Üniversitepark Bülten

www.unibulletin.com

ISSN 2147-351X (Print), 2564-8039 (Online)

UNIVERSITEPARK bülten bulletin

Research Article

Cite this article: Gürbüz, O., & Özdemir, T. Y. (2025). The Relationship Between School Organizational Structure and Tokenism Perception: A Study Based on Teachers' Views. *Üniversitepark Bülten (UNIBULLETIN), 14*(1): 74-92.
https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5

Received January 4, 2025
Accepted May 9, 2025

Keywords: Discrimination, tokenism in teachers, tokenism, school structure, obstructive bureaucracy, facilitating bureaucracy

Author for correspondence:
Oğuz Gürbüz
ogzgrbz@gmail.com
Ministry of National Education, Malatya, Türkiye

The Relationship Between School Organizational Structure and Tokenism Perception: A Study Based on Teachers' Views

Oğuz Gürbüz, Tuncay Yavuz Özdemir

Abstract

Background/purpose. The main purpose of this research is to examine "the relationship between the structure of schools and teachers' perceptions of tokenism" with the relational research model, one of the quantitative research methods.

Materials/methods. The sample group is based on data from 507 teachers, obtained through convenience sampling. Research findings revealed that obstructive bureaucracy in schools had positive and significant effects on all three dimensions of tokenism.

Results. This result showed that bureaucratic restrictions in schools increased teachers' perceptions of tokenism. It has been concluded that obstructive bureaucracy, characterized by strict rules and centralist structures, strengthens teachers' perceptions of tokenism. It was determined that the school structure facilitative bureaucracy dimension showed a negative relationship with all sub-dimensions of tokenism, and had a low-level significant effect, especially in the "raised boundaries" dimension. This finding demonstrated that a facilitative school structure can reduce teachers' perceptions of tokenism. Finally, the research revealed that gender differences also influence teachers' perceptions of both tokenism and school structure.

Conclusion. In this context, the importance of building inclusive, equitable, and supportive school structures has been highlighted to prevent gender-based symbolic pressures and role limitations.

1. Introduction

Schools are important organizations where individuals receive education and transfer social and cultural values. Each school has its own unique structure, educational philosophy, and organizational characteristics. These structures directly affect the quality of education and shape the development of teachers and students. School structure is not limited to physical facilities and classroom order, but also includes many factors such as school management, teacher-student relations, and the content of educational programs. Understanding the structure of schools is a fundamental step in understanding how the education system works.

The success of the education system is directly related to how efficiently schools' organizational structures operate. Schools' organizational structures are designed to effectively manage both educational activities and administrative tasks (Mintzberg, 2014). This structure is of great importance in achieving the targeted educational results (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Educational processes are closely linked to the organization and management of the school's internal structure, as well as teaching strategies and methods. This structure is generally hierarchical and ensures a distribution of authority, duties, and responsibilities among deputy principals, teachers, and other personnel under the school principal's leadership (Çevik & Gülcan, 2022; Karakose et al., 2025a). The hierarchical structure's order ensures that each individual's responsibilities are clearly defined and that work within the school progresses in an orderly manner. This order enables the effective use of all necessary resources to achieve the school's goals. At the same time, when the roles and responsibilities of each position within the school are clearly defined, better communication and cooperation between employees can be achieved. Schools are organizations mostly governed by bureaucratic structures. Bureaucratic structures are often defined by strict rules and regulations (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Such structures enable centralized decision-making and ensure that certain standards are maintained. However, the negative effects of bureaucracy should not be ignored. These structures can limit employees' flexibility and productivity, hinder innovative approaches, and sometimes create unnecessary bureaucratic obstacles (Taylor & Robinson, 2020). To ensure educational efficiency, properly managing these bureaucratic structures is crucial for increasing students' and teachers' motivation. In this context, it is possible to discuss the concepts of facilitative and obstructive school structures (Özer & Dönmez, 2013). Schools' achievement levels may vary depending on what types of structures they adopt and how effectively these structures operate.

The facilitative school structure is an educational model that aims to reduce technological and bureaucratic obstacles and to support flexibility and productivity, enabling school administrators and teachers to work in a more effective educational environment (Senge, 2000). By departing from traditional school structures, it aims to encourage effective decision-making processes, greater participation, and more dynamic learning (Danielson, 2007; Karakose & Polat, 2025). Strong, visionary leadership forms the basis of an enabling school structure (Aydın et al., 2021; Karakose et al., 2025b). The most distinctive characteristics of facilitator school principals can be summarized as follows; Democratic leadership (Bush, 2020), communication ability (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003), empathy and emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995), innovative and original thinking (Fullan, 2007), motivation and inspiration (Kouzes & Posner, 2017), justice and egalitarian approach (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007) and solution orientation to problems (Marzano et al., 2005). These qualities reveal that school leaders (principals) have the potential to transform not only the routine operations of the school but also the school culture and learning environments (Taylor & Robinson, 2020).

Obstructive school structures often include rigid bureaucratic regulations, poor communication processes, limited team collaboration, and an approach that is far from student-centered. (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2015). This type of structure may create negative situations for teachers and

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

students (Hıraoğlu & Hıraoğlu, 2023; Papadakis et al., 2024). It often makes teachers feel pressured and limited (Schein, 2010). School principals who manage such a structure generally exhibit an authoritarian management style, adopt a centralist approach, and are resistant to innovations (Fullan, 2015; Gülbahar & İlanbey, 2020). Other characteristics of obstructive school principals can be summarized as follows: Lack of communication (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006), lack of motivation (Bass & Avolio, 1994), lack of empathy and insensitivity (Goleman, 1998), lack of justice and equality (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007), insecure and controlling behaviors (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). These characteristics indicate that obstructive school principals can negatively affect the school's overall development and weaken cooperation, motivation, and innovation (Taylor & Robinson, 2020). The negative effects of the obstructive school structure on school principals' management styles and relationships within the school may lead teachers to feel excluded and discriminated against. In this context, a phenomenon in which discrimination and exclusion can take various forms in school environments can be better understood through the concept of "tokenism".

Individuals may develop certain attitudes and behaviors to present themselves in a superior or privileged position relative to others in their environment. Such forms of behavior can lead to discrimination, which poses a significant problem for societies (Polat & Hiçyılmaz, 2017). In an organization, when an individual is exposed to exclusion and oppression by the dominant group, he or she may feel like a member of a minority or disadvantaged group (Lewis & Simpson, 2012). The concept of "tokenism", which expresses this situation, was first introduced to the literature in 1975 by the German sociologist Laws, and gained its real fame with the works of Kanter (1977a; 1977b; 1987; 2008; cited by Doğan et al., 2023). This concept is defined as the situation in which the minority group (token) feels restricted because all power resources and opportunities in a group or community are controlled by the majority group (tokenist) in terms of numbers and quality (Gustafson, 2008). Minority group members who are represented at 15% or less within a group are called "tokens" (Zimmer, 1988). Within a group, majority group members represented by 85% or more are defined as "tokenists" (Yoder, 2002).

Individuals who serve as tokens in organizations face three basic dimensions of tokenism: performance pressure, heightened boundaries, and role encapsulation (Yılmaz & Sürgevil, 2020). These dimensions and their sub-dimensions are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Tokenism Dimensions and Sub-Dimension

Tokenism Dimensions	Sub-Dimensions
Performance Pressure	Society Performance (Expectation)
	Scope (Generalization) of the Results
	Focusing on Different Features of Tokens
	Anxiety of Revenge
	Tokens' Response to Performance Pressure
Raised Boundaries	Exaggeration of the Dominant Group's Culture
	Sections Reminding Difference
	Informal Isolation (Explicit Blocking)
	Loyalty Tests
	Attitude of Tokens towards Raised Boundaries
Role Encapsulation (Asimilation)	Status Leveling
	Stereotypical Role Assignments

Source: Yılmaz & Sürgevil, 2020.

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

1. Performance pressure is the situation in which minority individuals (tokens) feel obliged to constantly prove both their own identity and the community they represent against the majority (tokenists), usually in a group where they are few in number (Mallett, 2013). This pressure is especially evident in individuals who experience gender, race, ethnicity, or other forms of discrimination in workplaces or social settings (Kanter, 2008). In the educational context, this situation may manifest particularly in institutional environments such as kindergartens, where male teachers are underrepresented, or in vocational high schools, where female teachers predominantly work under male administrators. For example, a female physical education teacher working among mostly male colleagues may find herself under constant scrutiny regarding whether she possesses "sufficient authority," leading her to feel a persistent need to prove her professional competence. Similarly, a headscarved teacher who is the only visibly religious individual in the school may experience pressure to be evaluated not only as an individual but also as a representative of her religious group. Such conditions can create a constant burden for teachers in token positions to demonstrate their capabilities in various areas, including classroom performance and student achievement. During end-of-year performance evaluations or parent-teacher conferences, token teachers may be assessed based on the identities they are perceived to represent, rather than solely on their professional contributions. This dynamic can undermine their job satisfaction and increase the risk of professional burnout.

2. Raised Boundaries: This dimension describes the psychological and social barriers created by the dominant group to defend themselves against tokens (Ott, 1989). When the dominant group sees the presence of tokens as a threat, it develops various methods to limit tokens' interactions and ways of working within the group, thereby increasing these barriers (Yoder & Sinnett, 1985). In the educational context, such boundaries may manifest in various forms. For instance, in some schools, the pedagogical suggestions or teaching methods proposed by a newly appointed young teacher may be perceived by more experienced colleagues as a form of "generational imposition," leading to the systematic disregard of the teacher's contributions. This dynamic can weaken the token teacher's sense of institutional belonging and restrict their access to professional development opportunities.

3. Role encapsulation: Role encapsulation is the situation where a token individual is limited by a certain role assigned to him/her, and this role completely assimilates the individual's identity (Acker, 1990). This process can lead individuals to feel incomplete or incompatible, and sometimes cause them to change their identities in order to accept this constricting role (Harper, 2016). In educational settings, role entrapment often emerges when specific roles are assigned to teachers based on particular identity characteristics. For example, a teacher from a different ethnic background may be assigned solely to cultural events or confined to symbolic roles as a "representative of diversity." Such role restrictions can diminish the teacher's overall institutional contribution and negatively impact the development of their professional identity.

The concept of tokenism identified by Kanter (1987) in organizations can also help us understand the roles teachers assume within educational institutions and the experiences they undergo in these processes (Doğan et al., 2023). Structural features of educational organizations are an important element that directly shapes teachers' professional experiences and perceptions (Taylor & Robinson, 2020). Management decisions, leadership approaches, organizational structures, and working relationships made in schools determine how teachers understand their professional roles and social identities (Göksoy et al., 2019; Karakose & Tülübaş, 2025). The social exclusion and marginalization experiences that teachers, especially those from minority groups, face due to their characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, language, or religion can make their professional lives difficult (Aydın et al., 2021; Karakose et al., 2024). In this context, the concept of tokenism offers a comprehensive perspective on the performance pressures, loneliness, and role limitations faced by teachers, especially those from minority groups, in educational organizations (Griffin et al., 2011). Therefore,

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

analyzing this concept is of great importance for understanding the steps needed to create a truly inclusive and just society (Stanley, 2006). Such an analysis can contribute to how fundamental principles such as social justice, equality, and diversity can be concretely implemented. Given tokenism's potential to hinder both professional and personal development by marginalizing minority groups, investigating teachers' experiences in this context is an important step toward understanding the effects of social isolation. It is frequently stated that education policies in Türkiye should improve in terms of diversity and inclusion. Understanding teachers' experiences with these issues is very valuable for strengthening inclusiveness in education and ensuring a more equitable working environment (Doğan et al., 2023).

This research aims to help understand social justice and equality issues in schools more deeply by examining “the impact of structural features of schools on teachers' perceptions of tokenism.” In this context, this research, which will analyze the structural difficulties and tokenism experiences that teachers face in educational organizations, will not only contribute to understanding the process teachers experience but may also help develop strategies to ensure equal opportunities and professional satisfaction in education. Additionally, by revealing the difficulties teachers face due to tokenism, it can provide important indicators for shaping education policies more effectively. While many studies on tokenism deal with the issue of tokenism in education through western societies (Kanter, 1977a; 1977b; 1987; 2008; Zimmer, 1988; Yoder; 2002; Tatum, 2003;), examining this issue specifically in Türkiye can make an important contribution to our understanding of how cultural, social and educational differences are reflected in teachers' experiences. When the literature is examined, it can be seen that most of the national and international studies on the perception of tokenism focus on variables such as "gender" (Kanter, 1977a; 1977b; 1987; 2008; Yoder, 1991; Stichman et al., 2010; Bayat & Baykal, 2021; İlhanlı, 2022), “disability” (Ababio & Mahlangu, 2010; Ataman & Oğrak, 2022) and “ethnicity” (Niemann, 1999; Sekaquaptewa et al., 2007; Wingfield, 2009; Stroshine & Brandl, 2011). These studies have revealed findings that gender, disability, and ethnicity lead to the perception of tokenism in individuals (Taylor & Robinson, 2020). Moreover, in the qualitative research on teachers conducted by Doğan et al. (2023), it was concluded that, in addition to gender, political thought structure, union differences, belief structure, and professional seniority, these factors also contribute to the perception of tokenism. However, no study or research has been found examining the "relationship between the structure of schools and teachers' perceptions of tokenism". Therefore, this study is expected to fill an important gap in the literature by examining the school structure and teachers' perceptions of tokenism, while accounting for teachers' emotional, intellectual, and opinionated perspectives. In addition, it is expected that the research will help develop solutions to educational problems by making a unique contribution to the literature on the structural characteristics of schools in Türkiye.

In light of these explanations, answers were sought to the following questions within the scope of the research:

- Is there a statistically significant difference in teachers' perceptions of tokenism and school structure according to their demographic characteristics, such as gender, professional seniority, tenure at school, and branch?

- Is there a significant relationship between the structure of schools (obstructive bureaucracy, facilitating bureaucracy) and teachers' perceptions of tokenism?

2. Method

2.1. Model of the Research

In this study, the relational research model, a quantitative research method, was used to examine the relationship between the structural characteristics of schools and teachers' perceptions

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

of tokenism. Relational research is a type of research that aims to reveal differences among multiple variables and the magnitudes of these differences (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). This type of research is considered the most appropriate method for determining the connection between two variables, including its direction (positive or negative) and intensity.

2.2. Population and Sample

The scope of the research is high school teachers working in the Battalgazi and Yeşilyurt districts of Malatya province during the 2023-2024 academic year. These two districts are the central districts of Malatya and are of great importance for reflecting the city's general education structure and teacher profiles. While determining the sample size, the total number of high school teachers in Malatya (Battalgazi district: 4291; Yeşilyurt district: 5515; total: 9806) and the expected response rate were considered. A calculation was made for all high school teachers in Malatya, with a 95% confidence interval and a 5% margin of error. In the study, 510 teachers were selected using convenience sampling (Etikan, 2015) to accurately represent the universe, and thus the results were generalized to the universe. In this context, after eliminating erroneous data, analyses were carried out using data from 507 teachers within the margin of error. Demographic information of the teachers in the sample group is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Demographic Information of Teachers in the Sample Group

Variable	Groups	n	%
Gender	Female Male	219	43.2
	Total	288	56.8
		507	**100**
Professional Seniority (Work Experience)	1-5	29	5.72
	6-10	74	14.60
	11-15	86	16.96
	16-20	85	16.77
	21+	233	45.95
	Total	**507**	**100**
Tenure at School (Working Time at School)	1-5	284	56.02
	6-10	102	20.11
	11-15	70	13.81
	16-20	34	6.71
	21+	17	3.35
	Total	**507**	**100**
Branch	Verbal	249	49.12
	Quantitative	129	25.44
	Other **Total**	129	25.44
		507	**100**
Total		**507**	**100**

2.3. Data Collection Tools

In the study, two scales were used for data collection. The first of these is the "Facilitative School Structure Scale" and the other is the "Tokenism Perception Scale", which was specially developed within the scope of the research. Details about these measurement tools used to obtain the data are given below.

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

2.3.1. Facilitative School Structure Scale

The "Effectiveness of School Structure" scale, developed by Hoy and Sweetland (2001) and adapted into Turkish by Buluç (2010), consists of 12 items. The psychometric properties of this scale were re-examined by Özer & Dönmez (2013). As a result of the validity and reliability tests, it was determined that the original one-factor structure in the Turkish version formed a two-factor structure: "obstructive bureaucracy" and "facilitating bureaucracy". This 5-point Likert-type scale is presented to participants with options ranging from "never" to "always". The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients for the scale were .774 for the obstructive bureaucracy dimension and .806 for the facilitating bureaucracy dimension. In analyses of the data obtained in the study, the internal consistency coefficient was .715 for the obstructive bureaucracy dimension and .848 for the facilitating bureaucracy dimension.

2.3.2. Tokenism Perception Scale

The Tokenism Perception Scale utilizes a 5-point Likert scale, with response options ranging from "never" to "always." Following psychometric analysis and validity and reliability tests, the scale shows a 14-item structure, grouped into three main factors. When the items related to these factors were examined, the first factor was named "Raised Boundaries", the second factor was named "Performance Pressure", and the third factor was named "Role Encapsulation". The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of the scale were determined as .87 in the Raised Boundaries dimension, .73 in the Performance Pressure dimension, and .80 in the Role Encapsulation dimension. As a result of the reliability analysis, a value of .826 was obtained for the Raised Boundaries dimension, .701 for the Performance Pressure dimension, and .788 for the Role Encapsulation dimension (Ozdemir et al., 2025).

2.4. Analysis of Data

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS 22.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Statistical calculations of the data, such as frequency, minimum and maximum values, standard deviation, and mean, were performed using this software. Skewness and kurtosis values were examined to determine the suitability of the data set for normality, and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Skewness and Kurtosis Values for the Data

Scales	Skewness	Kurtosis
Tokenism-Role Encapsulation	1,258	1,317
Tokenism-Performance Pressure	-1,32	,895
Tokenism-Raised Boundaries	,529	-,086
School Structure-Obstructive Bureaucracy	,819	,178
School Structure-Facilitative Bureaucracy	-1,44	,079

The skewness and kurtosis coefficients in Table 3 are between -1.5 and +1.5. These values indicate that the data show a normal distribution (George & Mallery, 2010). The scale ranges are given in Table 4.

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

Table 4. Evaluation Ranges Used in Scales

Option	Range
Never	1,00 - 1,80
Rarely	1,81 - 2,60
Sometimes	2,61 - 3,40
Often/Mostly	3,41 - 4,20
Always	4,21 - 5,00

Score range = (highest value – lowest value)/5 = (5–1)/5 = 4/5 = 0.80.

3. Findings

3.1. Comparison of Teacher Opinions According to Demographic Characteristics

Under this heading, the aim is to examine participants' opinions by gender. In this regard, the average scores of male and female teachers across various variables were compared using an independent-samples t-test. The results obtained are important for determining whether there is a significant difference in teachers' perceptions of tokenism by gender. Table 5 presents the mean, standard deviation, and standard error values for male and female teachers on these variables, along with the detailed data.

Table 5. The Effect of Gender on Perceptions of Role Encapsulation, Performance Pressure, Raised Boundaries, and Obstructive and Facilitative Bureaucracy: T-Test Group Statistics

Variables	Gender	n	x̄	sd	se
Role Encapsulation	Female	219	1,6877	,76887	,05196
	Male	288	1,6829	,76165	,04488
Performance Pressure	Female	219	3,7272	,78587	,05310
	Male	288	3,9470	,61805	,03642
Raised Boundaries	Female	219	2,1123	,81492	,05507
	Male	288	2,2509	,80404	,04738
Obstructive Bureaucracy	Female	219	1,9467	,87953	,05943
	Male	288	2,1265	,84949	,05006
Facilitative Bureaucracy	Female	219	3,8179	,89033	,06016
	Male	288	3,6241	,94031	,05541

Table 5 examines whether teachers' perceptions of tokenism differ according to gender. According to the independent samples t-test results, there was no significant difference between genders in the dimensions of tokenism-role encapsulation and tokenism-raised boundaries ($p > 0,05$). However, men have a higher average in the tokenism-performance pressure dimension, and a significant difference was detected ($p < 0,05$). Similarly, the mean scores of males were higher on the school structure-obstructive bureaucracy dimension, and a significant difference was observed ($p < 0,05$). On the other hand, women have higher mean values in the school structure-facilitative bureaucracy dimension, and a significant difference was detected ($p < 0,05$).

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

Analysis of variance conducted according to variables such as teachers' professional seniority, time spent at school, and branch showed that these factors did not have a significant effect on their perception of tokenism (p > 0,05).

3.2. Descriptive Statistics for the Variables of School Structure and Teachers' Perceptions of Tokenism

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for the Variables of School Structure and Teachers' Perceptions of Tokenism

Variables	min.	Max.	x̄	sd
Tokenism-Role Encapsulation	1,00	5,00	1,68	,764
Tokenism-Performance Pressure	1,00	5,00	3,85	,703
Tokenism-Raised Boundaries	1,00	4,86	2,19	,811
School Structure-Obstructive Bureaucracy	1,00	5,00	2,05	,866
School Structure-Facilitative Bureaucracy	1,00	5,00	3,71	,923

These findings show that the mean score of the "Role Encapsulation" sub-dimension of the Tokenism Scale is in the low range, the mean score of the "Performance Pressure" sub-dimension is in the high range, and the mean score of the "Raised Boundaries" sub-dimension is in the medium range. It shows that the mean score for the "Obstructive Bureaucracy" sub-dimension of the School Structure Scale is in the low range, while the mean score for the "Facilitating Bureaucracy" sub-dimension is in the high range.

3.3. Relationships Between the Variables of School Structure and Teachers' Perceptions of Tokenism

Table 7. Relationships Between the Variables of School Structure and Teachers' Perceptions of Tokenism

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
Tokenism-Role Encapsulation (1)	1,000				
Tokenism-Performance Pressure (2)	,035	1,000			
Tokenism-Raised Boundaries (3)	,472	,113	1,000		
School Structure-Obstructive Bureaucracy (4)	,394	,088	,506	1,000	
School Structure-Facilitative Bureaucracy (5)	-,295	-,006	-,413	-,712	1,000

According to the data in Table 7, a positive, moderate (r = 0.394) and statistically significant (p < 0.05) relationship was determined between "school structure-obstructive bureaucracy" and "tokenism-role encapsulation". On the other hand, a negative, low-level (r = -0.295) and statistically insignificant (p > 0.05) relationship was observed between "school structure-facilitative bureaucracy" and "tokenism-role encapsulation". Additionally, a positive, low-level (r = 0.088) and statistically insignificant (p > 0.05) relationship was observed between "school structure-obstructive bureaucracy" and "tokenism-performance pressure". A negative, very low level (r = -0.006) and statistically insignificant (p > 0.05) relationship was observed between "school structure-facilitative bureaucracy" and "tokenism-performance pressure". While there is a positive, moderate (r = 0.506) and statistically significant (p < 0.05) relationship between "school structure-obstructive bureaucracy" and "tokenism-raised boundaries", a negative, moderate (r = -0.413) and statistically

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

significant relationship was detected between "school structure-facilitative bureaucracy" and "tokenism-raised boundaries" ($p < 0.05$).

In light of these data, it is concluded that there is a generally positive relationship between tokenism and obstructive bureaucracy and a negative relationship between facilitative bureaucracy.

In the study, multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the effect of the independent variable, school structure, on the dependent variable, teachers' perceptions of tokenism. The analysis results are presented in tables 8, 9, and 10.

Table 8. Multiple Regression Analysis Results of the Effect of School Structure-Obstructive and Facilitative Bureaucracy Dimensions on the Tokenism-Role Encapsulation Dimension

Variables	B	Std. Error	Beta(β)	t	p	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	1,097	,266		4,119	,000		
Obstructive Bureaucracy	,329	,051	,374	6,406	,000	,493	2,030
Facilitative Bureaucracy	-,024	,048	-,028	-,488	,626	,493	2,030

Dependent Variable: Role Encapsulation

OB CI 95 % lower= ,228; upper= ,431 & FB CI 95 % lower= -,118; upper= ,071

When Table 8 is examined, as a result of the multiple regression analysis conducted to determine the predictive levels of the independent variables, obstructive bureaucracy and facilitative bureaucracy, on the dependent variable, role encapsulation; It is observed that obstructive bureaucracy has a positive, moderate (Beta (β) = 0.374) and statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) effect on the tokenism-role encapsulation dimension. On the other hand, the effect of facilitative bureaucracy on the tokenism-role encapsulation dimension is not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). The fact that the tolerance values are above 0.1 and the VIFs are below 10 for both independent variables does not indicate a multicollinearity problem.

Table 9. Multiple Regression Analysis Results of the Effect of School Structure-Obstructive and Facilitative Bureaucracy Dimensions on the Tokenism-Performance Pressure Dimension

Variables	B	Std. Error	Beta(β)	t	p	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	3,243	,265		12,242	,000		
Obstructive Bureaucracy	,138	,051	,170	2,703	,007	,493	2,030
Facilitative Bureaucracy	,088	,048	,115	1,829	,068	,493	2,030

Dependent Variable: Performance Pressure

OB CI 95 % lower= ,38; upper= ,239 & FB CI 95 % lower= -,007; upper= ,182

When Table 9 is examined, as a result of the multiple regression analysis conducted to determine the predictive levels of the independent variables, obstructive bureaucracy and facilitative bureaucracy, on the dependent variable, performance pressure; It is observed that obstructive bureaucracy has a positive, low level (Beta (β) = 0.170) and statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) effect on

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

the tokenism-performance pressure dimension. On the other hand, the effect of facilitative bureaucracy on the tokenism-performance pressure dimension is not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). The fact that the tolerance values are above 0.1 and the VIFs are below 10 for both independent variables does not indicate a multicollinearity problem.

Table 10. Multiple Regression Analysis Results of the Effect of School Structure-Obstructive and Facilitative Bureaucracy Dimensions on the Tokenism-Raised Boundaries Dimension

Variables	B	Std. Error	Beta(β)	t	p	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	1,720	,264		6,504	,000		
Obstructive Bureaucracy	,401	,051	,429	7,863	,000	,493	2,030
Facilitative Bureaucracy	-,095	,048	-,108	-1,977	,049	,493	2,030

Dependent Variable: Raised Boundaries

OB CI 95 % lower= ,301; upper= ,502 & FB CI 95 % lower= -,189; upper= -,001

When Table 10 is examined, as a result of the multiple regression analysis conducted to determine the predictive levels of the independent variables, obstructive bureaucracy and facilitative bureaucracy, on the dependent variable, raised boundaries; It is observed that obstructive bureaucracy has a positive, moderate (Beta (β) = 0.429) and statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) effect on the tokenism-raised boundaries dimension. On the other hand, facilitative bureaucracy appears to be negatively (Beta (β)=0-108) and weakly statistically significant (usually at a threshold of 0.05) on the tokenism-raised boundaries dimension. The fact that the tolerance values are above 0.1 and the VIFs are below 10 for both independent variables does not indicate a multicollinearity problem.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This research aimed to examine the relationship between school structural characteristics and teachers' perceptions of tokenism. The positive, moderate average scores on the obstructive bureaucracy dimension of the facilitative school structure scale indicate that obstructive bureaucracy limits teachers' roles and responsibilities more strictly. This finding is consistent with some concepts in the existing literature. It is especially parallel to the understanding of role encapsulation put forward by Kanter (1977a; 1977b; 1987; 2008), Zimmer (1988) and Yoder (1991; 1994; 1996; 2002); obstructive bureaucracy can stifle productivity and diversity by restricting individuals' professional flexibility. This view suggests that employees' professional roles have been narrowed due to excessive regulations and rigid hierarchical structures. As a result, employees may begin to view their jobs and roles more narrowly. This situation is especially related to the pressures imposed by rigid, hierarchical structures in education on teachers' professional identities (Harper, 2016; Kanter, 1977a; 1977b; 1987; 2008; Coser, 1971). In their research, Yılmaz & Sürgevil (2020) state that the rate of teachers experiencing gender-based tokenism increases due to the harsh bureaucratic structures of school administrations. The negatively moderate mean scores obtained from the facilitative bureaucracy dimension indicate that a structured and, at the same time, supportive school environment can help teachers evaluate their professional roles from a broader and flexible perspective (Garcia & Weiss, 2023; Wang & Zhang, 2021; Taylor & Robinson, 2020; Buluç, 2010; Spillane & Diamond, 2007).

It was observed that the average scores obtained from the tokenism-performance pressure dimension were quite high. This high-pressure environment indicates that teachers feel they are constantly being “observed and evaluated”. While obstructive bureaucracy has a significant and

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

positive effect on this dimension, the effect of facilitative bureaucracy is not statistically significant. This suggests that performance pressure is more closely associated with centralized, rigid organizational structures. It is frequently stated in the literature that performance pressure is linked to negative consequences such as stress, burnout, and low job satisfaction (Korkmaz, 2023; Gültekin & Coşkun, 2022; Tilly & Tilly, 2016; Derks et al., 2011; Budig, 2002; Ely, 1995; Yoder, 1994; Spangler et al., 1978; Coser, 1974).

The average scores for the tokenism-raised boundaries dimension are at a medium level. Moderately raised boundaries reflect the existence of distance or boundaries between individuals. While the effect of obstructive bureaucracy on this dimension was positive and strongly significant, the effect of facilitative bureaucracy was negative and marginally significant. These findings show that bureaucratic barriers make the boundaries between individuals more rigid, whereas facilitative bureaucratic structures make them more flexible (Aydın et al., 2021). Coser's (1974) theory of loyalty tests argues that dominant groups make these boundaries more evident for token individuals.

Obstructive bureaucracy exhibits positive and significant effects on all three dimensions of tokenism. This shows that bureaucratic obstacles in schools increase teachers' perceptions of tokenism. Strict rules and centralized structures reinforce teachers' perception of tokenism. This bureaucratic structure, which prevents the culture of innovation and cooperation in educational organizations, is also supported by research (Taylor & Robinson, 2020; Demirtaş et al., 2016; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2015; Schein, 2010; Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

Facilitative bureaucracy is negatively related to all subdimensions of tokenism and has a particularly low significant effect on raised boundaries. This finding suggests that facilitative school structures can reduce teachers' perceptions of tokenism. Additionally, it is frequently emphasized in the literature that facilitator structures contribute to creating a more inclusive environment by encouraging collaboration (Trabzonluoğlu, 2024; Korkut & Yılmaz, 2021; Göksoy et al., 2019; Senge, 2017; Fullan, 2011; Darling & Hammond, 2010; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007; Goleman, 1995).

Descriptive statistics indicate significant relationships among teachers' perceptions of tokenism, their views on school structure, and their levels of professional satisfaction. This finding supports studies in the literature on the impact of tokenism on workplace perceptions and behaviors (Doğan et al., 2023; Bayat & Baykal, 2021; Ataman & Oğrak, 2022; Jayasekara, 2022; Phelps, 2016; Wilson & Tagg, 2010). In this context, the finding that teachers' perceptions of tokenism are linked to organizational support and leadership styles overlaps with existing research in the literature (Culha & Yücel, 2024; Smith & Johnson, 2022; Shields & Hesbol, 2020; Dinham, 2008; Spillane & Diamond, 2007; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Bogler, 2001).

Correlation analysis reveals significant relationships and strong correlations. These findings indicate that school structure significantly affects teachers' perceptions of tokenism. Reducing obstructive bureaucracy and supporting facilitative bureaucracy may particularly help reduce perceptions of role encapsulation and raised boundaries. The results of the performance pressure dimension of tokenism emphasize the importance of individual support and professional development-oriented approaches. The literature reveals that such structural changes can increase teachers' job satisfaction and professional motivation (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Kanter, 1977b).

Multiple regression analysis revealed that school structure had both direct and indirect effects on teachers' perceptions of tokenism. This finding is consistent with broader research explaining how organizational structures influence individuals' working conditions and perceptions (İmadoğlu & Çavuş, 2022; Hoy & Miskel, 2010; Scott & Davis, 2007; Bryk & Schneider, 2002). In particular, centralized structures and limited participation can prevent token teachers from being involved in decision-making, further reducing their sense of belonging (Doğan et al., 2023).

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

These findings reveal that both obstructive and enabling types of bureaucracy in schools may affect teachers' experiences of tokenism in different ways. While obstructive bureaucracy elements may increase teachers' perceptions of tokenism, facilitative bureaucracy elements may reduce these perceptions. In particular, obstructive bureaucracy plays an important role in restricting teachers' professional identities and increasing performance pressure. On the other hand, facilitating bureaucracy may positively influence perceptions of tokenism by offering teachers greater autonomy and flexibility.

Evaluating the findings in terms of the gender variable allows for a deeper understanding of these relationships. The significantly higher mean scores of male teachers on the tokenism-performance pressure dimension may be explained by the increased visibility and representational burden they experience in female-dominated environments (e.g., certain school types or subject areas). As emphasized in Kanter's (1977a; 1977b) tokenism theory, individuals in token positions are often perceived as representatives of their entire group, which may place considerable pressure on them to perform at a high level. This kind of "representational burden" can negatively impact an individual's job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Yoder, 1991; Zimmer, 1988).

Similarly, male teachers' higher scores on the hindering bureaucracy dimension indicate that they perceive the school's structural arrangements as more restrictive and controlling. The literature suggests that male teachers, as minorities in female-dominated professional environments, may experience greater administrative supervision and social isolation (Yoder, 1994; Simpson, 2004). This may lead them to experience hindering structures more intensely.

On the other hand, the finding that female teachers reported higher perceptions of "facilitative bureaucracy" suggests that they evaluate organizational structures as more supportive and open to collaboration. The literature indicates that female teachers tend to value horizontal relationships, social support, and cooperation and, therefore, may be more sensitive to the positive aspects of bureaucratic structures (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). In this context, it can be argued that female teachers are better able to work within facilitative structures, and that such structures may help mitigate their perceptions of tokenism.

In conclusion, this study reveals that gender and school structures are significant variables in shaping teachers' organizational experiences and can influence their perceptions of tokenism. These findings highlight the importance of creating more inclusive, equitable, and fair organizational structures in schools. Particularly in leadership and policy development processes, taking these variables into account is crucial for reducing the symbolic pressures that token teachers (female or male) may face.

5. Suggestions

Based on the results of the research, the following recommendations are presented:

- This study is limited only to educational institutions and teachers, but can also be conducted on school administrators, employees, and managers in other sectors.

- This study examined the obstructive and facilitative bureaucracy tendencies in public schools and teachers' perceptions of tokenism; the same analysis can also be done in the context of private schools.

- Examining the effects of various leadership approaches (transformational, distributive, autocratic, etc.) on teachers' perceptions of tokenism can contribute to the development of strategies for implementation.

- In schools where obstructive bureaucracy predominates, centralized decision-making processes should be made more flexible, and teachers should be more involved in these processes in

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

order to reduce these perceptions. In this regard, regular feedback meetings should be held where teachers can share their opinions, and the feedback obtained should be implemented as concrete steps.

- In order to enable teachers to do their jobs more flexibly and efficiently, more flexible and productive working arrangements should be made rather than rigid job descriptions.

- In order to relieve teachers' performance pressure, evaluation processes should be organized in a way that emphasizes individual development and success, rather than focusing on constant control.

Declarations

Conflicts of Interest. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Ababio, E., & Mahlangu, L. (2010). Disability management in the South African Public Service. Redress or tokenism? *Administratio Publication*, 18(3), 90–108.

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & society*, 4(2), 139–158.

Ataman, S., & Oğrak A. (2022). Kamu Sektöründe Çalışan Engelli Personelin Tokenizm Algısı: Van İlinde Bir Uygulama, *İş Ahlakı Dergisi,* 15(2), 39-76.

Aydın, M., Çetin, F., & Öztürk, İ. (2021). Bürokratik Yapı ve Öğretmenlerin Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri: Türkiye'deki Okullarda Bir Araştırma. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 59(1), 54-68. https://doi.org/xxxxxxx

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage.

Bayat, İ., & Baykal, B. (2021). Toplumsal Cinsiyet Ayrımcılığının Yarattığı Engeller: Çalışma Yaşamında Var olmaya Çalışan Kadın. *Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergis*i, 23(3), 745-762.

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational administration quarterly,* 37(5), 662–683.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement. Russell Sage Foundation.

Budig, M. J. (2002). Male advantage and the gender composition of jobs: Who rides the glass escalator?. *Social problems*, 49(2), 258-277.

Buluç, B. (2010). İlköğretim Okullarında Bürokratik Okul Yapısı ile Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stilleri Arasındaki İlişki. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 34(152).

Bush, T. (2020). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy and practice. South African journal of education, 27(3), 391–406.

Coser, L. A. (1971). *The Functions of Social Conflict*. Free Press.

Coser, L. A. (1974). *Greedy Institutions: Patterns of Undivided Commitment.* New York: The Free Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.

Culha, A., & Yücel, A. (2024). Okul Müdürlerinin Kapsayıcı Liderlik Davranışlarının Okul Kültürüne Etkisi. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* 19(43), 2344-2362.

Çevik, M. N., & Gülcan, M. G. (2022). Örgütsel Yapı Ölçeği-Üniversite Versiyonunun Okullara Uyarlanması ve Okulların Örgütsel Yapısının İncelenmesi. *Siirt Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 10(1), 65-82.

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. AsCD.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Recruiting and retaining teachers: Turning around the race to the bottom in high-need schools. *Journal of curriculum and instruction,* 4(1), 16–32.

Derks, B., Ellemers, N., Van Laar, C., & De Groot, K. (2011). Do sexist organizational cultures create the Queen Bee?. *British Journal of Social Psychology,* 50(3), 519-535.

Dinham, S. (2008). How to get your school moving and improving: An evidence-based approach. *Aust Council for Ed Research*.

Doğan, A., Gürbüz, O., & Can, Y. (2023). Öğretmen Algılarıyla Eğitim Örgütlerinde Tokenizm: Nitel Bir Araştırma. *Kahramanmaraş İstiklal Üniversitesi Psikoloji Dergisi*, *1*(1), 46-58.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. Psychological review, 109(3), 573.

Ely, R. J. (1995). The power in demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at work. *Academy of Management Journal,* 38(3), 589–634.

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics*, *5*(1), 1–4.

Fullan, M. (2007). Change the terms for teacher learning. *The Learning Professional*, 28(3), 35.

Fullan, M. (2011). *Change leader: Learning to do what matters most*. John Wiley & Sons.

Fullan, M. (2015). *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Garcia, E., & Weiss, E. (2023). School Management during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Adaptation and Resilience. *International Journal of Educational Administration,* 45(2), 200–218.

George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*, 17.0update (10a ed.) Boston: Pearson.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence Bantam Books.* New York.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence.* Bantam Books.

Göksoy, S., Torlak, E., & Uğuz, B. (2019). Okul Müdürlerinin Dönüşümcü (Transformational) Liderlik Rolleri. *Düzce Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* 9(2), 209-222.

Griffin, K. A., Bennett, J. C., & Harris, J. T. (2011). Analyzing Gender Differences in Black Faculty Marginalization Through a Sequential Mixed-Methods Design. *New Directions for Institutional Research,* 151, 45–61.

Gustafson, J. L. (2008). Tokenism in policing: An empirical test of Kanter's hypothesis. *Journal of criminal justice,* 36(1), 1–10.

Gülbahar, B., & İlanbey, Ö. (2020). Öğretmenlerin okul müdürü desteği ile ilgili görüşleri. *International Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research (JSHSR),* 7(62), 3569-3579.

Gültekin, M., & Coşkun, A. (2022). Öğretmenlerin Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri ve Bürokratik Yapı: Türkiye'deki Okullarda Bir Durum Çalışması. *Educational Research Review,* 34(2), 199-210. https://doi.org/xxxxxxx

Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2006). Sustainable Leadership. *Jossey-Bass Education Series,* 324.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2015). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school.* Teachers College Press.

Harper, C. M. (2016). *Token female police officers or police exemplars: An evaluation of the theory of tokenism.* Illinois State University.

Hıraoğlu, S., & Hıraoğlu, E. (2023). Öğretmen liderliğini etkileyen değişkenlerin belirlenmesi. *Enderun*, 7(1), 96-120.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi* (Çev. Ed. S. Turan). Ankara: Nobel Akademi Yayıncılık.

Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and measure of enabling school structures. Educational Administration Quarterly, 37(3), 296–321.

İmadoğlu, T., & Çavuş, M. F. (2022). Weber'in Demir Kafesi Örgütsel Değişimi Etkiler mi? *Journal of Management Theory and Practices Research*, *3*(1), 32-38.

İlhanlı, H. (2022). *Yerel yönetimlerdeki kadın temsilinde tokenizm'in izleri: Kadıköy ve Sultanbeyli Belediyeleri* (Master's thesis, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü).

Jayasekara, L. (2022). Importance of studying the dominant perspective on women workers in male-dominated workplaces: *Revisiting Kanter's theory. University of Colombo Review*, 3(2).

Kanter, R. M. (1977a). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Kanter, R. M. (1977b). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology,* 82(5), 965–990.

Kanter, R. M. (1987). Men and women of the corporation revisited: interview with Rosabeth Moss Kanter. *Human Resource Management*, 26(2), 257–263.

Kanter, R. M. (2008). *Men and women of the corporation:* New edition. Basic books.

Karakose, T., & Polat, H. (2025). Science Mapping of the Knowledge Base on the Effects of Artificial Intelligence (AI)Based Chatbots on Student Learning Outcomes: A Bibliometric Study. In: Lampropoulos, G., Papadakis, S. (eds) *Social Robots in Education. Studies in Computational Intelligence*, vol 1194. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/9783031829154_18

Karakose, T., & Tülübaş, T. (2025). Türkiye'de eğitim yönetimi ve liderlik araştırma alanında gelişen bilgi tabanının boylamsal tematik analizi. İçinde: Karakose, T. (ed.) *Cumhuriyet'in 100. Yılında Türkiye'de Eğitim Yönetimi Alanının Gelişimi: İnceleme ve Değerlendirme*. Nobel Bilimsel Eserler, ISBN-978-625-393-783-6

Karakose, T., Gurr, D., Tülübaş, T., & Kanadlı, S. (2025a). What factors mediate the relationship between leadership for learning and teacher professional development? Evidence from meta-analytic structural equation modelling. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432241308461

Karakose, T., Ozdogru, M., & Malkoc, N. (2024). Leading sustainable school improvement: a meta-synthesis of qualitative research on problems and challenges faced by school leaders. *Frontiers in Education, 9*: 1449174. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1449174

Karakose, T., Tülübaş, T., Kanadli, S., & Gurr, D. (2025b). What factors mediate the relationship between principal leadership and teacher professional learning? Evidence from meta-analytic structural equation modelling (MASEM). *Journal of Educational Administration*, *63*(1), 6376. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA0520240160

Korkmaz, F. (2023). Eğitimde Tokenizm ve Liderlik Yaklaşımları. *Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 29*(4), 512–532.

Korkut, F., & Yılmaz, G. (2021). *Okul Yapıları ve Liderlik: Eğitim Yönetiminde Yeni Yaklaşımlar.*

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2017). *A coach's guide to developing exemplary leaders: Making the most of the leadership challenge and the leadership practices inventory (LPI).* John Wiley & Sons.

Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (2003). What we know about successful school leadership (pp. 406028754–1581215021). Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, *17*(2), 201-227.

Lewis, P., & Simpson, R. (2012). Kanter revisited: Gender, power and (in) visibility. *International Journal of Management Reviews,* 14(2), 141–158.

Mallett, J. R. (2013). *Kanter's theory of tokenism and the socialization of African American students attending Midwestern university:* Edgewood College.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). School leadership that works: From research to results. *ASCD*.

Mintzberg, H. (2014). *Örgütler ve yapıları* (Çev. Ed. A. Aypay). Ankara: Nobel Akademi Yayıncılık.

Niemann, Y. F. (1999). The making of a token: A case study of stereotype threat, stigma, racism, and tokenism in academe. Frontiers: *A Journal of Women Studies*, 20(1), 111–134.

Ozdemir, T. Y., Gurbuz, O., & Dogan, A. (2025). Tokenism Perception Scale: Validity and Reliability Study. *Participatory Educational Research*, *12*(1).

Özer, N., & Dönmez, B. (2013). Kolaylaştırıcı okul yapısı ölçeğinin Türkçe formunun psikometrik özelliklerinin yeniden değerlendirilmesi. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi, 3*(4), 57-68.

Papadakis, S., Kanadlı, S., Kardas, A., Tülübaş, T., Karakose, T., & Polat, H. (2024). Investigating the Relationship Between Leadership for Learning and Student Achievement Through the Mediation of Teacher Performance: A Meta-Analytic Structural Equation Modeling (MASEM) Approach. *Education Sciences 14*(12), 1320. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14121320

Phelps, P. M. (2016). *An examination of the effects of tokenism for female command officers in law enforcement (*Doctoral dissertation, Capella University).

Polat, S., & Hiçyılmaz, G. (2017). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin maruz kaldıkları ayrımcılık davranışları ve bu davranışların nedenleri. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *5*(2), 46-65.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.

Scott, W. R., & Davis, G. F. (2007). Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems Perspectives. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Sekaquaptewa, D., Waldman, A., & Thompson, M. (2007). Solo status and self-construal: Being distinctive influences racial self-construal and performance apprehension in African American women. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13(4), 321.

Senge, P. M. (2000*). Schools That Learn: A Fifth Discipline Fieldbook for Educators, Parents, and Everyone Who Cares About Education*. New York: Doubleday.

Senge, P. M. (2017). *The leader's new work: Building learning organizations.* In Leadership perspectives (pp. 51–67). Routledge.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). *The supervisor's educational platform.* Supervision: A redefinition.

Shields, C. M., & Hesbol, K. A. (2020). Transformative leadership approaches to inclusion, equity, and social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, *30*(1), 3–22.

Simpson, R. (2004). Masculinity at work: The experiences of men in female-dominated occupations. Work, employment and society, 18(2), 349–368.

Smith, A. L., & Johnson, P. (2022). *Equity Leadership and School Culture: Enhancing Collaboration and Student Achievement*. Educational Leadership Quarterly, 58(3), 120–139.

Spangler, E., Gordon, M. A., & Pipkin, R. M. (1978). Token women: An empirical test of Kanter's hypothesis. *American Journal of Sociology,* 84(1), 160–170.

Spillane, J. P., & Diamond, J. B. (2007). Distributed Leadership in Practice. *Teachers College Record*, 109(4), 124–145.

Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the Academic Landscape: Faculty of Color Breaking the Silence in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(4), 701–736.

Stichman, A. J., Hassell, K. D., & Archbold, C. A. (2010). Strength in numbers? A test of Kanter's theory of tokenism. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*(4), 633–639.

Stroshine, M. S., & Brandl, S. G. (2011). Race, gender, and tokenism in policing: An empirical laboration. *PoliceQuarterly*, *14*(4), 344–365.

Tatum, B. (2003). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?:* Revised Edition. Hachette UK.

Taylor, J. C., & Robinson, D. H. (2020). The Impact of Organizational Structure on Teacher Satisfaction and Commitment. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies,* 41(4), 175–193.

Tilly, C., & Tilly, S. (2016). *Durable Inequality.* University of California Press.

Trabzonluoğlu, Z. (2024). Kolaylaştırıcı Okul Yapısı İle Öğretmenlerin Mesleki Eşitlik Algısı Arasındaki İlişki. *Uluslararası Liderlik Eğitimi Dergisi*, 8(1), 24-44.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of educational research*, 70(4), 547–593.

Wang, Y., & Zhang, Z. (2021). "Digital Transformation and Organizational Structures in Schools: Implications for Teacher and Student Performance. *Journal of Educational Technology Research*, 39(1), 45–62.

Wingfield, A. H. (2009). Racializing the glass escalator: Reconsidering men's experiences with women's work. *Gender & society*, *23*(1), 5–26.

Wilson, F., & Tagg, S. (2010). Social constructionism and personal constructivism: Getting the business owner's view on the role of sex and gender. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 68–82.

Yılmaz, B. K., & Sürgevil, O. (2020). Cinsiyete dayalı tokenizm: Kadın egemen ve erkek egemen meslekler üzerinde nitel bir araştırma. *Istanbul Management Journal*, (88), 85–125.

Yoder, J. D., & Sinnett, L. M. (1985). Is it all in the numbers? A case study of tokenism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 9(3), 413–418.

Yoder, J. D. (1991). Rethinking tokenism: Looking beyond numbers. *Gender & society,* 5(2), 178–192.

https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.141.5 Published online by Universitepark Press

Yoder, J. D. (1994). Looking beyond numbers: The effects of gender status, job prestige, and occupational gender-typing on tokenism processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 150–159.

Yoder, J. D., & Schleicher, T. L. (1996). Undergraduates regard deviation from occupational gender stereotypes as costly for women. *Sex Roles*, *34*, 171–188.

Yoder, J. D. (2002). 2001 Division 35 presidential address: Context matters: Understanding tokenism processes and their impact on women's work. *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 26(1), 1–8.

Zimmer, L. (1988). Tokenism and women ın the workplace: the limits of gender-neutral theory. *Social Problems, 35*(1), 64–77.

About the Contributor(s)

Oğuz Gürbüz, Ministry of National Education, Malatya, Türkiye
Email address: ogzgrbz@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0052-9093

Tuncay Yavuz Özdemir, Fırat University, Elazığ Türkiye
Email address: tyozdemir@firat.edu.tr
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6474-5915