = .50$ ) and reward power and identification ( $r = .32$ ). The analysis also showed that there are positive and low associations between reward power and expectation ( $r = .23$ ), reward power and motivation ( $r = .14$ ), and reward power and total belonging ( $r = .26$ ). On the other hand, there are negative and medium level of associations between coercive power and expectation ( $r = -.37$ ), coercive power and identification ( $r = -.63$ ), coercive power and motivation ( $r = -.64$ ), coercive power and total belonging ( $r = -.65$ ), legitimate power and identification ( $r = -.44$ ), legitimate power and motivation ( $r = -.48$ ), and legitimate power and total belonging ( $r = -.45$ ). The relationship between legitimate power and expectation ( $r = -.22$ ) is negative and low.

The results of the Regression Analysis regarding whether the power sources used by the lecturers are significant predictors of belonging to the university status of the prospective pre-school teachers are given in Table 5.

**Table 5. Multiple Regression Analysis for Sub-dimensions of Power Sources Used by the Lecturers and the Belonging to the University**

Variables		Expectation	Identification	Motivation	Total Belonging
		$R = .487$ $R^2 = .237$ $F(5,294) = 18.263$ $p = .000$	$R = .705$ $R^2 = .497$ $F(5,294) = 58.029$ $p = .000$	$R = .688$ $R^2 = .473$ $F(5,294) = 52.843$ $p = .000$	$R = .728$ $R^2 = .530$ $F(5,294) = 66.372$ $p = .000$
Coercive Power	$\beta$	-.201	-.395	-.395	-.392
	$t$	-2.795	-6.751	-6.593	-6.939
	$p$	.006	.000	.000	.000
Reward Power	$\beta$	.118	.168	-.015	.095
	$t$	2.221	3.874	-.337	2.265
	$p$	.027	.000	.737	.024
Referent Power	$\beta$	.130	.303	.230	.256
	$t$	1.690	4.835	3.583	4.232
	$p$	.092	.000	.000	.000
Legitimate Power	$\beta$	.049	-.023	-.086	-.027
	$t$	.737	-.432	-1.565	-.515
	$p$	.462	.666	.119	.607
Expert Power	$\beta$	.231	-.0004	.113	.153
	$t$	3.593	-.082	2.113	3.036
	$p$	.000	.935	.035	.003

When Table 5 is examined there is a significant relationship between power sources and expectation sub-dimension of the belonging to the university scale ( $R = .487$ ;  $R^2 = .237$ ;  $F(5,294) = 18.263$ ;  $p = .000$ ). Accordingly, the predictor variables explain 23.7% of the variance in expectation sub-dimension of the belonging to the university scale. According to the  $t$  values of the regression analysis, it can be proposed that the variables of coercive power ( $t = -2.795$ ), reward power ( $t = 2.221$ ) and expert power ( $t = 3.593$ ) are significant predictors of expectation sub-dimension of the belonging to the university. The legitimate power and referent power sub-dimensions are not effective in explaining variance in expectation sub-dimension of the belonging to the university scale. The relative importance of the predictor variables on the expectation variable ( $\beta$ ) is expert power (.231), coercive power (-.201) and reward power (.118).

There is a significant relationship between the power sources and identification sub-dimension of the belonging to the university scale ( $R = .705$ ;  $R^2 = .497$ ;  $F(5.294) = 58.029$ ;  $p = .000$ ). Accordingly, the predictor variables explain 49.7% of the variance in identification sub-dimension of the belonging to the university. Looking at the  $t$  values of the regression analysis, it can be said that coercive power ( $t = -6.751$ ), reward power ( $t = 3.874$ ) and referent power ( $t = 4.835$ ) were significant predictors of identification sub-dimension of the belonging to university status of prospective teachers. Legitimate power and expert power sub-dimensions were not found to be effective in explaining identification sub-dimension of the belonging to the university scale. The relative order of importance of the predictor variables on the identification variable ( $\beta$ ) is coercive power (-.395), charismatic power (.303), and reward power (.168).

There is a significant relationship between power sources and motivation sub-dimension of the belonging to the university ( $R = .688$ ;  $R^2 = .473$ ;  $F(5.294) = 52.843$ ;  $p = .000$ ). Accordingly, the predictor variables explain 47.3% of the variance in motivation sub-dimension of the belonging to the university. According to the  $t$  values of the regression analysis, coercive power ( $t = -6.593$ ), referent power ( $t = 3.583$ ) and expert power ( $t = 2.113$ ) were found to be significant predictors of motivation sub-dimension of the belonging to university status of prospective teachers. Reward power and legitimate power sub-dimensions were not found to be effective in explaining motivation sub-dimension of the belonging to university status of prospective teachers. The relative order of importance of the predictor variables on the motivation variable ( $\beta$ ) is coercive power (-.395), referent power (.230), and expert power (.113).

There is a significant relationship between power sources and total score of the belonging to the university ( $R = .728$ ;  $R^2 = .530$ ;  $F(5.294) = 66.372$ ;  $p = .000$ ). Accordingly, the predictive variables explain 53% of variance in the belonging to the university scale. According to the  $t$  values of the regression analysis, coercive power ( $t = -6.939$ ), reward power ( $t = 2.265$ ), referent power ( $t = 4.232$ ), and expert power ( $t = 3.036$ ) were found to be significant predictors of the belonging to university status of prospective teachers. The sub-dimension of legitimate power did not explain the belonging to university status of prospective teachers. The relative order of importance of the predictor variables on total score of the belonging to the university ( $\beta$ ) is coercive power (-.392), referent power (.256), expert power (.153) and reward power (.095).

## DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

According to the research findings, lecturers use expert power, referent power, reward power, legitimate power and coercive power, respectively. This finding is similar to the previous findings of studies stating that lecturers use expert power more and coercive power less (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Özdemir, 2013; Paulsel et al., 2005; Teven & Herring, 2005; Turman & Schrod, 2006). According to the research findings, it is understood that the lecturers use expert power, referent power and reward power more, which are known as positive power sources. Expert power is based on the knowledge, skills, abilities and experiences of the lecturers. Moreover, expert power is more democratic than coercive power. Emphasizing the expert roles of lecturers by prospective pre-school teacher can be considered as a positive feature because lecturers are experts in their profession. It is important that lecturers use their expert power more because it increases students' cognitive and affective learning (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983), motivation (Özdemir (2013), perceptions of justice (Paulsel et al., 2005), effectiveness and productivity. According to Hall (1977), the frequency of coercive power is low in environments where professionalism and education level are high (cited in Aslanargun & Eriş, 2013). This situation has also emerged in the research findings and coercive power has been the least used power source by the lecturers. The reason for this finding may be that legitimate and coercive power sources with anti-social characteristics are less attractive in the university environment where sociality is at the center. Using coercive power is also undesirable from a pedagogical point of view. In this respect, the absence of a coercive authority relationship in educational institutions such as universities can be considered as a positive feature.

According to another finding of the study, prospective pre-school teachers have a high level of the belonging to the university where they study. Studies on university students show that the level of the belonging to the university may differ. For example, university students may have a low level (Hoffman et al., 2002), a medium level (Alptekin, 2011; Banat & Rimawi, 2017; Karaman & Çırak, 2018; Pittman & Richmond, 2007), a high level (Freeman et al., 2007; Sarwar & Ashrafi, 2014) and very high level (Aşık, 2018) sense of belonging to the university. It can be said that group relationships, personal relationships, environmental factors and interpersonal factors (Slaten et al., 2014) may have an impact on the high level of belonging to the university of prospective pre-school teachers. Another important factor that is effective in the high level of belonging of prospective pre-school teacher to the university is the lecturers. Being prepared for the lesson, being professional, being respectful, being enthusiastic, being passionate (Zumbrunn, McKim, Buhs, & Hawley, 2014) and establishing quality communication (Brown & Burdsal, 2012; Slaten et al., 2014; Tinto, 1993), which are related to the power sources used by the lecturers are effective in the high level of belonging of prospective pre-school teacher to the university. In addition, lecturers' respecting to the students, valuing them (Wilson, Murray, & Clarke, 2018), providing academic and social support (Zumbrunn et al., 2014) also affect prospective pre-school teacher' level of belonging to the university. The fact that prospective pre-school teachers have a high level of belonging to the university can be considered as a positive finding because it is known that a high sense of belonging positively affects cognitive processes, emotional patterns, social relations, behaviors, mental health and well-being. (Duru, 2008a; Duru, 2008b; Ersanlı & Koçyiğit, 2013; Guiffrida et al., 2013; Hill, 2006; King et al., 2002; Malone et al., 2012; Osterman, 2000; Pittman & Richmond, 2007).

The findings of the study show that there is a significant relationship between the power sources used by the lecturers and the belonging to university status of the prospective pre-school teachers. There is a positive and moderate relationship between the referent power and expert power used by the lecturers and the status of belonging, and there is a positive and low-level relationship between the reward power and belonging to the university status. The relationship between the use of referent power by the lecturers and the sense of belonging emerges as the strongest positive relationship. There is a negative and moderate relationship between coercive power and legitimate power used by the lecturers and the status of belonging. The strongest negative relationship is between the coercive power and the sense of belonging. When the results of the regression coefficients were examined, it was determined that the variables of coercive power, reward power, referent power and expert power were significant predictors of belonging to the university status of prospective pre-school teachers. While coercive power predicted sense of belonging negatively, reward power, referent power and expert power predicted sense of belonging positively. These predictive variables explain approximately 53% belonging to the university status. The legitimate power sub-dimension does not explain belonging to the university status of prospective pre-school teachers. According to the standardized regression coefficient, the order of importance of the variables on total belonging is coercive power, referent power, expert power, and reward power. These results lead to the conclusion that the power sources used by the lecturers are important predictors of the belonging status of the prospective pre-school teachers. This finding highlights the importance of the lecturers on sense of belonging.

The use of the referent, expert, and reward power by the lecturers causes the prospective pre-school teachers to increase their level of belonging to the university. At the same time, referent power, expert power and reward power are positive and significant predictors of prospective pre-school teacher' belonging to the university. In the previous studies, it was found that referent power, expert power and reward power used by the instructors can have a positive relationship with perceiving the instructors as competent, affectionate, and reliable, being satisfied with the instructors, being satisfied with the classroom environment (Teven & Herring, 2005), internal motivation (Özdemir, 2013) and the perception of justice towards the learning environment (Hoşgörür & Yorulmaz, 2016), which may have positive effect on the sense of belonging. In referent power, the appreciated and admired personal characteristics of the lecturers are at the forefront (Robbins & Judge, 2013). It can be said that prospective pre-school teacher like, respect and take role-models for the lecturers who use their referent power. Therefore, it is not surprising that referent power, which is connected with

interpersonal relationships, is positively associated with the sense of belonging. The expert power is based on the knowledge, skills, abilities and experiences of the lecturers (Bayrak, 2001). People tend to pay regard to what knowledgeable and experienced people will tell (Dyer, 1979). At the same time, information is perceived as an important power nowadays when communication becomes widespread (Aslanargun & Eriş 2013). According to Özdemir (2013), lecturers' use of their expert power leads to an increase in prospective teacher' motivation and identification with the organization. Similarly, it is expected situation that there is a positive relationship between prospective pre-school teacher' perception of lecturers as competent and knowledgeable people and their belonging to the university. Reward power is based on being able to give or retain rewards (Çelik, 2003). Prospective pre-school teachers' needs for approval and appreciation, which are related to their sense of belonging, reveal the effect of reward power (Giblin, 2008). Lecturers used the reward power to meet these needs of prospective pre-school teacher. Thus, the use of the reward power of the lecturers has been effective in the prospective pre-school teachers' sense of belonging to the university.

The use of coercive power and legitimate power by the lecturers has a negative effect on the university belonging of the prospective pre-school teachers. At the same time, coercive power is a negative and significant predictor of prospective pre-school teacher' state of belonging to the university. It was observed in the previous studies that there is a relationship between the use of coercive power by the lecturers and perception of justice (Hoşgörür & Yorulmaz, 2016; Paulsel et al., 2005), satisfaction from the learning environment, learning quality, the effect of the instructor on the classroom (Jamieson & Thomas, 1974), cognitive and affective learning (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983), and internal motivation (Özdemir, 2013), which may have a negative effect on the sense of belonging of the students to the university. In coercive power, there is intimidation, bullying, punishment or physical and psychological violence (Güney, 2015). The use of coercive power by lecturers harms their own authority (Aslanargun & Eriş 2013) and their referent power (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). At the same time, the use of coercive power can lead to resistance, dissatisfaction, negative emotional reactions (Golish & Olson, 2000), hostility, alienation, aggression (Hoy & Miskel, 2010), culture of fear, feeling of anxiety and decrease in the expectation for justice (Özdemir, 2013). Therefore, it does not seem possible for lecturers using coercive power to have a positive effect on prospective pre-school teacher. In addition, it may cause prospective pre-school teachers to develop negative sense of belonging. Legitimate power refers to the authoritative power provided by the official position of the person (Hitt, Black, & Porter, 2005). The use of legitimate power by lecturers can cause resistance and conflict, which has a negative effect on the sense of belonging (Yılmaz & Altınkurt, 2012; Altınkurt et al., 2014; Bolman & Deal, 2013). It does not seem possible that the lecturers, who use their legitimate power against the prospective pre-school teachers, have a positive effect on the prospective pre-school teachers. Although using legitimate power has a negative effect on the level of belonging, it does not predict the belonging status of prospective pre-school teachers in this study.

As a result, prospective pre-school teachers have a high level of belonging to the university. While lecturers use expert power the most, they use coercive power the least. The referent power, expert power and reward power used by the lecturers lead to positive sense of belonging; contrary to coercive power and legitimate power which lead to negative sense of belonging. Coercive power, referent power, expert power and reward power among the power sources used by the lecturers are significant predictors of belonging to the university levels of prospective pre-school teachers.

The relationship between lecturers and prospective teachers is an interpersonal relationship in which they negotiate with one another to achieve goals (Frymier & Houser, 2000). It can be evaluated that the power sources used by the lecturers can guide the behaviors of the prospective teachers. Since the lecturers have an important effect on the formation of the sense of belonging, the use of power by the lecturers can lead to positive or negative results. Therefore, the lecturers should pay attention to where and which power sources to use. It should be ensured that the awareness of the lecturers about power sources should be increased. Studies should be conducted using mixed or qualitative methods on the relationship between the power sources used by the lecturers and the sense of belonging of the prospective pre-school teachers. It can be investigated whether the power sources used or the status of

belonging to the university of the prospective pre-school teachers differ according to the personal variables of the lecturers (gender, academic title, age, department, etc.) and prospective teachers (gender, reason for choosing the department, etc.). Studies can be conducted on other factors that affect belonging to the university levels of prospective teachers. Likewise, the effects of the power sources used by the lecturers on the prospective teachers can be investigated.

## REFERENCES

- Alptekin, D. (2011). *Toplumsal aidiyet ve gençlik: Üniversite gençliğinin aidiyeti üzerine sosyolojik bir araştırma* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Selçuk University.
- Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2012). Relationship between school administrators' power sources and teachers' job satisfaction. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 20(2), 385-402.
- Arslan, G., & Duru, E. (2017). Initial development and validation of the school belongingness scale. *Child Indicators Research*, 10(4), 1043-1058. <https://www.doi.org/10.1007/s12187-016-9414-y>
- Aslanargun, E., & Eriş, H. M. (2013). The scale development of power sources that lecturers' applied in class management at higher education. *Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences*, 17(2), 207-220.
- Aşık, N. A. (2018). Sense of belongingness and nomophobia relationship: A research on tourism students. *Journal of Tourism and Research*, 7(2), 24-42.
- Bakan, İ., & Büyükbeşe, T. (2010). Leadership "types" and "power supplies" on the current-prospective status comparison: A case study based on perceptions of educational institution managers. *Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University Journal of Social and Economic Research*, 12(19), 73-84.
- Banat, B. Y. I., & Rimawi, O. T. (2017). Sense of university belonging: A case study of Al-Quds University students. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 6(2), 60-71.
- Başaran, İ. E. (2000). *Eğitim yönetimi nitelikli okul* (4th ed.). Feryal Matbaası.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>
- Bayrak, S. (2001). Power and power management in organizations as a neglected subject-II. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(1), 23-42.
- Brown, S. K., & Burdsal, C. A. (2012). An exploration of sense of community and student success using the national survey of student engagement. *The Journal of General Education*, 61(4), 433-460.
- Büyükalım, M. (2020). Predictive relationships between general belonging, nomophobia and life satisfaction among university students [Unpublished master's dissertation]. Necmettin Erbakan University.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2002). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* (16th. ed.). Pegem Publishing.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (18th. ed.). Pegem Publishing.

- Can, A. (2013). *SPSS ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi* (8th ed.). Pegem Publishing.
- Creasey, G., Jarvis, P., & Gadke, D. (2009). Student attachment stances, instructor immediacy, and student–instructor relationships as predictors of achievement expectancies in college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(4), 353–372. <http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0082>
- Çelik, K. (2003). Örgütsel kontrol. In C. Elma & K. Demir (Ed.), *Yönetimde çağdaş yaklaşımlar: Uygulamalar ve sorunlar* (2nd ed., s. 67-91). Anı Publishing
- Çelik, V. (2005). *Sınıf yönetimi* (3rd ed.). Nobel Publishing.
- Dahl, R. A. (2001). *Demokrasi üstüne* (4th ed.). (B. Kadioğlu, Trans.). Phoenix Yayınevi (Original work published 1998).
- Duru, E. (2008a). The role of social support and social connectedness in predicting loneliness. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 24(61), 15–24.
- Duru, E. (2008b). The direct and indirect roles of social connectedness and social support in predicting loneliness in the adjustment process to university. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 3(29), 13-22.
- Duru, E. (2015). The psychometric properties of the general belongingness scale: A study of reliability and validity. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 5(44), 125-135.
- Dyer, W. G. (1979). Caring and power. *California Management Review*, 21(4), 84-89. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41164838>
- Ersanlı, K., & Koçyiğit, M. (2013). Psychometric properties of the belonging scale. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 8(12), 751-764.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Freeman, T. M., Anderman, L. H., & Jensen, J. M. (2007). Sense of belonging in college freshmen at the classroom and campus levels. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 75(3), 203-220. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.75.3.203-220>
- French, J. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (1st ed., pp. 150-167). Institute for Social Research.
- Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education*, 49(3), 207-219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520009379209>
- Giblin, L. (2008). *İnsan ilişkilerinde kendine güven ve güç elde etmenin yolları* (6th ed.). (İ. Güpgüpoğlu, Trans.). Sistem Publishing (Original work published 1956).
- Golish, T. D., & Olson, L. N. (2000). Students' use of power in the classroom: An investigation of student power, teacher power, and teacher immediacy. *Communication Quarterly*, 48, 293-310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370009385598>
- Guiffrida, D. A., Lynch, M. F., Wall, A. F., & Abel, D. S. (2013). Do reasons for attending college affect academic outcomes? A test of a motivational model from a self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of College Student Development*, 54, 121–139. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2013.0019>

- Güney, S. (2015). *Örgütsel davranış* (3rd ed.). Nobel Publishing.
- Hill, L. H. (2006). Sense of belonging as connectedness, American Indian worldview, and mental health. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 20(5), 210-216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2006.04.003>
- Hitt, M. A., Black, J. S., & Porter, L. W. (2005). *Management* (1st ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hoffman, M., Richmond, J., Morrow, J., & Salomone, K. (2002). Investigating “sense of belonging” in first-year college students. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 4(3), 227-256. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DRYC-CXQ9-JQ8V-HT4V>
- Hoşgörür, T., & Yorulmaz, Y. İ. (2016). The effect of power sources used by lecturers in class management on the pre-service teachers’ perceptions of fairness regarding their learning environment. *Cukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 45(2), 375-404. <https://doi.org/10.14812/cuefd.284860>
- Jamieson, D. W., & Thomas, K. W. (1974). Power and conflict in the student-teacher relationship. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 10(3), 321-336. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002188637401000304>
- Karaman, Ö. (2013). *Öğrencilerin öğrenim gördükleri üniversiteye aidiyet gereksinimlerinin incelenmesi* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. İnönü University.
- Karaman, Ö., & Çırak, Y. (2018). The investigation of the belongings requirements of the students to their university with the various variables. *İnönü University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 19(1), 151-173. <https://doi.org/10.17679/inuefd.409094>
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (14th ed.). Nobel Publishing.
- Keskin, S., & Seferoğlu, S. S. (2017). An investigation of prospective teachers’ sense of belonging and perceptions of the community of inquiry. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty*, 44, 90-114. <https://doi.org/10.21764/maeuefd.309133>
- Kılıç, S., & Öksüz, Y. (2020). The relationship between university students’ inferiority feeling and their general level of belonging. *Ondokuz Mayıs University Journal of Education Faculty*, 39(2), 216-225. <https://doi.org/10.7822/omuefd.804719>
- King, A. K., Vidourek, A. R., Davis, B., & McClellan, W. (2002). Increasing self-esteem and school connectedness through a multidimensional mentoring program. *Journal of School Health*, 72(7), 294-299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2002.tb01336.x>
- Koşar, S., & Çalık, T. (2011). The relationship between primary school administrators’ styles of using power in management and organizational culture. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 4(4), 581-603.
- Kourou, O. (2019). *Rehberlik ve psikolojik danışmanlık öğrencilerinin ait olma ile varoluşsal kaygı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Unpublished master’s dissertation]. Marmara University.
- Lee, S. M., Luthans, F., & Hodgetts, R. M. (1992). Total quality management: Implications for central and eastern europe. *Organizational Dynamics*, 20(4), 42-55. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(92\)90074-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(92)90074-W)

- Malone, G.P., Pillow, D. R., & Osman, A. (2012). The general belongingness scale (GBS): Assessing achieved belongingness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 311–316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.10.027>
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1983). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. *Communication Education*, 32(2), 175-184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528309378527>
- Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Research of Educational Research*, 70(3), 323-367. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543070003323>
- Özdemir, A. (2013). The relationship between the power sources of the lectures and the organizational identification of the prospective teachers: The mediator role of the intrinsic motivation. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33(2), 269-291.
- Özteke Kozan, H. İ. Ö., Kavaklı, M., Ak, M., & Kesici, Ş. (2019). The associations among smartphone addiction, general belongingness and happiness: A structural equation modelling. *Turkish Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 22(4), 2152-2159. <https://doi.org/10.5505/kpd.2019.87587>
- Paulsel, M. L., Chory-Assad, R. M., & Dunleavy, K. N. (2005). The relationship between student perceptions of instructor power and classroom justice. *Communication Research Reports*, 22(3), 207-215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036810500207030>
- Pichon, H. W. (2016). Developing a sense of belonging in the classroom: Community college students taking courses on a four-year college campus. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 40(1), 47-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2014.964429>
- Pittman, L. D., & Richmond, A. (2007). Academic and psychological functioning in late adolescence: The importance of school belonging. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 75(4), 270–290. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.75.4.270-292>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior* (15th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Sarwar, M., & Ashrafi, G. M. (2014). Students' commitment, engagement and locus of control as predictor of academic achievement at higher education level. *Current Issues in Education*, 17(3), 1-10.
- Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., & Turman, P. D. (2007). Reconsidering the measurement of teacher power use in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, 56(3), 308-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520701256062>
- Slaten, C. D., Yough, M. S., Shemwell, D. A., Scalise, D. A., Elison, Z. M., & Hughes, H. A. (2014). Eat, sleep, breathe, study: Understanding what it means to belong at a university from the student perspective. *Excellence in Higher Education*, 5, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.5195/ehe.2014.117>
- Teven, J. J., & Herring, J. E. (2005). Teacher influence in the classroom: A preliminary investigation of perceived instructor power, credibility, and student satisfaction. *Communication Research Reports*, 22(3), 235-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036810500230685>
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition* (2nd ed.). University of Chi-cago Press.

- Turman, P. D., & Schrodt, P. (2006). Student perceptions of teacher power as a function of perceived teacher confirmation. *Communication Education*, 55(3), 265-279.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520600702570>
- van Gijn-Grosvenor, E. L., & Huisman, P. (2020). A sense of belonging among Australian university students. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(2), 376-389.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1666256>
- Yokuş, G., Ayçiçek, B., & Yelken, T. Y. (2017). An investigation about the perceptions of undergraduate students related to higher education service quality and their sense of institutional belongingness: Education faculty sample. *Karaelmas Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5, 1-18.