TURKISH ONLINE JOURNAL of QUALITATIVE INQUIRY

Volume 8, Issue 3, July 2017

Editor
Abdullah KUZU

ISSN 1309-6591

Published in TURKEY

Contact Address:
Prof.Dr. Abdullah KUZU
TOJQI, Editor in Chief
Eskişehir-Turkey

Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)
Volume 8, Issue 3, July 2017

ISSN 1309-6591

Editör-in-Chief

Associate Editors

Editorial Board

The Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI) (ISSN 1309-6591) is published quarterly (January, April, July and October) a year at the www.tojqi.net.

For all enquiries regarding the TOJQI, please contact Prof.Dr. Abdullah KUZU, Editor-In-Chief, TOJQI,
Anadolu University, Faculty of Education, Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technology,
Yunus Emre Campus, 26470, Eskisehir, TURKEY,
Phone #:+90-222-3350580/1925, Fax # :+90-222-3350573,
E-mail : akuzu@anadolu.edu.tr; editor@tojqi.net.

Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)
Volume 8, Issue 3, July 2017

Contents

Research Articles / Araştırma Makaleleri

Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)
Volume 8, Issue 3, July 2017: 291-322

DOI: 10.17569/tojqi.292135

Research Article

Investigation of Instructional Technology Acceptance and Individual Innovativeness of Academicians [1]

Fatma Akgün [2]

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to investigate individual innovativeness and instructional technologies acceptance of academicians in Faculty of Education. The participants of this mixed methods study are 92 academicians on duty between the years of 2013 and 2014 in public universities. This study was conducted using a scale of "Individual Innovativeness", created by Hurt, Joseph, and Cook (1997) and adapted by Kılıcer and Odabasi to comply with Turkish culture. Another scale of "Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)" developed by Davis (1989) was also used for the purpose of this study. TAM scale was adapted by the researcher to comply with Turkish culture. Qualitative data were collected from 13 academicians with different specialty areas and seniority using semi-structured interview form. Statistical tests were used to analyze quantitative data, and content

1 This study is a part of research was supported by Trakya University Scientific Research Projects Unit (Project No. 2013/54.)

2 Assist.Prof.Dr. Trakya University, Faculty of Education, Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technology, fatmaa@trakya.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9728-7516

Received: 14.02.2017, Accepted: 15.06.2017

analysis was used to analyze qualitative data. According to the findings obtained from quantitative and qualitative data that academicians have high levels of individual innovative characteristics such as leadership characteristic. The academicians also have positive perspectives towards acceptance, usage, and usefulness of instructional technologies. This study found a positive and significant relationship between participants' individual innovativeness characteristics and acceptance perception towards instructional technology. This study also showed that qualitative and quantitative data supported one another. The researcher made suggestions regarding innovativeness and instructional technology acceptance.

Keywords: *Individual innovativeness, technology acceptance, instructional technologies, academicians*

Introduction

It is expected of individuals to know their responsibilities, question, and produce to put innovations into practice and use technology effectively in education. If teachers are considered to bring change and innovation, as a result, shaping education (Bakkenes, Vermunt, & Wubbels, 2010), it is required for teachers to come up with creative ideas, learn new instructional techniques, and keep up with the developments of their field (Pollock, 2008). It is crucial for academicians, who educate these teachers, to accept change and innovation in education, integrate innovations and technology into education, and use instructional technologies in their instruction effectively. Accepting change and innovation, especially in education environments, depends on if individuals adopt innovation, have innovative perspective, and even cooperate with individuals in education when necessary (Al-Husseini & Elbeltagi, 2016; Könings, Gruwel, & Merrienboer, 2007). Related to the phenomenon of innovation, Rogers (1995) use the term of an idea, application or object that an individual or individuals perceive as new, whereas Goldsmith and Foxall (2003) describe innovation sometimes as a creative process behind the emergence of new ideas and applications, sometimes new ideas and applications themselves, and sometimes a piece of cognitive and behavioral reactions of individuals who adopt an existing innovation. The phenomenon of innovativeness is described as a desire to change and try new things (Hurt, Joseph, & Cook, 1977); as a degree to which individuals adopt innovation prior to other things (Rogers, 1995); as reactions of individuals towards innovations (Goldsmith & Foxall, 2003); and as creativity, risk taking, being open to experience, and idea leadership (Kılıçer & Odabaşı, 2010; Şahin İzmirli & Gürbüz, 2017). The circumstances of individuals to accept any change and innovation might be different from individual to individual. Considering the individual differences, Rogers (2003) evaluates innovativeness under five categories.

- Innovators: Individuals who love to try new ideas and take risk, have the ability to think forward, accept change before anyone, are in interaction with their environment, and have entrepreneur and creative skills.
- Early Adapters: Individuals who inform others about innovations, lead people, influence society to a great extent, share what they know, and adopt innovation early.

- Early Majority: Individuals who form the majority of society and have good relationships with others, are timid to adopt innovation, and are not willing about taking risk too much.
- Late Majorities: Individuals who are timid towards and skeptical about innovations, expect majority of people to adopt innovations, and have fears and worries about this situation.
- Laggards: Individuals who are dependent on traditions, are prejudiced and conservative towards change, are unrealistic to events, and are at the backstage in adopting innovations.

Embracing Rogers' (2003) expansion of innovations theory, Moore and Bensabat (1991) investigate the adoption forms of information technologies whereas Vanderlinde and Braak (2011) study the interest of teachers towards new generation information and communication technologies. Most important factor towards accepting innovations is the usefulness of innovation towards individual and society and the ease of use of innovation (Demiralay, Bayır, & Gelibolu, 2015). It is considered to be beneficial when the use of innovation is easy (Usluel & Mazman, 2010); however, one of the most important factors to use technology effectively is to be innovator towards technology (Lu, Yao, & Yu, 2005).

Various models and theories were used in majority of studies conducted in the process of accepting, adopting, and expanding innovations. Among these models and theories, Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) has been the most efficient and studied one. Davis (1985) studies TAM model and how it works in detail. In meta analysis studies about TAM (Chuttur, 2009; King & He, 2006), it was proved that this model is a reliable and valid model and is a very good tool to understand user acceptance towards many areas such as the use of LMS (Fathema, Shannon, & Ross, 2015; Schoonenboom, 2014), e-learning (Masrom, 2007; Persico, Manca, & Pozzi, 2014; Tarhini, Scott, Sharma, & Abbasi, 2015), mobile technologies (Lu, Yao, & Yu, 2005), e-mail (Davis, 1989), social networks (Arı, Yılmaz & Bekteş, 2016), software applications (Samancıoğlu, Bağlıbel, Keser Özmantar, & Çetin; 2015), educational innovations (Usluel & Mazman, 2010), e-portfolio (Cheng, Chen, & Yen, 2015), wearable locating systems (Bützler, & Schlick, 2016, Hong, Lin & Hsieh, 2017; Kwee-Meier), and information technologies (Bülbül & Çuhadar, 2012; Davis, 1989; Teo, 2011). Besides, TAM's main purpose is to explain the behavior of the individual in adopting

technology (Chang, Hajiyev, & Su, 2017), innovative and / or knowledge-based technology, which factors influence the acceptance of their products (Shih, Lu, Liu ve Wu, 2017).

TAM was created for users to adopt and predict. Recently, it has been expanding to a great extent by including education technologies. TAM emerged as a scientific paradigm to investigate the education technology acceptance of students, teachers, and many others (Teo, 2011).

When elements within TAM are analyzed, it shows individuals' usefulness perception when they believe their performance will increase if they use innovation; their intention when they are in preparation to display a behavior; their attitude when they have positive and negative thoughts about displaying a behavior; and their ease of use when they believe they can easily use something without much effort (Usluel & Mazman, 2010).

TAM advocates that technology acceptance of users shape under the impact of perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. Perceived usefulness is explained as the degree of which individuals think their performance and efficiency increase, while perceived ease of use is explained as the perception of using system easily without any physical or cognitive effort (Davis, 1989). It is proposed that perceived ease of use has a significant impact on the attitude of perceived usefulness and use (Akman & Mishra, 2015; Chuttur, 2009; Kelly, 2014; Luan & Teo, 2011; Schoonenboom 2014), and that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use has a positive impact on affecting intention (Luan & Teo, 2011; Schoonenboom, 2014). These two factors, which have stronger impact compared to others, have a significant impact on affecting intention and attitude of users towards technology use (Masrom, 2007). Besides, perceived usefulness forms a relationship between perceived ease of use and intention towards use (Chen & Lu, 2016). It is easier for individuals to accept technology when they think their performance will increase and technology has benefits towards what they do (Powell & Wimmer, 2016; Samancıoğlu, et al., 2015).

In the name of embracing information age, it is very important to put technological innovations into practice in every field, especially education, thanks to the opportunities provided by technology use. With the use of such information and communication technologies in education

environments, learning sources diversify, the transition from teacher-centered education system to student-centered education system accelerates (Hannafın, 2012; Hannan, 2005) and students' participation into education and training is increased through development of their creative skills (Ma, Anderson, & Strith, 2005). Because educational institutions aim to train innovativeness individuals, who can access information that they need, analyze and produce information, use technology efficiently, and integrate it into education, it is important to inform teacher candidates about the necessity of sufficient technological skills and adaptation to change and innovation in teacher education programs where learning technologies play a significant role in especially learning and teaching processes (Brenner & Brill, 2016; Zhu, 2015).

There have been many studies about the significance of being innovative and using information and communication technologies in education and training (Hannan, 2005; Jaskyte, Taylor, & Smariga, 2009; Ntemana & Olatokun, 2012; Rosen 2005). One of these studies, Rosen (2005) discusses that individual innovativeness have a significant place in understanding interest towards technology and can easily reflect this individuals' applications in the field of information technologies in his thesis that aimed to identify the effect of individual innovativeness in information technologies. In their study exploring students' and academicians' perspectives towards innovative education, Jaskyte and others (2009) propose that there are many factors such as having an innovative perception about technology use to be an innovative academician and integrating new teaching methods into education process. Besides, having the individual innovation feature has affected the use of the new technological products positively (Kim & Chai, 2017).

As it is seen from studies, educators are expected to be individuals who help to improve innovations, find solutions to problems, generate information, research, create, keep up with change and innovation, make society conscious of these and benefit from technology. It is necessary for academicians, who are responsible for educating teacher candidates, to improve themselves in their fields and use such technologies effectively (Özgür, 2013; Turan & Çolakoğlu, 2008). In this study, the purpose is to investigate the individual innovativeness characteristics and instructional technology acceptance of academicians. In the light of this purpose, following research questions were asked.

1. What are individual innovativeness characteristics of academicians?
2. Do individual innovativeness characteristics of academicians differ among gender, field of expertise, title and vocational technology use?
3. What is instructional technology acceptance of academicians?
4. Do instructional technology acceptance of academicians differ among gender, field of expertise, title and vocational technology use?
5. Is there any correlation between individual innovativeness characteristics and instructional technology acceptance of academicians?
6. What are views of academicians about innovation and innovativeness concept?
7. What kind of process do academicians follow about accepting a new idea, event or object?
8. What are views of academicians about positive and negative factors affecting innovativeness?
9. What are views of academicians about effects of educational institutions on individual innovativeness?
10. What are views of academicians about the concept of instructional technology?
11. What are views of academicians about ease of use of instructional technologies and usefulness of technology on educational activities?
12. What are views of academicians about the use of new generation instructional technologies (social networks, smart board, smartphone, tablet pc, etc.) in education?

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a mixed methods study using qualitative and quantitative data. The mixed method aims to present, analyze and combine events in a broad framework with a comprehensive and complementary approach, bridging between quantitative and qualitative research and helping to develop the quantitative dimension of research on qualitative data (Baki & Gökçek, 2012). Co-use of qualitative and quantitative data in research involves more precise and holistic information on the theory or practice being put forward (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The aim of the study

was to increase the validity and reliability of the research findings using both approaches. In this study, a mixed method design, convergent parallel design was used. In this design, qualitative and quantitative data are collected together and results are compared to identify if collected data validate each other (Creswell, 2013). For the quantitative part of this study, screening model (Frankel & Wallen, 2006, Karasar, 1999) that puts forward the characteristics of participants was used and which is aimed at determining the presence and / or extent of interchange between two or more variables. For the qualitative part, in phenomenological data analysis, experiences and meanings are revealed. In content analysis made for this purpose, there is an effort to conceptualize the data and to reveal the themes that can describe the phenomenon. The results are presented in a descriptive way and frequently quoted directly (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011).

Participants

The participants of this study were 92 academicians teaching at a public university in Turkey in the spring semester of 2013-2014. Information about the participants can be found in Table 1. For the qualitative part of this study, 13 academicians with different specialty areas and seniority using semi-structured interview form among the 92 academicians were recruited through purposeful sampling. Information about these participants can be found in Table 2.

Table 1
General Distribution Characteristics of Academicians (Quantitative Data)

Gender	N	(%)
Female	46	50
Male	46	50
Total	92	100

Field of Expertise	N	(%)
CEIT Teach.	4	4.3
Prim. Sch. Teach.	13	14.1
Science Std. Teach.	11	11.9
Social Std. Teach.	6	6.5
Pre-School Teach.	2	2.1
Turkish Lang. Teac.	7	7.6
Special Ed. Teach.	5	5.4
German Lang. Teac.	7	7.6
English Lang. T.	13	14.1
Art and Crafts T.	5	5.4
Musics Teach.	6	6.5
Science of Educat.	13	14.1

Title	N	(%)
Prof. Dr.	2	2.1
Assoc. Dr.	7	7.6
Asst. Prof. Dr.	45	48.9
Instructor Dr.	2	2.1
Res. Asst. Dr.	3	3.2
Instructor	20	21.7
Res. Asst.	11	11.9
Lecturer	2	2.1

Technology Use	**N**	**(%)**
Rarely	4	4.3
Generally	37	40.2
Always	51	55.4

Table 2
Academicians (Qualitative Data)

Field of Expertise	Title	N	Gender
German Lang.	Assoc.Prof.Dr.	1	Male
CEIT Teach.	Assist.Prof.Dr.	1	Male
Science of Educat.	Assist.Prof.Dr.	1	Male
Science Std. Teach	Assoc.Prof.Dr.	1	Female
English Lang.	Lecturer	1	Male
Musics Teach.	Prof.Dr.	1	Male
Prim. Sch. Teach.	Assoc.Prof.Dr.	1	Female
Special Education	Assist.Prof.Dr.	1	Female
Art and Crafts Teach.	Instructor	1	Female
Primary School	Assist. Prof. Dr.	1	Female
Social Science	Assist. Prof. Dr.	1	Male
Turkish Lang.	Assist. Prof. Dr.	1	Male
Maths Teach.	Assist. Prof. Dr.	1	Female
	Total	13	

Data Collection

Data was collected through Individual Innovativeness Scale (IIS) and Technology Acceptance Scale (TAM). Personal information form was also used to gather demographic information about participants.

Individual Innovativeness Scale was originally developed by Hurt, Joseph and Cook (1977), but adapted to Turkish culture by Kılıçer and Odabaşı (2010). The survey consists of 20 items and 4 factors including "Resistance to change," "Opinion leadership," "Openness to the Experience," and "Risk Taking" Internal consistency regarding the survey is 0.82. Individuals can be categorized into innovativeness types based on their scores calculated from the survey. According to this, individuals are considered to be "Innovator" if their score is above 80, "Early Adapters" if the score is between 69 and 80, "Early Majority" if the score is between 57 and 68, "Late Majorities" if the score is between 46 and 56, and "Laggards" if the score is below 46. Regarding the innovativeness levels of individuals, they are further categorized into being extremely innovative if their score is above 68 whereas they are categorized into being a low level innovative if their score is below 64 based on the scores calculated from the survey (Kılıçer & Odabaşı, 2010).

Technology Acceptance Scale (TAM), developed by Davis (1989), constitutes of 12 items and 2 factors including "Perceived Usefulness" and "Perceived Ease of Use." Permission to use the survey was received through email. In the adaptation process of the survey, two experts translated the survey into Turkish and then into English. An English language expert analyzed the translated items and original items to find out their appropriateness in the two languages. After this process, experts in the fields of Curriculum and Instruction and Information and Communication Technology were consulted about their opinions on if each item is appropriate to our culture and if the items serve to the purpose of this study. In addition, two Turkish language experts analyzed the clarity of statements. Necessary corrections were made based on their suggestions. Factor analysis was made to verify if the survey confirms to the participants in Turkey. In the light of this, the survey was conducted to 130 academicians in the School of Education departments of various universities in Turkey. While making confirmatory factor analysis in the process of survey adaptation, X^2/df (Chi square degree of freedom), TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index) and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) values were considered. Based on analysis results, fit indices were calculated to be TLI=.92, CFI=.94 and X^2/df=2.5. When other studies were analyzed to be a sample to this study, Brown (2006) proposes that TLI and CFI values must be .90 and above, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) argue that model is considered to be perfect when X^2/df value is below 2. According to these views, this survey can be considered to be acceptable. 2 factor structure of the survey is verified in Turkish culture as well. The regression weights of the first factor, "Perceived Usefulness" are between the values of .84 and .94. The regression weights of the second factor, "Perceived Ease of Use" are between the values of .52 and .91. Cronbach Alpha coefficient of internal consistency for the first factor is .96 whereas it is .91 for the second factor. This value for the whole survey is .92. Regarding the coefficient of internal consistency, Özdamar (2004) argued that values above .60 for coefficient of internal consistency are acceptable. Considering this argument, this survey is considered to be acceptable.

Data Analysis

In this study, test of normality was used followed by descriptive statistics, Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis H tests for the quantitative data analysis. For the qualitative data analysis, content analysis was used. Following content analysis, inter rater reliability was established with an expert

academician. The formula of inter rater reliability= agreement/(agreement+divergence) was used. According to the results, reliability of this study is %89 and, therefore, this study is considered to be reliable (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Findings

Individual Innovativeness Characteristics of Academicians

According to quantitative data, innovativeness scores show that 55 academicians are high-level innovator (%59.78), 16 academicians are medium-level innovator (%17.39), and 21 academicians are low-level innovator (%22.82). This is shown in Table 3. When the scores for individual innovativeness are analyzed, the score for "high-level innovat0r" is ($\bar{X}$ =70.09).

Table 3
Distribution According to Individual Innovativeness Levels

Innovativeness Level	n	*(%)*	$\bar{X}$	*ss*
High-level innovator	55	59.78	77.41	5.445
Medium-level innovator	16	17.39	66.18	1.376
Low-level innovator	21	22.82	53.90	7.006
Total	92	100.00	70.09	11.148

When categories for individual innovativeness of academicians are analyzed, they are generally in "Early Adapters" category. When the scores in low levels are analyzed, 40 of academicians are "Early Adapters" (%43.5), 25 of them are Early Majority (%27.02), 15 of them are Innovators (%16.3), and 9 of them are Late Majority (%.98) and 3 of them are Laggards (%0.33) as seen in Table 4.

Table 4
Distribution According to Individual Innovativeness Categories

Innovativeness Category	f	(%)
Early Adapters	40	43.5
Early Majority	25	27.2
Innovators	15	16.3
Late Majority	9	.98
Laggards	3	.33
Total	92	100.00

Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics related to the low levels of individual innovativeness of academicians. The highest mean score from the individual innovativeness scale is ($\bar{X}/m$=4.10) in the "Openness to experience" dimension, while it is ($\bar{X}/m$=2.34) in the "Resistance to Change" dimension.

Table 5
Mean Scores Related to Individual Innovativeness

Variables	n	m	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}/m$	*ss*
Individual Innovativeness	92	20	70.09	3.50	11.148
Openness to Experience	92	5	20.54	4.10	3.806
Opinion Leadership	92	5	18.82	3.76	3.503
Risk Taking	92	2	7.45	3.72	1.660
Resistance to Change	92	8	18.72	2.34	5.333

Instructional Technology Acceptance of Academicians

Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics related to the low factors of Instructional Technology Acceptance of Academicians scale. In the low factors of Instructional Technology Acceptance of Academicians scale, "Perceived Usefulness" dimension is ($\bar{X}$/m=6.38), "Perceived Ease of Use" dimension is ($\bar{X}$/m=5.90) and the general survey dimension is ($\bar{X}$/m=6.14) in the positive level.

Table 6
Mean Scores Related to Instructional Technology Acceptance of Academicians

Variables	n	m	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ /m	ss
Perceived Usefulness	92	6	38.28	6.38	4.84
Perceived Ease of Use	92	6	35.43	5.90	6.37
Technology Acceptance	92	12	73.71	6.14	10.34

Analysis of Individual Innovativeness Characteristics and Instructional Technology Acceptance of Academicians

Analysis of gender variable

There is no significant relationship between the scores from individual innovativeness survey of academicians and gender variable (U= 994.50, p>.05). Similarly, there is no significant relationship between the scores from instructional technology acceptance scale of academicians and gender variable (U= 1054.50, p>.05), as shown in Table 7.

Table 7
Mann-Whitney U –Test Results Based on Gender Variable of Individual Innovativeness Characteristics and Instructional Technology Acceptance of Academicians

Factor	Group	n	Mean Rank	Sum Rank	U	p
Resistance to Change	Male	46	48.82	2245.50	951.50	.404
	Female	46	44.18	2032.50		
Opinion Leadership	Male	46	45.65	2100.00	1019.00	.759
	Female	46	47.35	2178.00		
Openness to Experience	Male	46	44.33	2039.00	958.00	.432
	Female	46	48.67	2239.00		
Risk Taking	Male	46	50.38	2317.50	879.50	.153
	Female	46	42.62	1960.50		
Individual Innovativeness	Male	46	45.12	2075.50	994.50	.620
	Female	46	47.88	2202.50		
Perceived Usefulness	Male	46	46.91	2158.00	1039.00	.873
	Female	46	46.09	2120.00		
Perceived Ease of Use	Male	46	46.36	2132.50	1051.50	.959
	Female	46	46.64	2145.50		
Technology Acceptance	Male	46	46.58	2142.50	1054.50	.978
	Female	46	46.42	2135.50		

Analysis of field of expertise variable

There is no significant relationship between the scores of academicians from the scale of individual innovativeness and field of expertise variable (χ^2 =5.354, p>.05). Similarly, there is no relationship between the scores of academicians from the scale of instructional technology acceptance and field of expertise variable (χ^2 =6.317, p>.05).

Table 8.
Kruskal Wallis Test Results Based on Field of Expertise Variable for Individual Innovativeness Characteristics and Instructional Technology Acceptance of Academicians

Factor	Field of Expertise	N	Mean	df	χ2	p
Individual Innovativeness	CEIT	4	33.63	11	5.354	.913
	Prim. Sch. T.	13	36.46			
	Science Std. T.	11	46.68			
	Social Std. T.	6	40.58			
	Pre-School T.	2	46.50			
	Turkish Lang. T.	7	58.79			
	Special Ed. T.	5	51.00			
	German Lang. T.	7	47.86			
	English Lang. T.	13	50.73			
	Art and Craft T.	5	52.40			
	Musics T.	6	45.00			
	Science of Edu.	13	48.19			
Technology Acceptance	CEIT	4	54.88	11	6.317	. 851
	Prim. Sch. T.	13	36.73			
	Science Std. T.	11	40.09			
	Social Std. T.	6	46.08			
	Pre-School T.	2	42.75			
	Turkish Lang. T.	7	40.71			
	Special Ed. T.	5	59.10			
	German Lang. T.	7	48.14			
	English Lang. T.	13	51.85			
	Art and Craft T.	5	59.90			
	Musics T.	6	43.17			
	Science of Edu.	13	48.31			

Analysis of title variable

There is no significant relationship between the scores of academicians from the scale of individual innovativeness and title variable (χ^2 =9.835, p>.05). Similarly, there is no relationship between the scores of academicians from the scale of instructional technology acceptance and title variable (χ^2 =5.26, p>.05), as shown in Table 9.

Table 9
Kruskal Wallis Test Results Based on Title Variable for Individual Innovativeness Characteristics and Instructional Technology Acceptance of Academicians

Factor	Title	N	Mean	df	χ2	p
Individual Innovativeness	Prof. Dr.	2	56.25	7	9.835	.198
	Assoc. Dr.	7	54.57			
	Asst. Prof. Dr.	45	42.16			
	Instructor Dr.	2	19.75			
	Res. Asst. Dr.	3	34.83			
	Instructor	20	58.10			
	Res. Asst.	11	41.05			
	Lecturer	2	64.50			
Technology Acceptance	Prof. Dr.	2	65.25	7	5.263	. 628
	Assoc. Dr.	7	49.93			
	Asst. Prof. Dr.	45	43.97			
	Instructor Dr.	2	30.50			
	Res. Asst. Dr.	3	56.50			
	Instructor	20	42.40			
	Res. Asst.	11	57.68			
	Lecturer	2	53.25			

Analysis of vocational technology use variable

There is no significant relationship between the scores of academicians from the scale of individual innovativeness and vocational technology use variable (χ^2 =1.775, p>.05). However, there is significant relationship between the scores of academicians from the scale of instructional technology acceptance (χ^2 =20.607, p<.05) and its low level factors of Perceived Usefulness (χ^2 =19.336, p<.05) and Perceived Ease of Use (χ^2 =16.589, p<.05) and vocational technology use variable, as shown in Table 10. Mann Whitney U-test was conducted to the double combinations of all groups to identify the significance of observed difference between groups. According to the results, the score of academicians using technology always ($\bar{X}$=57.09) is more than the scores of those using technology rarely ($\bar{X}$=14.25) and usually ($\bar{X}$=35.39) in terms of vocational technology use.

Table 10
Kruskal Wallis Test Results Based on Vocational Technology Use Variable for Individual Innovativeness Characteristics and Instructional Technology Acceptance of Academicians

Factor	Frequency	N	Mean	df	χ^2	p	Significant Difference
Individual Innovativeness	Rarely	4	41.13	3	1.775	.412	
	Usually	37	42.51				
	Always	51	49.81				
Perceived Usefulness	Rarely	4	11.13	3	19.336	.001	1-2, 1-3, 2-3
	Usually	37	37.86				
	Always	51	55.54				
Perceived Ease of Use	Rarely	4	21.00	3	16.589	.001	1-3, 2-3
	Usually	37	35.89				
	Always	51	56.20				
Technology Acceptance	Rarely	4	14.25	3	20.607	.001	1-3, 2-3
	Usually	37	35.39				
	Always	51	57.09				

1-rarely, 2- usually, 3- always

Relationship Between Individual Innovativeness And Technology Acceptance

Table 11
Correlation Analysis Between Individual Innovativeness Characteristics and Instructional Technology Acceptance of Academicians

	Resistance to Change	Opinion Leader-ship	Openness to Experience	Risk Taking	Individual Innovative-ness	Perceived Usefulness	Perceived Ease of Use
Opinion Leadership	-.246*						
Openness to Experience	-.408**	.757**					
Risk Taking	-.316**	.465**	.633**				
Individual Innovativeness	-.733**	.742**	.862**	.664**			
Perceived Usefulness	-.210*	.229*	.261*	.318**	.290**		
Perceived Ease of Use	-.124	.250*	.266*	.247*	.253*	.697**	
Technology Acceptance	-.177	.273**	.285**	.283**	.293**	.848**	.960**

**. Correlation is significant in the level of .01 *. Correlation is significant in the level of .05.

According to the results from correlation analysis, there is a positive and low-level relationship between academicians individual innovativeness and instructional technology acceptance (r=.293, p<.01), as shown in Table 11. Regression analysis results show that %8.58 of instructional technology acceptance scores of academicians can be explained with the change in individual

innovativeness characteristic scores. According to this, those who have higher scores in instructional technology acceptance also have higher individual innovativeness scores (or those who have higher scores in individual innovativeness also have higher instructional technology acceptance scores).

Qualitative Data Analysis of Academicians

Following the quantitative data analysis, 13 academicians were interviewed through a semi-structured interview for the qualitative part of this study, 10 questions were asked in the interview. Following themes emerged from data analysis.

Table 12
Academicians' Opinion Toward the Phenomenon of Innovation

Theme	f
Being extraordinary/different	7
Technology	5
Creativity/new ideas/change	5
Being first/ discovery/invention	4

In the interviews with academicians, definition of innovation was explained with the terms of being extraordinary or different. Related to this, A4 said, "*About the terms of new and innovation, I think of existing outside the usual, different situations, events, and processes from cognitive schemas.*" Among academicians, definitions emphasizing similarity of innovativeness and technology were used.

Table 13
Academicians' Opinions About Innovativeness

Theme	f
Supporting/accepting/using innovations	9
Having different/unique perspective	3
Following new trends	3
Using technological equipment	3
Being creative	2
Concretizing new ideas	1

Academicians mostly used the terms of supporting any innovation, adopting and accepting innovations, using innovations about the term of innovativeness. Related to this, A4 said "*Behind the thought of creating a new thing and developing new thought, concept, or new theory is supporting, accepting, and providing support to reveal this.*" While some of the academicians focus on the necessity to have a different and unique perspective towards a previously realized application or a new situation, the others emphasize following innovations, being open to technological equipment, approach, technique or applications, being creative or putting something new on the top of what is available, concretizing thoughts and thinking of them in a broad perspective about innovativeness.

Table 14
Academicians' opinions about the method they use to solve problems

Theme Sub Theme	f
Trying New Solutions	**5**
Being innovative in academic life	4
Looking for new solutions	1
Use traditional Method	**4**
Traditional method	2
First traditional method to be quick	1
New solutions if traditional method does not work	1
One of each depending on the situation	**4**
Changing according to the quality of work	4

Some of the academicians argued that they tried to find new solutions to solve problems, and it is necessary to be innovative in the academic world, especially with the research they make. About being innovative, that is using new solutions, in academic world, A10 used the following explanation. "*Generally, a certain model is used to teach, but I find new models that have been used and are being used in my field. These might open a new window for every child, because I work on children, and there might be many different methods to reach a child.*" Some of the academicians explained that they generally preferred traditional methods that they knew better and were risk free. Others revealed that this situation was changeable for them in that they sometimes used traditional methods and sometimes innovative methods to find solutions to problems. They further explained that they would try whichever method was more beneficial when they made a choice, and they would use the most effective and least demanding method depending on the work, and their choices might change to be more effective.

Table 15
What Kind of Process do You Follow About Accepting a New Idea, Event, or Object? (Would You Prefer Being a Early Adapters or Waiting Others to Accept?

Theme	f
Inclined to be early adapters	7
Being changeable depending on the situation	3
Waiting others to try	3

While majority of the academicians mentioned that they were inclined to be early adapters, others told that this situation might be changeable depending on the situation, and that they might sometimes be inclined to be early adapters and sometimes wait others to try by keeping in the background. Related to the opinion of being inclined to be early adapters, A2 made the following explanation. "*I am on the side of being early adapters. If it is necessary to tell something in terms of being a early adapters, let me explain it this way. For instance, I would like to talk about one of the jobs that I made. There is a field called hormonology. I conducted the only research in that field around the world, and I explained all this mathematically. This might be considered as innovation and leadership in toner music.*"

Table 16
Academicians' Opinions About the Positive/Negative Factors Affecting Innovativeness

Theme Sub Theme	f	Theme Sub Theme	F
Positive Factors	**12**	Negative Factors	**12**
Supporting innovation	4	Lack of multidimensional approach	5
Benefit of innovation	3	Preconception	3
Curiosity about innovation	2	Social environment pressure	3
Information and communication technologies	1	Making innovations not for good purposes	1
Needs	1	Social environment	2
A free education environment	1		

When positive and negative factors affecting innovativeness are analyzed, academicians discussed that innovation will develop the more they support it, accepting it will be easier the more benefit it has for society. They also added that satisfying the curiosity about innovation, developing information and communication technologies, supplying the needs of society, and providing a free education environment are positive notions about innovativeness. About supporting innovation, A1 said, "*It is most probably the support in the workplace that you are in. There are 3D printers. I would love to see and try them. However, we need money and support to do this. They will agree,*

get one, and we will use it." Academicians explained that among the negative factors affecting innovation improvement are preconception towards innovation, social environment pressure, using innovation for bad purposes, not providing benefit to individuals, sometimes harming them, and personal problems such as individual's deficiency in using versatile methods.

Table 17
Academicians' Opinions About Impacts of Educational Institutions on Individual Innovativeness

Theme	f	Theme	f
Having quality educators	11	Providing opportunities for educators	2
Having innovative administrators	6	Supporting ideas	2
Providing free thought environments	4	Giving in-service training	2
Educational institutions' openness to innovations	4		

Many academicians asserted that educators on duty in educational institutions should be individuals conducting research, adapting innovations to their studies, and continuously improving themselves in their fields. Related to this, A6 made the following explanation. "*I think first institutions that expanded innovations in terms of society are educational institutions. For example, I consider myself as more of a researcher as an academician and a researcher, so I make research and reflect what I have found in my classrooms. The group that stands in front of me in classroom is a small sample of society, and that is the place for first societal meeting. If innovation is accepted there, then it is expanded to the other parts of society.*" Academicians further added that administrators in educational institutions should adopt an innovative perception and support such attempts to develop innovative individuals.

Table 18
Academicians' Opinions About the Notion of Instructional Technologies

Theme	f
All kinds of teaching materials	7
Technological tools	5
Learning outcomes, approach, assessment and evaluation, materials	1

When instructional materials are mentioned, majority of academicians mentioned that the first thing that came to their mind were all kinds of instructional materials that would make teaching easier. About this, A5 said, "*I think of any type of tools, materials, equipment that are electronic or not, to make teaching easier and provide a better learning environment for students.*" Majority

of academicians also added that they perceived the notion of instructional technologies as technological tools while one of the participants, having a theoretical perception, discussed that he accepted instructional technologies as a learning outcome, an approach, an assessment and evaluation, and a material.

Table 19
Academicians' Opinions About the Benefits of Technology on Instructional Activities

Theme	f
Supporting education and training	10
Making it easier to access information	5
Helping applications	5
Helping in terms of visual and audial sense	3
Benefit in terms of saving time	2

Majority of academicians explained that technology mostly benefits supporting education and training. Related to this, A3 made the following explanation. "*I think technology supports instructional activities to a great extent. I believe success and motivation will increase when technology is used effectively in educational environments. This will also be a benefit on academic success.* " In addition, academicians also added that using technology makes it easy to access information in terms of education at any time and makes life easy as much as possible.

Table 20
Academicians' Opinions About the Ease of Use of Instructional Technologies

Theme	f
Not too difficult	10
Difficulty of use in terms of technical problems	6
Not difficult if individuals make an effort	5
The fact that technology gets easier provides ease of use	2
In-service and pre-service education should be provided	2

Majority of academicians explained that they did not find it too difficult to use instructional technologies, and that they can use them easily. About using such technologies in classrooms, A5 said, "*I use instructional technologies easily in my classrooms. I use many science materials, projection, and many programs in computer*." While some of the academicians mentioned that they sometimes had difficulty because of technological problems, the others claimed that using technology was not difficult, but required some effort and interest to use easily.

Table 21
Academicians' Opinions About the Use of New Generation Technologies (Social Network, Smart Board, Smart Phone, Tablet PC., etc.) in Education

Theme	f
Using new generation technology in education is useful	9
Social networks are useful when they are used appropriate to their purpose	7
New generation technologies are useful, but they should be used appropriately	6
Making communication easier	5
Opportunity and education on new generation technology should be provided	2
It is very effective for individuals with special needs	1

Having positive opinions about new generation technologies, academicians explained that using these technologies, which provide learning opportunities anywhere, in education would be useful in any aspect. Related to this, ÖE3 said, "Using such environment and tools are useful for both academicians and students." Academicians explained that social networks, which were used to communicate, send files, discuss opinions, etc., would be useful when they were used appropriate to their purpose. While some of the academicians talked about the ease of communication, the others emphasized the need to provide training and moral and material support to supply and use new generation technologies. Furthermore, A11 made the following explanation about the benefits of new generation technologies for individuals with special needs. "*Technology is the place to provide equality in both certain environments and platforms. Many obstacles are removed with the use of technology by individuals with special needs in an active way. Thus, I think we, as special need educators, are one of the most actively technology using groups.* "

Discussion, Conclusion and Implications

The results of this study show that individual innovativeness scores of academicians are at high levels of innovativeness. The interviews with academicians also support this idea in that majority of them explained that they would try new solutions and be open to innovations. Related to this, Demiralay, Bayır, and Gelibolu (2016) emphasized the view that individuals, whose innovativeness were at high levels, would not be shy in trying innovations and consider innovations as useful and important. Different from these views, elementary school teachers were identified as having medium-level innovativeness (Demir Başaran, & Keleş, 2015; Öztürk & Summak, 2014) while their individual innovativeness characteristics were found to be at low levels (Kılıç & Ayvaz

Tuncel, 2014). The difference between teachers and academicians might be explained from the fact that academicians do more research, more interrogation, and are open to innovations because of their job.

According to the quantitative data in this study, individual innovativeness characteristics of majority of academicians were at “Early Adapters” category. Qualitative data support this notion in that interviews with academicians showed that they were more inclined to be leaders at accepting a new idea, event, or object. This is crucial because innovative and leader teachers at educational institutions help to expand technology in educational institutions and to form a technology culture among students (Kılıçer, 2008). Similarly Çoklar and Özbek (2017) emphasized that the great majority of teachers are in the categories of "early majority" and "early adapters" of the individual innovativeness levels. While the results of the data shows some similarities with the results of other studies in the same field (Yılmaz & Bayraktar, 2014), the results also conflict with the results of some studies (Argon, İsmetoğlu, & Yılmaz, 2015; Demircioğlu, Yavuz Konokman, & Akay, 2016; Gökçearslan, Karademir, & Korucu, 2017; Öztürk & Summak, 2014; Şahin & Thompson, 2006; Timucin, 2009).

Although individual innovativeness characteristics of female academicians were higher compared to male academicians, this did not bring out any significant results in terms of individual innovativeness in general and gender variable at its sub-factors. According to this data, it is concluded that both male and female academicians have individual innovativeness characteristics at similar levels. While the results of the data shows some similarities with the results of other studies in the same field (Argon, İsmetoğlu, & Yılmaz, 2015; Şahin & Thompson, 2006), the results also conflict with the results of some studies (Akdeniz ve Kadı, 2016). It was also found that there were no significant results in terms of individual innovativeness in general and field of expertise variable at its sub-factors. This data showed that academicians in different fields of expertise have similar characteristics in terms of individual innovativeness, and that they did not have too many differences in their thoughts. The results of this data showed some similarities with the literature (Argon, İsmetoğlu, & Yılmaz, 2015). The findings of the study also showed that there were no significant results in terms of individual innovativeness in general and title variable at its sub-factors. This data might be explained in that all academicians have similar thoughts in terms of

individual innovativeness and its sub-factors. In addition, no significant results were found among individual innovativeness characteristics of academicians and the variable of technology use for occupational purposes and total score of innovativeness and its sub-factors. Thus, it might be discussed that using technology for occupational purposes is not a significant variable in terms of developing or maintaining individual innovativeness.

When instructional technology acceptance of academicians was analyzed, it was found that academicians had positive opinions about acceptance, perceived ease of use, and perceived usefulness of instructional technologies. Similarly, Vanderlinde and Braak (2011) emphasized that teachers had positive opinions about technology use and teachers' BIT competence and schools' vision toward BIT were powerful and Bolat, Aydemir and Karaman (2017), graduate students, who educated in distance education, towards mobile Internet use had positively attitudes. Qualitative and quantitative data in this study supported each other and showed that academicians had positive opinions about innovations and instructional technologies. Besides, majority of academicians' trying new solutions to solve a problem, having no difficulty in using instructional technologies, and using such technologies easily supported the aforementioned opinions.

This study also showed that there was no significant difference between gender variable and instructional technology acceptance of academicians and its sub-factors, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. While the results of this data showed some similarities with the literature (Avcu & Gökdaş, 2012; Cheng, Chen, & Yen, 2015), the results also conflict with the results of some studies (Sanchez-Franco, 2006). It was found that there was no significant difference between instructional technology acceptance of academicians and its sub-factor, field of expertise. There are samples from the literature that has similarities with the results of this data (Avcu & Gökdaş, 2012). This might be explained with the similarity of perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness that belong to instructional technology use of academicians in every discipline. No significant difference was found between title variable and instructional technology acceptance of academicians. This might be explained with academicians' having similar perceptions towards instructional technology use regardless of title. On the other hand, there was a significant relationship between the variable of occupational technology use and instructional technology acceptance of academicians. This might be explained in that individuals, who always use

technology for occupational purposes, understand perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness of using such technologies more and consider them more seriously than individuals, who use them sometimes and rarely. About the contributions of instructional technologies to education, the interviews with the participants also revealed that instructional technologies provide ease of accessing information, help applications, provide visual and auditory contributions, and save time. Besides, academicians explained that they did not have too much difficulty in using instructional technologies in their classes and sometimes had problems because of technical issues. They further added that these problems would be overcome with in-service and pre-service training. Similarly, Ntemana and Olatokun (2012) suggested giving in-service training about expanding the use of BIT and using it efficiently. On the other hand, academicians discussed that simplified technology use provide ease for themselves. About using new generation technologies in education, academicians explained that using new generation technologies was useful, that they would provide more benefit if they were used appropriate to their purpose, that they provide ease at communication, and that they were important for the education of individuals with special needs.

Some of the reasons why innovation and instructional technology acceptance do not improve are the lack of source and money, not supporting educators in their studies enough, the lack of infrastructure of institutions such as information and application, administrators' keeping themselves away from innovations and change, educators and students' not being open to innovations, not providing the necessary in-service training, not understanding the relationship between technology and education, not providing enough collaboration between universities and industries, and societies' cultural and social structure (Kılıçer, 2008; Kılıçer & Odabaşı, 2010). Similarly, Wejnert (2002) emphasized that individuals' reactions towards innovations might change related to the cultural and belief systems that they are in and asserted that social culture is one of the obstacles in front of innovations. In spite of all these obstacles, educators are the most important individuals to improve the phenomenon of innovativeness. Innovative academicians might do cultural and social activities such as conferences, seminars, etc. to inform other academicians and teacher candidates about the benefit of using instructional technologies in education and the necessity of innovation and change in this information age. Related to this, Yavuz Konokman, Yokuş and Yanpar Yelken (2016) discussed that academicians should be innovative and integrate innovative instructional applications that were technology-centered into the learning

and teaching process to develop visions of teacher candidates, who would educate innovative individuals. Besides, it might be suggested that institutions should adopt an innovative perception and make smart classes comprised of new generation technologies to use instructional technologies more efficiently. It might also be suggested that academicians should share the results and impacts of any academic studies that includes technology and innovations. This study also has some limitations. One limitation is that academicians that are in this sample make evaluations based on their personal perceptions about individual innovativeness and instructional technology acceptance. Thus, it is necessary to conduct this study with other various samples and compare the results to generalize the results of this study.

References

Akman, I., & Mishra, A. (2015). Sector diversity in green ınformation technology practices: Technology acceptance model perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior, 49,* 477–486.

Akdeniz, A., & Kadı, A. (2016, July). Investigating individual innovativeness levels and lifelong learning tendencies of students in TMSC. *ICLEL 2016*, July 21th-23th, Leipaja University, Liepaja-LATVIA.

Al-Husseini, S. Elbeltagi, I. (2016). Transformational leadership and innovation: A comparison study between Iraq's public and private higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(1), 159-181. DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2014.927848

Argon, T., İsmetoğlu, M., & Yılmaz, Çelik-Yılmaz, D. (2015). Branş öğretmenlerinin teknopedagojik eğitim yeterlilikleri ile bireysel yenilikçilik düzeylerine ilişkin görüşleri [The opinions of branch teachers about their technopedagogical education competencies and individual innovativeness levels]. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching,* 4(2), 319-333.

Arı, E., Yılmaz, V., & Bekteş, R. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal ağ kullanımına ilişkin davranışlarının teknoloji kabul modeli ile araştırılması [Researching the behaviours of the university students regarding social networking by technology acceptance model]. *Int. Journal of Management Economics and Business, 12*(27), 67-81.

Avcu, D. Ü. & Gökdaş, İ. (2012). İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğretmenlerinin bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerine ilişkin kabul ve kullanım niyetleri [Acceptance and usage intentions related to information and communication technologies of second cycle primary school teachers]. *Jounal of Educational Sciences, 3*(1), 42-59.

Bakkenes, I., Vermunt, J. D., & Wubbels, T. (2010). Teacher learning in the context of educational innovation: Learning activities and learning outcomes of experienced teachers. *Learning and Instruction, 20*(6), 533-548.

Baki, A., & Gökçek, T. (2012). Karma Yöntem Araştırmalarına Genel Bir Bakış. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 11*(42), 1-21.

Bolat, Y., İ, Aydemir, M. ve Karaman, S. (2017). Uzaktan eğitim öğrencilerinin öğretimsel etkinliklerde mobil internet kullanımlarının teknoloji kabul modeline göre incelenmesi [Investigation of Distance Learners' Mobile Internet Usage for Instructional Activities Based on The Technology Acceptance Model]. *GUJGEF, 37*(1), 63-91

Brenner, A. M., & Brill, J. M. (2016). Investigating practices in teacher education that promote and inhibit technology ıntegration transfer in early career teachers. *TechTrends, 60,* 136–144.

Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis: For applied research*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Bülbül, T., & Çuhadar, C. (2012). Okul yöneticilerinin teknoloji liderliği öz-yeterlik algıları ile bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerine yönelik kabulleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [Analysis

of the relationship between school administrators' perceptions of technology leadership self-efficacy and their acceptance of ICT]. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty, 23,* 474 - 499.

Chang, C, T., Hajiyev, J., & Su, C., R. (2017). Examining the students' behavioral intention to use elearning in Azerbaijan? The General Extended Technology Acceptance Model for E-learning approach. *Computers and Education, 111,* 128-143.

Chen, H. J., & Lu, J. T. (2016) Clarifying the impact of social escapism in users' acceptance for online entertaining services—An extension of the technology acceptance model based on online karaoke television services users. *Information Systems Management, 33*(2), 141-153, doi: 10.1080/10580530.2016.1155949

Cheng, C. I., Chen, S. C., & Yen, D. C. (2015). Continuance intention of e-portfolio system: A confirmatory and multi-group invariance analysis of technology acceptance model. *Computer Standards & Interfaces, 42,* 17–23.

Chuttur, M.Y. (2009). Overview of the technology acceptance model: Origins, developments and future directions. *Association for Information Systems, 9*(37), 1-20.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). *Thousand Oaks,* CA: Sage.

Çoklar, A. N., & Özbek, A. (2017). Analyzing of relationship between teachers' individual innovativeness levels and their tpack self-efficacies. *Journal of Human Sciences, 14*(1), 427-440. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i1.4413

Davis, F. (1985). *A technology acceptance model for empirically testing new end-user information systems: theory and results,* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). MIT Sloan School of Management, Cambridge, MA.

Davis, F. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of ınformation technology. Retrieved from www.jstor.org

Demir Başaran, S., & Keleş, S. (2015). Yenilikçi kimdir? Öğretmenlerin yenilikçilik düzeylerinin incelenmesi [Who is Innovative? Examination of Teachers' Innovativeness Level]. *H.U. Journal of Education, 30*(4), 106-118.

Demiralay, R., Bayır, E. A., & Gelibolu, M. F. (2016). Öğrencilerin bireysel yenilikçilik özellikleri ile çevrimiçi öğrenmeye hazır bulunuşlukları ilişkisinin incelenmesi [Investigation of relationship between students' personal innovativeness and readiness for online learning]. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching, 5*(1), 161-168.

Demircioğlu, T., Yavuz Konokman, G., & Akay, C. (2016). Eğitim Fakültesi öğretim elemanlarının yenilikçilik düzeylerinin Avrupa Birliği hayat boyu öğrenme projelerine yönelik tutumlarına etkisi [The effect of Proactivitiy of Academicians' at Education Faculty on their attitudes towards European Union lifelong learning projects]. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 15*(59), 1120-1137.

Fathema, N., Shannon, D., & Ross, M. (2015). Expanding the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to examine faculty use of Learning Management Systems (LMSs) in higher education institutions. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 11*(2), 210-232.

Frankel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York, NY: McGrawHill.

Goldsmith, R.E., & Foxall, G.R. (2003). The measurement of innovativeness. In L.V. Shavinina (Ed.), *The international handbook of innovation* (pp.321-329). Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Gökçearslan, Ş., Karademir, T., & Korucu, A., T. (2017). Preservice Teachers' Level of Web Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Assessment by Individual Innovativeness. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 55*(1) 70–94.

Hannan, A. (2005). Innovating in higher education: Contexs for change in learning technology. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 36*(6), 975-985.

Hannafin, M. J. (2012). Student-centered learning. In N. Seel (Ed), *Encyclopedia of the sciences of learnıng* (Part 19, 3211-3214). New York, NY: Springer.

Hong, J., C., Lin, P., H., & Hsieh P., C. (2017). The effect of consumer innovativeness on perceived value and continuance intention to use smartwatch. *Computers in Human Behavior, 67*, 264-272.

Hurt, H. T., Joseph, K., & Cook, C. D. (1977). Scales for the measurement of innovativeness. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 58-65.

Jaskyte, K.,Taylor, H., & Smariga, R. (2009). Student and faculty perceptions of innovative teaching. *Creativity Research Journal, 21*(1), 111–116.

Johnson, B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed methods resarch: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7).

Karasar, N. (1999). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kelly, H. (2014). A path analysis of educator perceptions of open educational resources using the Technology Acceptance Model. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 15*(2).

Kılıç, H., & Ayvaz Tuncel, Z. (2014, May). *İlköğretim branş öğretmenlerinin bireysel yenilikçilik düzeyleri ve yaşam boyu öğrenme eğilimleri*. Paper presented at the Conference 3. Ulusal Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Kongresi, Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.

Kılıçer, K. (2008). Teknolojik yeniliklerin yayılmasını ve benimsenmesini arttıran etmenler [Factors increasing the adoption and diffusion of technological innovations]. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 8*(2), 209–222.

Kılıçer, K., & Odabaşı, H. F. (2010). Bireysel Yenilikçilik Ölçeği (BYÖ): Türkçeye uyarlama, geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education) 38*, 150-164.

Kim, M., & Chai, S. (2017). The impact of supplier innovativeness, information sharing and strategic sourcing on improving supply chain agility: Global supply chain perspective. *International Journal of Production Economics, 187,* 42–52.

King, W. R., & He, J. (2006). A meta-analysis of the technology acceptance model. *Information & Management, 43,* 740–755.

Kwee-Meier, S. T., Bützler, J. E., & Schlick, C. (2016). Development and validation of a technology acceptance model for safety-enhancing, wearable locating systems. *Behaviour & Information Technology, 35*(5), 394-409, doi:10.1080/0144929X.2016. 1141986.

Lu, J., Yao, J. E., & Yu, C. S. (2005). Personal innovativeness, social influences and adoption of wireless ınternet services via mobile technology. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 14*(3), 245-268.

Luan, W. S., & Teo, T. (2011). Student teachers' acceptance of computer technology: An application of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). In T. Teo (Ed.), *Technology Acceptance in Education*: *Research and Issues* (pp. 43-61). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Masrom, M. (2007, May). *Technology acceptance model and e-learning.* Paper presented at 12th International Conference on Education, Sultan Hassanal Bolkiah Institute of Education University Brunei Darussalam.

Ma, W.W., Anderson, R., & Strith, K. O. (2005). Examining user acceptance of computer technology: An empirical study of student teachers. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 21,* 387-395.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moore G. C., & Benbasat, I. (1991). Development of an instrument to measure the perceptions of adopting an information technology innovation. *Information Systems Research 2*(3),192–222.

Ntemana, T. S., & Olatokun, W. (2012). Analyzing the influence of diffusion of innovation attributes on lecturers' attitudes toward information and communication technologies. *An Interdisciplinary Journal on Humans in ICT Environments, 8*(2), 179–197.

Özdamar, K. (2004). *Paket programlar ileistatiksel veri analizi-1* [Statistical data analysis with packet programs-I] (5th ed.). Eskişehir: Kaan Bookstore.

Özgür, H. (2013). Bilişim teknolojileri öğretmen adaylarının eleştirel düşünme eğilimleri ile bireysel yenilikçilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Exploring of the relationship between critical thinking tendencies and individual innovativeness of CEIT department pre-service teachers]. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 9*(2), 409-420.

Öztürk, Z. Y., & Summak, M. S. (2014). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin bireysel yenilikçiliklerinin incelenmesi [Investigation of primary school teachers individual

innovativeness]. *Special Issue on the Proceedings of the 3rd ISCS Conference, SI(1),* 844-853.

Persico, D., Manca, S., & Pozzi, F. (2014). Adapting the Technology Acceptance Model to evaluate the innovative potential of e-learning systems. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *30,* 614–622.

Pollock, K. (2008). The four pillars of ınnovation: An elementary school perspective. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, *13*(2), 1-20.

Powell, L., & Wimmer, H. (2016). Parental perceptions and recommendations of computing majors: A technology acceptance model approach. *Proceedings of the EDSIG Conference*, Las Vegas, Nevada USA.

Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Rosen, P.A. (2005). *The effect of personal ınnovatıveness on technology acceptance and use* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Faculty of the Graduate College of the Oklahoma State University. Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Samancıoğlu, M., Bağlıbel, M., Keser Özmantar, Z., & Çetin, H. (2015). Okul yöneticilerinin eğitim yönetimi bilgi sistemlerine ilişkin görüşleri: Memnuniyet, algılanan fayda ve göreve uygunluk arasındaki ilişki [School administrators' opinions regarding to educational management information systems: The relationship among satisfaction, perceived usefulness and task fit]. *Balıkesir University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 18*(34), 193-212.

Sanchez-Franco, M. J. (2006). Exploring the influence of gender on the web usage via partial least squares. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, *25*(1), 19-36.

Schoonenboom, J. (2014). Using an adapted, task-level technology acceptance model to explain why instructors in higher education intend to use some learning management system tools more than others. *Computers & Education*, *71*, 247–256.

Shih, Y., Y., Lu, Y., H., Liu, T., Y., & Wu, M., F. (2017). The staffs' adoption intention of knowledge management system in green hospital— the theory of technology acceptance model applied. *The International Journal of Organizational Innovation, 9*(3), 27-36.

Şahin, I., & Thompson A. (2006). Using Rogers' Theory to ınterpret ınstructional computer use by COE Faculty. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 39*(1), 81-104.

Şahin İzmirli, & Gürbüz (2017). An investigation of the relationship between the individual innovativeness and problem solving skills of teacher candidates: The Case of Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University. *SDU International Journal of Educational Studies, 4*(1), 29-43.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics.* (5th ed.) New York: Allynand Bacon.

Tarhini, A., Scott, M., Sharma, S., & Abbasi, M. (2015). Differences in intention to use educational RSS feeds between Lebanese and British students: A multi-group analysis based on the Technology Acceptance Model. *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, *13*(1), 14-29.

Tarhini, A., Hone, K., Liu, X., & Tarhini, T. (2017). Examining the moderating effect of individual-level cultural values on users' acceptance of E-learning in developing countries: a structural equation modeling of an extended technology acceptance model, *Interactive Learning Environments, 25*(3), 306-328, DOI: 10.1080/10494820.2015.1122635

Teo, T. (2011). *Technology Acceptance in Education.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Timucin, M. (2009). Diffusion of technological innovation in a foreign languages unit in Turkey: A focus on risk aversive teachers. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 18*(1), 75-86.

Turan, A. H., & Çolakoğlu, B. E. (2008). Yüksek öğrenimde öğretim elemanlarının teknoloji kabulü ve kullanımı: Adnan Menderes Üniversitesinde ampirik bir değerlendirme [Faculty's acceptance and use of technology in higher education: An empirical assessment at Adnan Menderes University]. *Doğuş University Journal, 9*(1), 106-121.

Usluel, Y. K., & Mazman, S. G. (2010). Eğitimde yeniliklerin yayılımı, kabulü ve benimsenmesi sürecinde yer alan öğeler: Bir içerik analizi çalışması [The factors that play role in the process of diffusion, acceptance or adoption of innovations in education]. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal, 3*(39), 60-74.

Vanderlinde, R., & Braak, J. V. (2011). A new ICT curriculum for primary in flanders: Defining and predicting teacher's perceptions of ınnovation attributes. *Educational Technology & Society*, *14*(2), 124-135.

Wejnert, B. (2002). Integrating models of diffusion of innovations: A conceptual framework. *Annual Review of Sociology, 28*, 297-326.

Yavuz Konokman, G., Yokuş, G., & Yanpar Yelken, T. (2016). Yenilikçi materyal tasarlamanın sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının yenilikçilik düzeylerine etkisi [The effect of designing innovative material on the elementary school pre-service teachers' innovativeness]. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education, 5*(3), 857-878.

Yıldırım, A., & Simsek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* [Qualitative research methods in the social sciences] (8th ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yılmaz, O., & Bayraktar, D. M. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards the use of educational technologies and their individual innovativeness categories. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116*, 3458 – 3461.

Zhu, C. (2015). Organisational culture and technology-enhanced innovation in higher education. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 24*(1), 65–79.

Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)
Volume 8, Issue 3, July 2017: 323-349

DOI: 10.17569/tojqi.331788

Research Article

The Views of Headteachers on Delegating Headteachers[1]

Necdet Konan[2], Büşra Bozanoğlu[3], Remzi Burçin Çetin[4]

Abstract

The main objective for this study is to investigate the views of headteachers about the measures, process and possible results of selecting headteachers in Turkey. In order to reach this main purpose, a qualitative research has been realized with phenomological desing. The study group for this study, all of whom working in the central district of Malatya city in the 2014-2015 academic year, is consisting of 15 headteachers, has been selected by means of maximum likelihood sampling model in which 5 headteachers were left as they didn't completed their 4 years period, 5 headteachers were selected as the headteacher for the first time and finally 5 headteachers were re-elected. The data of the research was collected with a semi-structured interviewing form based on the official regulation under Turkish Ministry of National Education about selecting headteachers. These data have been analyzed with descriptive

[1] The initial findings of the study were presented at the "VII. International Education Research Congress" held in Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University on May 28-31, 2015.

[2] Assoc.Prof.Dr., Inönü University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, necdet.konan@inonu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6444-9745

[3] PhD student, Inönü University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, bu-bozanoglu@hotmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2223-7853

[4] PhD student, Inönü University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, burcincetin@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8363-7466

Received: 22.08.2016, Accepted: 20.06.2017

analyzing technique. The results showed that selecting headteachers should be much more objective, fair and based on competences and on the other hand the new regulation has not yet answered this necessity as expected. Based on the findings of this study, it can be recommended that criteria must be identified to rise institutional standards and evaluations must be done in terms of considering these standards.

Keywords: *Headteachers, delegating headteachers, selecting managers*

Introduction

For humans who have to gain new information, behaviors and skills even to survive, the best place to fulfill this purpose systematically are schools. The basic principle to determine the quality of the output of education institutions are purpose oriented behaviors of teachers and their competencies (Konan, 2013b). Schools can be identified as the most critical element of whole education system in which general and specific goals of the system are transferred to students via basic principles (Sirin, 2007). Thus schools are expected to realize effective learning habits proper enough to answer basic needs. Schools are expected to realize effective learning to supply necessities. Those schools which could not maintain effective learning habit, the main motivation for schools existence, lose their conformity and status, and finally they could not fulfill their purposes at all. In fact, school effectiveness, basically, is comparing inputs and process (which has not economic bases such as course books, classes, teachers' professional development, teaching strategies etc.) with the outputs (Balci, 2013). The most valuable qualifications of an effective school are its high instructional effectiveness. Thus it can be stated that the level of school effectiveness can only be determined through students' behaviors. In other words, school's success depends on students' level of information and capabilities (Ostroff and Schmitt, 1993). So the school managers are the key figures in building effective schools, thus many education administrators claim that "a school is what its principal is".

As in many other organizations, there are personal, professional and institutional problems at schools. The most valuable expectation in solving these problems is on school managers. Because it is accepted that it is school manager's duty to sustain school organization prior to its main objectives (Konan, 2013b). It can be said that roles expected from school principal have been changing continuously nowadays.

It is stated that school principals carries chief responsibility to realize the goals of a school by coordinating, organizing, affecting, directing and inspecting staff members and also managing the school organization. However, principals are also responsible for coping with crisis in organization, managing conflicts, having vision, making proper and reliable decisions even at unexpected situations and finally being fully talented in problem solving (Celikten, 2001). The effectiveness of teaching-learning habits and making them sustainable depend on education

administrators', especially the school principals', lifelong learning, being aware of scientific developments and carrying new models developed by scientists into practical area (Leithwood and Louis, 1998; as cited in Hoy and Miskel, 2010).

School managers, as instructional leaders of their schools, have many duties and responsibilities such as having vision, creating a positive learning and teaching environment, paying enough attention to professional development, building communication and cooperation among staff to ensure that school's being a team, building well-designed relationships with the environment, having a capacity of planning something strategically and etc. (Balcı, 2013). Thus it is obvious that school principal should be selected and appointed carefully in terms of developing his qualifications till having enough information and capacity in order to fulfill his expected duties and responsibilities (Okcu, 2011).

In Turkey, considering the researches in selecting school principals, many of the studies are dealing with the necessity of improving the practice, so it can be stated that those studies are not beyond the theoretical framework (Korkmaz, 2005). Our policy for selecting and recruiting school principals since the beginning of Turkish Republic can be divided into three as: apprenticeship era, educational sciences era during 1970s and finally examing era with 1998 regulation, Şimşek (2004). Balci (2008), also adds the fourth era as arbitrariness period for the latest exam-free period.

In Turkey, because of the fact that managing has become a part of politics, changing the decisions frequently, education administration is still not an area of expertise, it is not likely to say that selecting and recruiting process for school principals is not at a desired level (Onural, 2005). But there was a vital step for making school principalship a professional job in 1998. Within this regulation, objective criteria had been determined for principalship and a 120 hours recruiting course was designed. This regulation which had been applied with goodwills and had a capasity to build professional school principalship was withdrawn in 2004 (Şişman ve Turan, 2004).

According to Gisberg, in developped countries especially in USA and Canada who accept school principalship as a profession, pre-service recruitment of school principals has some 100 years past (Karip ve Köksal, 1999). However, Açıkalın (2002) stated that recruiting those

managers through seminars and courses is like paving paths with asphalt. So the latest regulation also created some problems though it has tried to solve some others. Because together with their legal roles and responsibilities school principals have some ethical and moral roles. Thus it is important to pay enough attention to equality, justice and competences in selecting school principals (Aslanargun, 2012).

In Turkey, the troubles during applying legal procedures in selecting, training and appointing school principals are important problems. In many developed countries, especially in USA, although school principals have been trained on theoretical bases, in Turkey, it is still believed that there is no suitable school for training principals (Balci and Cinkir, 2002). On the other hand it can be done by determining qualifications first and then giving them via undergraduate or graduate studies or even via in-service-training activities in compulsory cases (Aydin, 1997; as cited in Agaoglu, Altinkurt, Yilmaz and Karaköse, 2012). However, in Turkey, because of the fact that managing is accepted as a possible secondary duty for all teachers, it hasn't been felt as a necessity to train school principals.

Considering many studies in the field, it can be stated that there are some problems in selecting and recruiting school principals and these problems should be solved via logical steps based on the evidences created by experts and scientists. In this paper, we aim to reveal principals' views about the regulation on Selecting and Appointing School Managers for Schools under Ministry of National Education dated 10.06.2014 and numbered 29026, to draw enough attention and produce some solutions.

The Aim of Study

Our main motivation for this study is to reveal the views of school principals on the latest legal regulation for selecting and recruiting school principals dated on 10.06.2014. We will try to answer these questions in order to reach our goal;

1. What do the head teachers think about the necessity of applying the regulation on Selecting and Appointing School Managers for Schools under Ministry of National Education?
2. What do the head teachers think about the evaluation process of selecting and recruiting head teachers?

3. What do the head teachers think about the possible results of this selecting and recruiting process based the regulation?
4. What do the head teachers suggest to create a satisfying regulation?

Methodology

The Model of Research

The study was designed with qualitative research model and in phenomenological research technique. Phenomenological studies deal with what do people think about the events they have faced and what are their experiences with them. Making these perceptions understandable, investigating phenomena deeply and presenting a whole approach are basic principles of qualitative research (Yildirim and Simsek, 2013). In this study phenomenological technique has been preferred to determine the views of head teachers on selecting, recruiting and delegating head teachers.

The Study-Group

The study group for this research consists of 15 head teachers who have been serving during 2014-2015 academic year in Malatya province. Maximum likelihood sampling technique has been used to determine the study group. Purposeful sampling technique helps to select rich situations prior to the main motivation of the research (Buyukozturk, Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz and Demirel, 2011). In other words the participants within this study group are those who can provide enough information about the phenomena that the researcher wants to explore (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006). Maximum likelihood sampling, on the other hand, creates a small size sampling including almost all stakeholders prior to the problem being studied (Yildirim and Simsek, 2013).

Thus, the study group includes 5 head teachers who have been excluded from this evaluation because they have not served for 4 years, 5 head teachers who have been delegated as school leaders for the first time and finally 5 head teachers whose headship have been renewed. All

these participants have been coded as K1, K2, K3…Participants demographic variables are given in Table 1.

Table 1
The Participants' Demographic Variables

Code	Gender	Serving Year		Education	Branch	School Type	Delegating Status
		Total Year	Headship Year				
K1	Male	17	10 years	Bachelor's Degree	Math's	Secondary	Based on Exam
K2	Male	15	7 years	Bachelor's Degree	Physics	High School	Based on Exam
K3	Male	23	8 years	Bachelor's Degree	Science and Tech	Secondary	Based on Exam
K4	Male	40	26 years	Associate Degree	Literacy	Primary	Based on Exam
K5	Male	20	15 years	Bachelor's Degree	Literature	High School	Based on Exam
K6	Female	20	4 months	Bachelor's Degree	Chemistry	High School	First time
K7	Male	23	5 months	Master Degree	English	Secondary	First time
K8	Male	17	5 months	Master Degree	Math's	Secondary	First time
K9	Female	18	5 months	Master Degree	Chemistry	High School	First time
K10	Male	15	5 months	Bachelor's Degree	English	Secondary	First time
K11	Male	23	16 years	Bachelor's Degree	Geography	Secondary	Renewed
K12	Male	19	7 years	Bachelor's Degree	Chemistry	High School	Renewed
K13	Male	17	10 years	Bachelor's Degree	Literacy	Primary	Renewed
K14	Male	15	10 years	Master Degree	Social Sciences	Secondary	Renewed
K15	Female	20	10 years	Bachelor's Degree	Literacy	Primary	Renewed

As it can be seen in table 1; the participants (head teachers) are from various backgrounds by means of different school types, serving year, branches and education in terms of maintaining maximum likelihood sampling. They have been selected equally according to being delegated for the first time, based on examination and renewed. While determining the number of participants, analyzing deeply, eagerness for interviewing and acceptance are considered. Also, the average serving years are as follow; 13 for exam based, 5 months for first-time delegated and 10 years for those renewed.

Data Collecting Tools

The data for the research have been collected with a semi-structured interviewing form "The Views of Head teachers on Delegating School Leaders" developed by us. These interviewing forms are the one the techniques to ensure that the questions cover almost all the sub dimensions of a problem (Yildirim and Simsek, 2013). Within this technique, the researcher is expected to determine the subjects beforehand but s/he can change the order of questions or improve their narration. The questions' scope validity of an interviewing form can also be improved through using probing questions (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006). Our interviewing form consists of two dimensions of which the first part includes the respondents serving year, branch, educational background and delegating status, while in the second part includes questions for evaluation process, criteria, evaluating bodies, success ratio, objectivity, renewing position and suggestions for a new legal regulation.

Some probing questions are used to find underlying causes for the respondents' answers. These probing questions and following ones are generally used for getting further information on what the respondents have just said (Merriam, 2013). Four faculty members, from two different universities and studying in educational leadership, were asked for their expertise to make our interviewing form valid. Then, first interviews were done with 3 head teachers to determine whether the improvements are working or not. Creating good questions are the key element for collecting valid data while managing the interviewing process and being careful will ensure the data and analysis' quality (Merriam, 2013). First interviews have proven that the form works well and then the interviewing process has started.

Collecting Data

The data for this research have been collected with the interviews during 2014 – 2015 academic year. All the participants were asked for permission and then scheduled before the interviews. Also they were informed for voice-recording and asked for permission. Each interview lasted for nearly 37 minutes. After interviews, in order to prevent data lose, the notes and voice records were once considered and the participants were informed that they could add or change anything they wanted. After their final approval the data were transferred to computer.

Data Analysis

The interviews were analyzed prior to descriptive analysis technique in which pre-determined themes and codes are also used and some cause-effect relations are explored (Yildirim and Simsek, 2013). First of all, all the notes and voice-records were typed and turned into written texts. After typing, the views of head teachers are analyzed and presented as the findings of this research. Moreover, some direct quotations are given to enable the reader better understand these participants' opinions without any interpretation.

Findings

The views of head teachers on selecting, recruiting and delegating school leaders prior to legal regulation of Turkish Ministry of National Education are given below.

The Views of Head Teachers on Necessity for this New Regulation

The first question for our research is what the head teachers think about the necessity for this legal regulation of Turkish Ministry of National Education on selecting, recruiting and delegating school heads dated 2014 and numbered 29026. Thus the participants have been asked whether they read this regulation and it is necessary or not; what they think about this new technique and who should be included.

Most of the participants (10/15) have said that an evaluation just based on interviewing is not proper. In addition to a written exam; interviews, experience, awards, leadership capacity and educational background should also be considered. Two of the participants have stated that:

> *"An exam-based appointing is much more suitable as it will provide clear conscience. This new regulation's consisting of many stakeholders will seem as more objective but it is inadequate in real. In fact we are top managers of teachers but when they have right to evaluate us, then some problems occur and we all are hurt. When you think that a teacher has right to evaluate his/her leader but then we should question the approach of that leader's against teachers. We all will be forced to build fake relations with these teachers for the fear of evaluations."* (K12)

> *"You can't be a leader with exam! However, leaders should be selected fairly. S/he should have academic qualifications such as master or doctoral degree, articles, books etc."* (K8)

Many researches have been for school heads that are also the corner stones of countries' education systems and it is emphasized that the key for school success is the school-head (Karip and Koksal, 1999). Thus one cannot be school-head with mere exam results but also it is not possible without considering capacity, experience, serving year and objective awards.

All the participants appointed by exam-based technique and most of the participants (4/5) whose headship renewed have found an exam-based way but improved with experience, awards etc. much more proper. On the other hand, most of the participants (3/5) who have been delegated for the first time found this new approach proper but offered that evaluations must be fair. It is not surprising that these new school heads are supporting this new way but those whose headship have been renewed are supporting exam-based selection are drawing attention.

When the participants are asked whether they investigated legal regulation in details, most of them (13/15) have replied that they have, while only 2 haven't done it deeply. While these participants are asked what they think about this technique, most of them (9/15) stated negative views and underlined that it cannot answer the need nor it is secure or objective. The participants with positive views (6/15) added that this will gain functionality by solving troubles and they have some doubts on it. Some stated that:
S/he underlines that new regulation has some disadvantages and risks, they aren't under some guarantee *and* complains about working conditions:

> *"They will end our career whenever they want. The most suitable way is exam-based one. I am against oral interviews. We are under pressure almost in every meeting they are threating us, we cannot work freely."* (K15)

> *"Delegations are not fair. Although it is not revealed there are growing complaints. I think it is not suitable for a school head to be evaluated by parents and students."* (K1)

> *"This new regulation was prepared well but there are still some faults. It should not be limited as 4+4 years but depend on real performance, and it is not fair to remove all rights gained with exams." (K9)*

> *"There are some problems, you can take parents', students' or teachers' views into consideration but that's not enough. Newly appointed local governors have made false evaluations. May be a much more successful man will be at my position thus I am not sure whether I am the most proper one or not. "* (K12)

Most of the participants (9/15) stated that this new regulation should not be applied for all the school heads, because such an act is against the "gained rights". While some the some others (5/15) think that it should cover the whole to be fair. On the other hand one participant stated that *"It should cover all the head teachers but this time changing all this people will certainly create chaos."* Some of the participants' statements are such:

> *"It should cover those who will be delegated for the first time. When head teachers are replaced then they also replace deputy-head teachers also so schools' organizational memories are deleted."* (K13)

> *"They can replace school heads among themselves so this should be applied to those who were appointed before."* (K14)

Finally, nearly the half of our participants (7/15) find this new approach totally negative, while the rest think that it has both negative and positive sides though the negative ones are much more. Only one participant think that this regulation has started a new era and thus it is totally positive. The participants' leading thoughts about the new regulation and delegating school heads matter are given in Table 2.

Table 2
The Participants' Leading Thoughts About the New Regulation

Positive	Negative
Brings a new perspective	Unfair
Maintains dynamism	Not objective
Team spirit and collaboration increases	Includes some factors rather than pure competence
Multi-sided, objective and democratic evaluation	Lack of standards for ending job
Prevents generation gaps for old fashioned school heads, maintains technological up-to-date	False relations, individual interests, revenge opportunities
	Decreases self esteem
	Political marginality
	Damages the organizational relations between the head teacher and other staff members

According to the table 2, the participants agree on that the new regulation does not depend on objectivity, competency and fairness, while some also accept that it brings a new perspective, team spirit and democracy.

Some of the participants stated that a head teacher can make up his/her own team so this will certainly maintain team spirit and collaboration. Thus, it will raise affectivity and so positive for organizational health, otherwise this will not be as positive as desired.

The Views of Head Teachers on Evaluation Process of New Regulation

The second sub-question of the research is what do the head teachers think about the evaluation process under the legal regulation. While answering this question, we tried to find out what is the impact of evaluating right of parents' leader, students' representative, four teachers and local governors. Most of the participants (7/15) stated negative opinion on this matter, while some (5/15) stated positive opinion and the remaining 3 stated that this has both negative and positive impact.

Here we have an interesting finding that all the five head teachers, delegated for the first time, have given positive opinion on this matter, while the rest have given negative opinion to some extent. İt can be said that the fear of losing their given position has some effect on this result, which means that although we tried to create a fair and objective climate for the interviews, they, however, feel some pressure on them. Here are two totally opposite views:

> *"If this regulation is applied fairly then it is good so that I will be able know the exact reason for why I have been removed from my position. But, it, even, is close to legal courts."* (K11) (Finds it risky)

> *"Headship should not be a lifelong position, thus delegating is a good way. A head teacher should not feel that s/he has positional guarantee and hide all his faults. Such a fault will cost much more than expected so local governors have chance to intervene in case of vital faults. It makes governing easier."* (K12) (finds it proper)

Many participants stated that they no longer have job-security and thus they can't feel comfort with their position. Bakioglu and Demiral (2013: 9) have revealed the situations that create ambiguity according to school heads as planning faults, instability, causes based on legal regulations and governors. As Sargut (2011) claims, determinism is dominant in Turkish culture. Thus it can be said that the tendency for avoiding ambiguity is high in our culture. So because of the fact that delegating school heads does not have certain standards and carries risks for position bothers head teachers.

In Table 3, the participants opinions about parents', students', teachers' and local governors' evaluating roles are given.

Table 3
The Participants Opinions About Parents', Students', Teachers' and Local Governors' Evaluating Roles

Parents' Representatives	Students' Representative	Four Teachers	Local Governors
Positive (3/15)	Positive (3/15)	Positive (2/15)	Positive (2/15)
Both Positive and Negative (2/15) • Point ratio should be decreased (1/15) • The coverage should be largened (1/15)	Both Positive and Negative (5/15) • Much more attendance should be maintained (4/15) • High schools are more suitable (2/15)	All teachers should be included (7/15)	
Negative (10/15)	Negative (7/15)	Negative (6/15)	Negative (13/15)

As it is seen in Table 3, head teachers especially disagree with the fact that parents' and students' representative's situation. Whereas, many of the local governors were appointed short before this headship delegation process which means that they do not enough opportunity collect necessary data to realize a fair evaluation. Although in 19th National Education Summit, there was a suggestion that any governor must have at least one year cooperation with the head teacher they will evaluate, but this suggestion has been maintained. On the other hand, the fact that local governors, who have not known the candidates necessarily, have some % 60 role in determining head teachers has drawn much attention with reaction.

While the participants have stated that teachers are the most suitable ones to evaluate any head teacher, they also added that this should include all the teachers instead of a limited number. Some of the participants stated that:

> *"Parents' council, in fact, does not know how the things work inside a school, they are familiar with the economic issues but not with the management. Thus I think they cannot be as objective as they are expected." (K1)*

> *"You cannot ask the parents' council to evaluate an institution's head; he cannot know the legal basis of an organization." (K10)*

> *"It is good for them to be a part of this evaluation, while it is highly important to value what the students think." (K5)*

> *"If appropriate criteria have been set up, evaluating head teachers through the eyes of teachers is totally democratic." (K6)*

> *"We, as the school leaders, have close relations with the superordinates prior to our Daily roles, so that they are observing our performance and thus their views are important for evaluations." (K7)*

Another finding of this study is how the relations will be between head teachers and those who evaluate them. Many of the participants (10/15) have stated negative opinions on these relations at the end of the evaluation process because of those reasons "revenge, grouping, conflict, individual interest, favoritism…" Some others (3/15) have stated positive opinions as this will provide "democratic" effects. The remaining two participants have stated both negative and positive opinions. Here are some statements of the participants:

> *"Such an application will put the head teacher in many difficulties such as his authority will be damaged as he will be evaluated, makes him yes-man. I am against this! "* (K15)

> *"It will certainly have negative impact, I totally disagree with this. This will lead teachers to set up a type of authority over the head teachers, for instance any head teacher will have to ignore those teachers who interrupt class hours as they will evaluate the head teacher."* (K2)

> *"I think it is democratic that both local governors, teachers, parents and students have rights to say something on delegating a head teacher."* (K6)

It can be said that identifying the capabilities of head teachers is highly important for evaluating the effectiveness of head teachers, balancing the control of various groups and societies over the school organization and to determine the roles of head teachers clearly (Ağaoğlu, Altınkurt, Yılmaz ve Karaköse, 2012). With all these identifying habits, the decision makers will certainly make much more objective decisions. Most of the participants agree that the relationship between them and those stake holders who will evaluate them will be badly affected from the situation. The lack of certain objective criteria has caused the possibility of the stakeholders' applying personal relations in evaluations. It clearly bothers the participants that there will be someone who will use the case for revenge or personal interest.

The Views of Head teachers on Possible Results of New Regulation

The participants were asked what the possible results and factors to effect the situation would be. Prior to this aim, it has been investigated that which factors mostly effect the process, trade-unions' positions, 4 years limitation and becoming a teacher again after being refused. The participants' views on the factors mostly affecting the process are given in Table 4.

Table 4
The Participants' Views on the Factors Mostly Affecting the Process

The factors	Frequency
Trade-union membership	6
Competency	5
Political view	4
Knowledge, leadership, communication skills, experience and rewards	4
Pressure groups	2
Mutual relations	2

According to Table 4, it can be said that these different factors effecting the process. Especially the trade-union membership and political views are highly distinctive ones. Here are some of the participants' statements:

> *"In current process, almost everything except for competency and exam results is active in determining who will lead school." (K2)*

> *"Some external societies have also contributed to the process rather than pure educational bodies. For example many of the head teachers are the members of the same trade union." (K11)*

On the other hand there are also some participants who feel depressed because of the prejudice that all the head teachers have been delegated with injustice. Some have stated that:

> *"I know that there are various factors but I think the CVs have been analyzed carefully." (K8)*

> *"Some others factors may be influential but for me this is not true." (K13)*

> *"Many people are prejudiced against us. I, in fact, desire that those who are the most suitable for the position should be delegated but the local governors are not even selected as such. I have never begged anyone to be delegated but such a thought over me bothers me much! I fell myself confortable but there is such a prejudice against us." (K12)*

In addition, the participants also stated that they have a negative impact and draw prejudice. Altun-Akbaba and Kirkit (2005) have also reached that most of the news about head teachers are negative and hypercritical , only a small part is really supportive. The participants also stated that such news and prejudice have offended themselves. With the delegating process, even the teachers will start to think in same way and their acceptance and reputation have gone wrong.

Some participants (3/15) have stated that their trade-union is effective in these results, while most (11/15) have stated that this should not be the case. Only one participant has claimed that trade-union has no power in this process. Some of the participants' statements are as such:

> *"The trade unions are much likely to know exactly their members, thus it will be useful for them to state their opinions on who should be head teacher or not. However, this should be done in maintaining equity and justice; I find it useful by means of building up a team."* (K8)

> *"Trade-union must be objective to whatever ends, if there is any form injustice it should protect our rights"* (K1)

On the other hand, some participants also have mentioned on changing one's trade-union membership status and stated that:

> *"I think anybody who thinks such an activity may be useless for this society at all. I take such men as opportunist and self-seeker. For me, I will never be in such an intention because I am sure that my conscience will bother me forever." (K7)*

> *"I am one of those who have opposed for such but I was made disadvantaged. When I was 30, I was to be made a local education governor but as of my trade-union choice I was delayed. I was young and had some future plans. This is not fair not good." (K5)*

> *"There are many who have changed. This will prevent people's revealing their true thoughts and increase the number of yes-men." (K15)*

On the other hand, on the fact that the upper limit for headship is only 4 years with this new regulation, some of the participants (7/15) have given positive opinions while some others (6/15) and the remaining 2 have given both positive and negative opinions.

Here, an important finding is that one of the participants, who has only a 5 months headship experience and also being made head teacher for the first-time, has found this 4 years length proper, however; 2 participants have still remained abstain. This has leaded us to state that those head teachers, who do not have enough experience, haven't developed a vision for the limited time of headship. Meanwhile, the fact that these inexperienced head teachers being abstain besides those with clear thoughts who have at least 6 years' experience is also drawing attention. This can be related directly to experience-inexperience dilemma. Considering that there are also 2 newly delegated ones remaining abstain, it can be said that being inexperienced is effective in this case. Those who have found it positive, claim that this will save the institution in falling monotony and make it much more dynamic.

The participants with positive thoughts stated, "That's enough, staying at the same school for long years is not true, S/he should go a different school as school is not a proper institution to make long-term decisions." (K4); "*Any school needs new breathe!*" (K1)
While there are negative thoughts such as:

> "*I can't understand why the head teacher is delegated for only 4 years at an organization where even the strategic plan, itself, is done for some 5 years period. This is not fair. The first two years will take him to learn and adapt environmental conditions and the third will cover the practices to try to be delegated once again.*" (K13)

Inactivity in public organizations means idleness, passivity and monotony in system. This is accepted as a problem which prevents both individuals and organizations from working and serving effectively and leads to loss of efficiency. Because the institutions tends to carry on the master bureaucratic structure instead of adapting the environmental changes (Leblebici, 2005). Also Tonbul and Sagiroglu (2012) have found that there is a link between the length of working at the same school and stability, complacency, insisting on same ways to solve different problems. Turkish Ministry of National Education has started head teacher-rotation for the first time with the legal regulation in 2010; although it was strictly opposed in the beginning, it has been found that many head teachers have found it positive (Akcadag, 2014; Aktepe, 2013; Demir and Pinar, 2013; Wilma, Altinkurt, Karakose and Erol, 2012).

Almost all the participants (14/15) have stated that these ex-head teachers who have not been delegated once again should not return to teaching profession instead they should choose retirement. Here are some statements:

> *"Teaching after all these long years means torture for the students, he can't be efficient." (K12)*

> *"When an ex-teacher sits in teachers' room and share his day with the teachers, once he used to lead, he will certainly suffer. There will surely ones whom he has had problems while leading and now sharing the same positions will bother both sides. But things have changed now, one accepts this career even if he well knows that this is a temporary position." (K9)*

The only positive opinion is that: *"I think a good head teacher teaches well. If he has enough knowledge he will do his best in teaching also."* (K14)

Finally many of the participants (9/15) have stated that this new method will lead negative impact, some (3/15) have stated that although it initially bothers some people this will have positive impact, and two participants have claimed that it has both negative and positive sides.

Another important finding is that all the 5 head teachers, who have been remained out of this new regulation because they have not yet filled their 5 years serving time, have given negative opinions. Here are some:

> *"In fact this new method has been well established but there are injustice and unethical conditions." (K13)*

> *"This new regulation will neither ruin nor praise our national education system. All the serving conditions and limitations are clear. Likewise, positive or negative changes are not totally related to individuals but to government policies. These systems which were not well established cannot be polished with individual attempts." (K7)*

> *"This is clearly negative and we will see the results in 10-15 years' time. They are ruining our children's fate" (K4)*

The Views of Head Teachers on How a New Regulation Should Be?

Within the study, the head teachers have been asked for their suggestions on how a new regulation should be. Some of the participants (4/15) have mentioned that point system is

necessary but evaluating bodies and proportions should be changed. The participants' suggestions are given in Table 5.

Table 5
The Suggestions Made by the Participants

Code	Evaluation Suggestion and Ground
K7	*Teacher % 20; The closest follower of head teacher*
	Parent (parents' union) % 10; The closest co-worker of the school. Can see both the needs and functions of school.
	Students % 10; Being aware of the existence of students' evaluating, head teacher will sympathize
	Local Governors % 40; The head teachers always have to collaborate with top managers and they are thus among those who can best evaluate their practices
	Other % 20; Head teacher's previous success, awards etc.
K8	*Teacher % 20; Teachers can evaluate best.*
	Parents (parents' union) %10; Decrease the psychological stress over the head teachers
	Students %10; Maintains feedback for school affectivity
	Local Governors %20; Knows each other well
	Other %30; To make evaluation process much more objective
K11	*Top managers; %50*
	Parents, Teachers, Students; %50
K14	*Teacher %40,*
	Parents (parents' union) %5,
	Students %5,
	Local Governors %25,
	Others %25: Awards, experience etc.

Besides this, the participants also have made some suggestions on the qualifications they any head teacher should have and on the ways to make evaluation process more objective; these are given in Table 6.

Table 6
Suggestions for Headship

Qualifications for Head teacher	Frequency (f)
Legislation	8
Objective, fair, democratic	6
Leader	5
Active-social	5
Communication skills	4
Managing experience	3
Technological Competence	3
Having no limits for working hours	3
Smiling and elegant	2

According to the table, the participants care for those qualifications; legislation, objectivity, democracy, leadership and social relations. On the hand, some has drawn attention that also physical appearance is important and it should reflect his/her position's importance.

The participants' suggestions for making the delegating process much more objective are given in table 7.

Table 7
Suggestions for Making the Process More Objective

Code	Suggestion
K1, K2, K4, K5, K9, K12, K13, K15	Both written and oral exam
K1, K3, K4, K7, K8, K9, K10, K11, K14	Increasing the number of teachers, parents and students in evaluation
K6	A candidate should have at least 3 years deputy experience
K12	Master or Doctoral Degrees
K13	An Academy for educational leadership should be established and the teachers with at least 5 years' experience should be selected carefully. After 2 years training, head teachers should again be selected prior to final exam.

As it can be seen in Table 7, while some of the participants are offering both written and oral exam, some others have made extra suggestions for objectivity.

Discussions, Results and Suggestions

Although the participants general opinion on the new regulations is partly negative; it has increased the demand for school leadership that such a duty has been accepted as an advantage and privilege. However, at this point, the most suitable candidates are expected to be selected, prior to the first finding of this study, at the moment, has revealed that an objective evaluation

has not been made and some other factors rather than bare competences are valid. The evaluations can be made more objective and fair by defining criteria to increase organizational standards that will enable us to determine the success and performance of head teachers in addition to written exams. So that, a head teacher, delegated within such a process, will only be respectable and acceptable for subordinates.

Many of the participants have given negative responses on the evaluation process and regulation's items. It has been revealed that the head teachers, whether or not they are included in these evaluations, are anxious about their future and suffer from their badly damaged images and prejudices. They have claimed that there are different factors rather than pure competence based ones. This can be explained with the lack of infrastructure to apply this new regulation truly. The basic principle for promoting has long been serving year together with politician's choices (Ozdemir, 2014). Many of the participants have stated that the trade-unions are effective in delegating process. Similarly, Kayikci (2013), have claimed that trade-unions play a vital role in maintaining their members promotion expectations and delegating head teachers. Sahin and Ustuner (2014) have also revealed that head teachers think that such interviewing methods will make delegations unreliable and decrease validity.

The participants have stated some negative sides of the new regulation. With the latest regulation (10.06.2014), appointing head teachers was ended and instead an era of delegating has started. School leadership has been no longer identified as a job but made a secondary duty. Evaluation commissions have built up and they have evaluated the candidates. In oral interviews the candidates are expected to be evaluated through their competences, communication skills, problem solving skills, analytical thinking and analyzing capabilities which may seem as positive development; however Turkey's current infrastructure has created some problems with this method. It should be considered that impact groups, trade-unions and political parties may have power to affect the process, so that it can be said that the regulation needs some additions to make it much more objective, competence based and clear. Especially, the evaluations made by local governors with a % 60 effect size without knowing the candidates well will be the basic cause of these problems. On the other hand, it can be taken as a positive development that the students, parents and teachers are included in the process which may maintain democratic and multi-sided evaluation.

Only 4 of the participants agree with the pointing system but suggest changing their proportion. Especially the local governors' being unaware of the candidates' real life experiences is the most problematic theme in this process. The participants mostly care for the head teachers' leadership skills, managing fairly and capable at human relations. Many have suggested that local governors should work with the head teachers at least for 6 months before the evaluations, applying both written exam and interviews at the same time and widening the number of evaluators. Moreover, they also suggest that in order to be a head teacher candidate one should work as a teacher and then as a deputy head teacher and finally to have at least a master degree.

Kepenekci (2004), in her research, has claimed that these legal regulations are unfortunately being prepared without a serious process and moreover without consulting those who will be especially affected from it. Thus, such things are done with practicing method which will force them to remain totally bureaucratic. So it can be said that we should follow much detailed and consistent policies for training and delegating school leaders. There is no doubt that consulting to head teachers and considering their suggestions will certainly add to the process. Because it is known that those who are affected by any decision should take part in decision making process. Transition can only be achieved properly when the individuals are eager to take part in and move with adopting their new roles (Sergiovanni, 1994; as cited in Ozdemir, 2014). Creating ideas, questioning the current ones and criticizing will lead positive developments. In this study, participants mostly criticize fairness and objectivity of the evaluation process. Although they have been selected and delegated, they still can criticize the process.

In many developed countries, including USA, school leaders are trained in a theory-based process, however; in Turkey there is a misbelief that there can be a special education programmer for training school leaders and thus it is not accepted as profession instead it is run as a secondary duty (Balci and Cinkir, 2002). If we take school leadership as a profession, this will solve many problems of our age. Karatas, Kyzy and Topuz (2014) also stated that there in a lack of information and theoretical framework for school leadership in Turkey and neither the head teachers nor the scholars are trying to solve this problem. On the other the decisions to make school leadership as a profession that was made in National Education Councils have not been applied yet. So it can be stated that there a clear need to develop a new perspective for selecting, training and delegating school leaders in our country (Akcadag, 2014). In order to make theories into practice there is a need for collaboration. But this so called collaboration

is too weak between the scholars and practicing head teachers of school leadership area (Karatas, Kyzy and Topuz, 2014).

Many participants have claimed that the regulation is not enough to select, train and delegate school leaders properly and there is a need for developing it. The competences should be clearly defined and then those competencies should be attained to candidates via Bachelors' or Master Degree programs. Taking school leadership as a profession is among the most suggested solving methods for the problems. 1998 dated regulation is accepted as the beginning of this professionalism.

Suggestions

These are suggested based on the findings of this research:

1. There is a need to revise legal regulations on selecting, training and delegating school leaders. Especially the local governors, whose statues are mostly criticized by the candidates, should be reconsidered. At least they should work with the candidates for 6 months and their proportion should be decreased.
2. To make these evaluations much more objective, both written exams and interviews should be prepared with the collaboration of scholars, local governors and head teachers.
3. As it was suggested in 19th National Education Council, a database for school evaluations can be formed and much solid benchmarks are to be defined.
4. Although it is included in current regulation, master degree must be defined as an obligation.

References

Açıkalın, A. (2002). Dahabir-eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *8*(2), 149-151.

Ağaoğlu, E., Altınkurt, Y., Yılmaz, K., & Karaköse, T. (2012). Okul yöneticilerinin yeterliklerine ilişkin okul yöneticilerinin ve öğretmenlerin görüşleri (Kütahya ili). *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *37*(164), 159-175.

Altun, S. A., ve Kirkit, G. (2005). Okul yöneticilerinin basındaki imajı. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *11*(1), 25-46.

Akçadağ, T. (2014). Okul yöneticilerinin bakış açılarıyla yöneticilerin yetiştirilme, atama ve yer değiştirmeleri; sorunlar ve çözümler. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 29,* 135- 150

Aktepe, V. (2013). Okul yöneticilerinin seçme ve yetiştirme uygulamalarına yönelik öğretmen ve yönetici görüşleri. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 9*(2), 89-105.

Aslanargun, E. (2012). Okul müdürlerinin atanmaları sürecinde idari yargı kararları ve öne çıkan değerler. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 18*(3), 347-376.

Bakioğlu, A., & Demiral, S. (2013). Okul yöneticilerinin belirsizlik durumlarını algılama ve karar verme tarzları. *Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 38*, 9-35.

Balcı, A. (2008). Türkiye'de eğitim yönetiminin bilimleşme sureci. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 14* (54), 181-209.

Balcı, A. (2013). *Etkili okul ve okul geliştirme kuram uygulama ve araştırma*. (6th ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Balcı, A., & Çınkır, Ş. (2002, May). *Türkiye'de eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi. Paper presented at the Symposium 21. Yüzyılın Eşiğinde Türk Eğitim Sistemi Ulusal Sempozyumu,* Ankara.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2011). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (9th ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Cemaloğlu, N. (2005). Türkiye'de okul yöneticisi yetiştirme ve istihdamı: Var olan durum, gelecekteki olası gelişmeler ve sorunlar. Gazi Üniversitesi, *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 25*(2), 249-274.

Çelikten, M. (2001). Okul yöneticilerinin problem çözme becerileri. *Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, *7*(3), 297-309.

Çınkır, S. (2010). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin sorunları: Sorun kaynakları ve destek stratejileri. *İlköğretim Online, 9*(3), 1027-1036.

Demir, S., & Pınar, A. (2013). 2011 Yılı yönetici atama ve yer değiştirme yönetmeliği'nin içeriğine ve puanlama ölçütlerine ilişkin yönetici görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 8*(6), 123-143.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi: Teori, araştırma ve uygulama* (S. Turan, Trans. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel yayınları.

Karataş, İ. H., Kyzy, J. A., & Topuz, C. (2015). Okul yöneticileri ile eğitim yönetimi alanında yapılan bilimsel araştırmalar ve çalışan bilim insanları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim Dergisi*, *8*(1), 125-152.

Karip, E., & Köksal, K. (1999). Okul yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 5(18), 193-207.

Kayıkçı, K. (2013). Türkiye'de kamu ve eğitim alanında sendikalaşma ve öğretmen ile okul yöneticilerinin sendikalardan beklentileri. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, *46*(1), 99-126.

Kepenekçi, Y. K. (2004). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin eğitim mevzuatına ilişkin görüşleri. *Eğitim Bilimleri ve Uygulama, 3*(6), 159-174.

Konan, N. (2013a). Educational supervisors' locus of control, *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *51*, 45-64.

Konan, N. (2013b). Relationship between locus of control and problem-solving skills of high school administrators. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education, 3*(3), 786-794.

Korkmaz, M. (2005). Okul Yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi: Sorunlar – çözümler ve öneriler. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *25*(3), 237-252.

Leblebici, D. N. (2005). Küresel değişim baskısına karşı Türk bürokrasisindeki yapısal uyum çabalarının yapısal atalet kavramı açısından değerlendirilmesi. *C.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 6*(1), 1-14.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Merriam, S. B. (2013). *Nitel araştırma: Desen ve uygulama için bir rehber*. S. Turan (Trans. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Okçu, V. (2011). Türkiye'de okul yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi ve atanmasına ilişkin mevcut durum, beklentiler ve öneriler. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 10*(37), 244-266.

Onural, H. (2005). Üst düzey yöneticilerin eğitim yönetimi alanındaki yeterlik sorunu ve nedenleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetim Dergisi, 11*(41), 69-85.

Ostroff, C., & Schmitt, N. (1993). Configurations of organizational effectiveness and efficiency,*Academy of Management Journal, 36*(6), 1345-1361.

Özdemir, S. (2014). Türk eğitim sisteminin yapısı, eğilimleri ve sorunları. In S. Özdemir (Ed.), *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-52). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Özmen, F., & Kömürlü, F. (2010). Eğitim örgütlerinde yönetici seçme ve atamada yaşanan sorunlar ve yönetici görüşleri temelinde çözüm önerileri. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi, 2(1), 25-33.*

Sargut, A. S., (2011). *Kültürlerarası farklılaşma ve yönetim*. Ankara: İmge Yayıncılık.

Şahin, M., & Üstüner, M. (2014). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığının teşkilat ve görevleri hakkındaki 652 sayılı kanun hükmünde kararnameye ilişkin okul müdürlerinin görüşleri. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 11*(25), 373-392.

Şimşek, H. (2004). Eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi: Karşılaştırmalı örnekler ve Türkiye için öneriler. *Çağdaş Eğitim, 29*(307), 13-21.

Şirin, H. (2007). Okul ve özellikleri. In S. Özdemir (Ed.), *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi* (1st ed.) (pp. 49-77). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Şişman, M., & Turan, S. (2004). Eğitim ve okul yönetimi. In Y. Özden (Ed.), *Eğitim ve okul yöneticiliği el kitabı* (pp. 99–146). Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Tonbul, Y., & Sağıroğlu, S. (2012). Okul müdürlerinin zorunlu yer değiştirme uygulamasına ilişkin bir araştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 18*(2), 313-339.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (9th ed.) Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yılmaz, K., Altınkurt, Y., Karaköse, T., & Erol, E. (2012). Okul yöneticilerine uygulanan zorunlu yer değiştirme uygulaması hakkında okul yöneticilerinin ve öğretmenlerin görüşleri. *E-International Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(3), 65-83.

Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)
Volume 8, Issue 3, July 2017: 350-371

DOI: 10.17569/tojqi.331792

Research Article

Supervisory Process in Pre-school Education in Turkey[1]

Zeynep Temiz [2]

Abstract

It was the responsibility of primary education supervisors to oversee the activities of pre-school education (PE) schools. All stakeholders in the education system, including teachers, principals and supervisors, were used to experiencing problems in the supervisory process related to early education. To address the issue, the Ministry of National Education (MONE) enacted new legislation that took the responsibility for auditing pre-school education teachers away from primary education supervisors, passing the duty to school principals. In the study, instrumental case study method, one of the qualitative research designs, has been adopted. The current study aims to shed light on functional and dysfunctional aspects of supervision in pre-school education. In order to scrutinize the new regulations related to the supervisory process in pre-school education, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with eight independent pre-school principals working in Van, Turkey. The current study utilized the instrumental case study approach, with the case being the principals' understanding and

[1] The initial findings of the study were presented at the VI Uluslararası Katılımlı Eğitim Denetimi Kongresi, held in İstanbul on June 2014.

[2] Assist.Prof.Dr., Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education, Primary Education, cimenzeynepakdag@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4436-9737

Received: 13.08.2016, Accepted: 25.07.2017

implementation of new regulations in the supervisory process in a pre-school setting. This case is bounded by both time, having started immediately after Ministry of National Education issued a new regulation on supervisory processes, and by context, being the accounts of principals who work only in independent schools. The data obtained from the study were subjected to content analysis. The findings of the study revealed that while the previous supervisory process did not function as intended, the respondent principals had some reservations related to the new supervisory process.

Keywords: *Pre-school education, supervision, primary education supervisors*

Introduction

It is well known fact that the later academic outcomes of students are influenced strongly by their learning experiences as a child, and that leadership is a key factor in making early childhood education successful, since school principals are the second most influential asset behind student achievement after teachers (Leithwood, Jantzi, Earl, Watson & Fullan, 2004). Despite this, leadership in early childhood education is greatly under-represented in academic literature, as the majority of studies focus on primary and secondary education. Thus, the early childhood education setting has been addressed only to a limited extent in studies (Bush, 2012). The terms 'leadership' and 'management' are sometimes used interchangeably, in that the two activities are often carried out in schools by the same people, although there is a distinction between the two concepts. While the former refers to vision, strategy, the creation of direction and transformation of the organization, the latter refers to the effective implementation of the vision and operational matters, ensuring the organization is run effectively and efficiently, allowing it to achieve its goals (Wa Ho, 2011). The concepts of support and relationship development in education are similar to those experienced in corporations, where the chief executive officer (CEO) aims to establish relationships and to garner support within the organization (Fleming & Love, 2003). School directors are pivotal in the success of a school, being the leader of what is essentially a child-care organization. His or her leadership supports the processes behind change within the organization. Being the director of an early childhood education school is no easy task, and can be of equal complexity as a corporate organization. A pre-school principal is required to ensure harmony among all those involved in education and in the care of young children. The corporate system of early education comprises parents, staff, directors, MONE board members and members from outside the community. In order to succeed in pre-school education, schools directors need to connect all stakeholders for the sake of children (Fleming & Love, 2003). The leadership responsibilities include quality improvement, pedagogical leadership, daily management, human resources management, external relations and advocating pre-school education within the community (Heikka & Hujala, 2013).

Considering the broad variety of programs and roles in the field of early education, it is easy to understand the challenges faced when trying to reach consensus on the type of preparation

leaders should have. First of all, an understanding of the needs and characteristics of school-age children is necessary for work in the field (Schomburg, 1999). Wa Ho (2011) identified three major roles of the school principal, being: role model; school manager; mentor for the curriculum and pedagogy. Regarding these roles, teachers, support staff and parents generally viewed themselves as followers, with the practice of school leadership being largely centralized on the principal him/herself. A leader's actions should be a model for the people that follow him or her, and effective leaders encourage their staff to be self-sufficient and interdependent, which enables colleagues to contribute and draw upon each other's talents (Arora, 2013).

The most important agent for effective school is also defined as "school administrators" by Turkish teachers. They further indicated that their supreme expectations from school administrators are his/her encouragements, cooperation and empathizing ability in personal relations (Uğurlu & Abdurrezzak, 2016). In order to accomplish all these task administrators should be able to adapt renovation in educational systems as Turkish educational system has been changing in a regular basis. The last and dramatic change has happened in in Turkey in 2012, when the eight year mandatory education was increased to 12 years, divided into three different levels, and referred to as the 4+4+4 system. (Karadeniz & Ulusoy, 2015).This new system assigned goals for early education, with the schooling rate for pre-school education aimed to be increased to 100 percent for children aged 48–66 months. Unfortunately, the recent schooling rate is still 27 percent for the 3-4 year-old age group, 37 percent for the 4–5 year-old age group, and 42 percent for the 5 year-old age group (MONE, 2014a). The government decided to place more emphasis to raising the schooling rate of pre-school education due to the associated positive effect on the overall development of children. The main objectives of early education are defined in Turkey as follows:

- To educate children to be respectful of national values.
- To improve the physical, cognitive and emotional development of children.
- To ensure the children speak Turkish smoothly and fluently.
- To make children creative, communicative and understanding of others.
- To prepare children for primary education.

As is the case with all levels of education, early education needs to be supervised to establish whether or not all of these objectives are being attained. Supervision is a process in which

somebody is appointed to monitor the operation of organization. In short, supervision involves evaluating the purpose of organization, and then assessing the steps taken to reach that purpose (Kaya, 1991). All organizations need to be measured and evaluated to assess their performance, and supervision is the most common way of evaluating the success of a school. This approach involves determining criteria for success, and measuring whether school activities meet them. The supervisory process can be defined as controlling the operation of schools in line with public interest (Yavuz, 2010). Supervision is a dynamic process that facilitates dialogue aimed at promoting instructional improvement, and is also central to the revitalization of classroom teaching and learning in the new century. The school supervisory process has witnessed a shift from an inspection to an evaluation model. In contrast to the inspection approach, the new paradigm of the supervisory process is collaborative rather than hierarchical, dialogic rather than didactic, descriptive rather than judgmental, and supportive rather than punitive (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Studies have revealed that teachers want and need feedback about their performance, but as it stands, they rarely receive information that may help them to improve their work. Teachers are often judged on their performance, and are advised on how to improve themselves; however, what would be more beneficial would be descriptions of practices and the desired effect on students (Akbaba, 2002; Akdağ, 2014; Haser, 2009; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). This could be achieved by effective supervision process in educational system (Başaran, 2000; Gürkan, 2006). As such, MONE made both structural and practical changes in this supervisory system to make it more effective (Turan, 2016).

MONE is the governing body overseeing pre-school education in Turkey, where pre-school education is offered in two types of public schools: independent pre-schools and primary schools. The former tend to be housed in their own separate building and garden, while the latter are generally only a classroom in a primary schools in which the first to eighth grades are taught. The pre-school classes in primary schools have been established by turning primary education classes into pre-school classes. Independent schools, on the other hand, provide a better educational environment for young children as they are generally run by principles with a pre-school education background. These schools generally have five classes, making both curricular and caring tasks much easier to maintain when compared to primary schools. Some primary schools have more than 2,000 students, and so pre-school classes are often neglected (Sahin & Dostoglu, 2014).

Independent pre-schools and primary pre-school classes used to be supervised by primary education supervisors in Turkey. All stakeholders in the education system, including teachers, principals and supervisors, were used to experiencing problems in the supervisory process related to early education since supervisors were not specialized on pre-school education (Budak, 2009; Büte & Balcı, 2010; Dağlıoğlu, 2008; Haktanır, 2008; Yücel, 2009). To become a supervisor, a teacher needs to work in a public school for eight years, after which they are required to take a written and oral examination. Teachers who pass this exam work as a deputy supervisor for three years, and then have to take another exam to become a supervisor. In addition to teachers with eight years of experience, those engaged in art and science, law, political science, theology and economics are able to take the supervisors' examination, as long as they get the necessary score in the Public Personnel Selection Examinations (MONE, 2014b). Almost all primary education supervisors are male, since the working conditions would be hard for a woman. Supervisors have spent most of their time travelling, and often return home late, sometimes even having to stay close to the facility they are supervising (Tok, 2013). Supervisor applicants should have no health problems that may hinder them from travelling (MONE, 2014b). As such, female teachers avoid becoming a supervisor. Considering the fact that pre-school education is provided mostly by female teachers, reasons for the shortage of supervisors with pre-school education background appears (Tok, 2013). To address the issue, the Ministry of National Education (MONE) enacted new legislation that took the responsibility for auditing pre-school education teachers away from primary education supervisors, passing the duty to school principals, as the teachers' executive managers, who, it was believed, were better placed to observe and guide teachers in schools (Turan, 2016).

Primary education supervisors generally are trained in the supervision of primary education schools. Although pre-school education and primary education have some common characteristics, pre-school education has a number of exclusive features, meaning that they need to be inspected and evaluated by a supervisor with knowledge of the development and learning style of young children. Due to a lack of knowledge of pre-school education, primary education supervisors tend to evaluate pre-school education teachers using the same criteria used in the assessment of primary school teachers. This is a flawed approach, in that pre-school classes are not bound by lesson schedules, since their daily schedules are

continuous – in other words, there are no lessons in pre-school education. Still, primary education supervisors ask for lesson schedule when supervising pre-school education teachers (Akdağ, 2014). Teachers have also reported that supervisory process is weak in several aspects. First of all, they have claimed that they are not informed about their supervision, and that their ideas are not taken into consideration at any stage of the process. Second, they often stress the lack of knowledge and experience of supervisors in pre-school education, expressing that supervisors make no contribution to their personal or professional development. Teachers have complained further about the duration of assessment, claiming that it is not long enough to understand the educational situation in class, to communicate with the teacher or manager, to observe classroom processes, to draw conclusions, to evaluate and share the results, or to develop new and creative solutions. Finally, teachers have stated that the supervisors were not suitably equipped to identify their needs and to guide them to develop new strategies to fulfil the environmental expectations (Sabancı & Ömeroğlu, 2013).

Table 1
Number of Schools, Students, Teachers and Classrooms by Types of Education in Pre-primary Education Institutions in the 2013–14 Academic Years.

Type of Schools	Schools	Number of Students	Number of Teachers			Number of Classes
			Male	Female	Total	
Pre-primary education (public Private)	26 698	1 059 495	3 387	59 940	63 327	50 466
Pre-primary Education (Public)	22 771	923 590	48 333	2 843	45 490	37 387
Pre-primary Education (Private)	3 927	135 905	14 994	544	14 450	13 079
Independent Kindergartens (public)	2 087	239 217	1 204	11 390	12 603	8 313
Total Number of Nursery Classes	21 268	704 315	1 678	35 791	37 468	31 652

Table 2
Number of Schools, Students, Teachers and Classrooms by Types of Education in Primary Education Institutions in the 2013–14 Academic Years.

Type of School	Schools	Number of Students	Number of Teachers			Number of Classes
			Male	Female	Total	
Primary Schools	28 532	5 574 916	120 661	167 783	288 444	243 305
Primary school (public)	27 461	5 390 591	115 548	151 623	267 171	227 679
Primary school (private)	1 0 7 1	184 325	5 113	16 160	21 273	15 626

Tables 1 and 2 present the number of schools, students and teachers to which primary education supervisors are responsible for guidance, supervision and assessment in primary education. There are currently 2,810 primary education supervisors affiliated to MONE (2014b). In Van, as the location of the current study, there are only 17 supervisors on duty, and there is a need for 32 more (MONE, 2014b). As a result of this shortage, supervisors are unable to visit schools on a regular basis, with some being visited only once in three years. Principals would actually welcome supervisor visits to their schools if they could provide them with appropriate guidance. This study confirms a finding of previous studies, indicating that supervisors tend to spend their time checking documentation rather than focusing directly on increasing the quality of education and training (Yavuz, 2010). According to the feedback received from the principals, the issues for which the principals are most often criticized by the supervisors are not related directly to education or training. This has led MONE to put in place new regulations related to the supervisory process in early education that prohibits primary education supervisors from entering pre-school classes to observe teachers' performance. The current study aims to shed light on the pros and cons of supervision in pre-school education, which is now carried out by the school director in line with recently issued legislation.

Following the enactment of new supervisory regulations in Turkey, primary education supervisors will no longer inspect pre-school education teachers. This task will now be undertaken by their school principals, who can observe and guide teachers in schools more effectively. There are many studies scrutinizing effectiveness of previous supervision process and almost all of them referred negative aspects of it (Budak, 2009; Büte & Balcı, 2010; Dağlıoğlu, 2008; Haktanır, 2008; Turan, 2016; Yücel, 2009).. New regulation is promising to yield more favorable outcomes as teachers will be supervised and guided by their administrators who have a pre-school education background. School administrators are also capable of evaluating teachers' performance based on the context in which they live. The current study aims to shed light on functional and dysfunctional aspects of supervision in pre-school education. More precisely, this study has been developed to answer the following research questions:

1) What is the reason behind the new regulations in pre-school education?
2) What are the advantages and disadvantages of the new regulatory and supervisory process in pre-school education?
3) How will principals implement the new regulations in their school?

Methodology

Participants

Creswell (2007) stated that the research process for qualitative researchers is emergent, meaning that an initial plan for a potential research cannot be tightly organized. Alterations do not necessarily occur at the beginning of a research, in that all phases of the process may change or shift after the researchers enter the field and begin to collect data. The current study is no exception in this regard, and immediately after researcher had developed the interview protocol and was about to begin data collection, the legislation related to supervision in pre-school education changed. As a result, the researcher shifted focus more towards the principals than the teachers, and the design of the study and the interview protocols were also modified.

Pre-school teachers often feel isolated in primary schools, in that primary schools have generally only one pre-school class. Principals tend to lack the relevant knowledge, and this is accompanied by a lack of support given to primary schools (Akdağ, 2014). Accordingly, only the principals of independent schools were chosen for this study, all of whom had graduated from a pre-school teacher education program and had worked as a teacher for at least five years before becoming a principal. An additional reason for the omission of primary school principals from the study is there potential lack of knowledge of the new regulations.

In order to reach participants researcher called all of the 25 schools in Van and she introduced herself, discussed the purpose of the study and asked for cooperation. Following this, non-respondents were contacted with a follow-up phone call again. Researcher could not reach four administrators, seven of them refused to join this study due to their tight schedule, three of them agreed to join study but researcher could not make an appointment with them for

various reason, finally three schools were really far from city center and located in unsafe neighborhood so researcher removed those schools' administrators from participant list. In the end, researchers reached eight independent pre-school principals, all of whom were employed in Van. The average duration of experience of the principals was 11.6 years, and all had been involved in a supervisory process on numerous occasions. There are 25 independent schools in Van, but only eight were available for this study. Table 3 represents participant characteristics.

Table 3
Participant Characteristics

Principals	Years of Experience	Number of Teachers	Number of Students
A1	11	10	190
A2	10	8	170
A3	14	8	170
A4	8	5	100
A5	12	14	260
A6	12	7	120
A7	12	12	200
A8	14	8	152

Data Collection

In order to scrutinize the new regulations related to supervision in pre-school education, the researcher conducted semi-structured interview with eight principals using an interview protocol that was designed based on related literature. The researcher had already carried out a similar research in which focus was on the supervisory process related to beginning pre-school teachers, during which several issues were detected in pre-school education. While the identified issues were specific to novice teachers, they were helpful in the construction of an interview protocol for both new and experienced teachers. The researcher determined a number of questions aimed at garnering in-depth information about the new regulations and their effect on the supervisory process in pre-school education in Turkey. Table 4 demonstrated examples of interview questions:

Table 4
Sample Questions of Interview Protocol

Why MONE has issued this new regulation?
Have you experienced problems during supervision?
How will you implement new regulation?
What is the reaction of teachers to the new regulation

The interview protocol was assessed for appropriateness by a primary education supervisor with 30 years of experience, and by a pre-school education principal with 13 years of experience, after which, interviews were conducted with the participating principals. Demographic information form was not prepared as the sample size quite small researcher asked demographic question beginning of the interview. The principals were asked about the implementation of the new regulations and the former supervisory process in pre-school education. All of the interviews took place in the participants' schools, where the researcher had the chance to observe the working conditions. While two of the principals allowed the interview to be recorded, the other six were reluctant, and so during those interviews, the researcher took notes. Interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes.

Data Analysis

Creswell defines a case study as the exploration of an issue through one or more cases within a bounded system, be it a setting or a context (Creswell, 2007, p. 73). Stake, Yin, and Meriam stand out as prominent researchers into the case study methodology since the 1980s (Creswell, 2007). The need for case studies stems from the desire to understand complex social phenomena, in that the case study method enables researchers to ascertain holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events. Similarly, in all qualitative researches, the case studies method best fits when 'how' or 'why' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events and when focus is on a real-life context (Yin, 2003).

Creswell (2007), describing what makes a research a case study, claims that the case being studied should be identified with its boundaries, and that data collection should involve extensive data sources. As the main aim of case study is to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the case in question, the context of the study should be described in detail.

Qualitative case studies are classified based on their size, such as whether they focus on individuals or groups of people; although case studies may also be classified according to the intent of the research, which can be instrumental, collective or multiple, or intrinsic. In an instrumental case study, the researcher focuses on one issue, and selects a bounded case in order to clarify this issue (Creswell, 2007). The current study utilized the instrumental case study approach, with the case being the principals' understanding and implementation of new regulations in the supervisory process in a pre-school setting.

This case is bounded by both time, having started immediately after MONE issued a new regulation on supervisory processes, and by context, being the accounts of principals who work only in independent schools of MONE. Data analysis in a qualitative research begins with the preparation and organization of the data, which is then categorized into themes through a process of coding, before being represented in figures, tables or narratives. This method is accepted in many books on qualitative research related to data analysis (Cresswell, 2007), and is the method adopted in this study to reduce the interviews into meaningful segments. First of all, the researchers made a fair copy of the noted interviews, after which the two audio recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim for data analysis. As Patton (1980) stated, qualitative data analyses are voluminous, and there is a lack of consensus on the most appropriate method of making sense of page upon page of interviews and files of field notes. That said, reading the transcripts several times gives researchers a level of insight into the data before separating it into themes and categories. Within this process, key concepts may make themselves apparent to the researcher, who should write short memos in the margin, as the first step of the initial data analysis (Creswell, 2007). The following step is the key part of the qualitative data analysis in which coding and categorizing takes place. This study attempted to investigate new regulation of supervising process in early education, however there was not enough predetermined code for such an analysis, since MONE announced the entry into force of new regulations on 25 May, 2014, and data collection started in early June. Open coding, as used in this study, refers to the initial phase of the coding process in which the intention is to break down the raw data into more manageable set of smaller categories and themes. A detailed word-by-word analysis is carried out to uncover the meanings contained within the interviews (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Coding details is seen in Table 5.

Table 5
Coding Themes and Categories

Themes	Categories	Codes
Insufficient supervision	Lack of supervisors	Single shot observation
		Short time evaluation
		No multiple source of data
	Lack of pre-school education background	Lack of knowledge on pre-school education Unfamiliarity to pre-school education
Inspection not Guidance	Judgement on performance	Feeling uncomfortable and nervous No guidance and training Relief when it ended Finding shortfalls No feedback Teacher complained Insulting teachers
Primary Schools	Lack of pre-school education background	Lack of knowledge Lack of guidance
	Overcrowded schools	Isolation ignorance
Implementation of New Regulations	Easy supervision in independent school	Small size of school Close relation
	Frequently changing regulation	No reaction from teacher

In order to ensure reliability a senior pre-service pre-school education teacher coded each statement made by the principals in reference to the new regulations. After that, researcher and second coder compared their coding and inter coder reliability ended with .88. Inter coder agreement was calculated with the following formula:

$$\text{Reliability of coding: } \frac{\text{Number of coding}}{\text{Total number of segments coded}}$$

Finally, a narrative description of the experience was made using clustered themes, and the meanings of the case were constructed. For confidentiality, the participants were designated A1 to A8, and the most representative quotations were selected.

Findings

Insufficient Supervision

All of the principals agreed that the previous supervision process had not function as it was supposed to. First of all, there were an insufficient number of primary education supervisors in Turkey, meaning that class visits made by the supervisors lasted less than an hour, and all of their judgments about the performance of the teachers were based on that single shot observation. The principals stated that education was an ongoing process, and should be evaluated based on multiple sources of data: '*The teachers were working for 5–6 months, and then all their efforts were evaluated in an hour. This raised many reactions'* (A3).

The supervisors' lack of knowledge of pre-school education sometimes resulted in tragicomic situations. Primary education supervisors are mostly have primary education training and work experience, and so their skills are suited to the guidance and evaluation of primary education schools and teachers. All of the principals stated that this unfamiliarity with pre-school education caused countless problems, in that the supervisors were unaware of in what they were in charge, as one principals expressed: *Once, the supervisors called me before coming and asked me what they were supposed to supervise. They said, 'Could you tell me the basics of the pre-school education supervision process?*' (A2)

Inspection not Guidance

All of the principals emphasized how the teachers felt uncomfortable about the supervisory process. Although the purpose of supervising is defined as to provide guidance and training, the teachers felt like they were being interrogated by the supervisors. Both principals and teachers all voiced negative feelings about the supervisory process, and expressed relief when it ended. All of the principals mentioned the conflicts between the supervisors' expectations and pre-school education requirements. In general, the primary education supervisors paid more attention to constructional deficiencies rather than giving feedback about educational practices. *'The supervisor asked us to form an 'Honor and Great Turkish Ancestors corner', which is inappropriate for pre-school education.'* (A2)

All of the participants complained that the purpose of supervision seemed to be to identify shortfalls in both the teachers and the school. '*It is supposed to be a guiding process, but principals seemed to be more interested in finding problems in the teachers' classes.*' (A4)

When the supervisors found even a minor deficiency, they did not miss the chance to hold that deficiency against the teachers: '*The supervisor found that a date that had been written incorrectly, and insulted the teacher in front of the students. Teacher cried a lot, and even wanted to resign*' (A2)

Primary Schools

The new regulations may result in more problems in primary pre-school education classes as the principals will need to supervise and guide pre-school education teachers with the limited knowledge that they possess. One of the principals mentioned the isolation associated with pre-school education in primary schools: '*Pre-school classes have always been ignored in primary schools, and the new regulations may increase the loneliness of teachers. Primary school principals have neither the time nor knowledge to guide and supervise pre-school teachers.*' (A7)

Another principal indicated that there will not be much change for teachers working in primary schools since primary schools principals' educational background is quite similar with primary education supervisors. *'Nothing has changed for teachers working in primary schools because their principals are also from different branches. How principals having BA degree from geography would guide or supervise pre-school education teachers?'.* (A6)

Implementation of New Regulations

At the time of this study, none of the participating principals had any experience with the new regulations, since the data for the study was collected immediately after MONE announced the changes to the supervisory process in pre-school education. Although all of the principals agreed that primary education supervisors should not enter pre-school classes or supervise or guide teachers, they expressed particular concerns at being the only providers of supervision to teachers. A8 anticipated a number of disadvantages of the supervisory process: *'The power*

of the principals is increased [under the new regulations], *which may lead to a misuse of power. Besides, teachers may use flattery with the principals to take advantage of their new position.'* A8

Some of the principals (A4, A1, A3, A5, A7) stated that the MONE supervisors were so busy that they were able to visit school only every two or three years. Supervisors' visits put pressure on the teachers, and those visits were not deemed sufficiently long for the evaluation of teacher performance. The largest school in the study employed 14 teachers. The principals expressed that providing guidance and support to teachers did not require much effort: '*Our school is small, and it is easy to guide and supervise teachers in such small schools. We have close relationships, and we can intervene immediately when any problems arise.'* (A4)

Legislation in MONE changes on a regular basis, and teachers become desensitized towards those changes, although they are closely linked to their professional life. The principals summarized the reason for the low level of interest among teachers in the new supervisory regulations: '*Teachers gave no reaction. They show no interest due to the frequency at which legislation changes.*' A1

Discussion and Conclusion

The job description of a primary education supervisor includes guidance and in-service training, supervision and assessment, investigation, and the examination of teachers, principals and schools in order to ensure the creation of efficient learning environments and to achieve better teaching standards (MONE, 2010). More precisely, the wide range of roles and duties of primary school supervisors aim at achieving the following goals within the national education system in coordination with teachers and supervisors: to follow and keep teachers and principals informed about the latest advances and professional publications; to contribute to educational practice consistent with the law and principles of the Turkish education system; to examine physical learning environments and identify needs; and to carry out research into educational issues such as the school enrollment problems of students, maintaining school environment relations and raising the efficiency of school personnel. Based on this wide range of roles and duties, primary school supervisors would indicate that

they would be a significant reference group for the evaluation of the existing structure of schooling in Turkey (Balcı, 2011), however the principals involved in this study did not mentioned the supervisors' role of informing teachers or carrying out research to improve educational standards in schools. The unfamiliarity of supervisors with early education did more to hinder the teachers rather than giving them the chance to benefit from the supervision process.

Although supervisors are supposed to guide rather than inspect teachers, in truth, the supervisory process does not function to support teachers. Teachers in general feel that they are questioned and monitored, while principals summarize the goal of the entire supervisory process as being to find shortfalls in both the school and teachers. School inspections are an important means in providing legitimacy to the school's operations as conformity to inspection standards is considered to be the criterion of good performance. Yet, such an external quality management and assessment systems may challenge the intrinsic value systems of professionals and will motivate a mechanism through which extrinsic values are given greater weight (Ehren, Perryman, & Shackleton, 2015). When principals start to guide teachers supervising process would become more efficient. All of the principals were in favor of new regulations, and agreed to collaborate with the teachers to provide a better level of education to young children. Their approach is parallel to Heikka and Hujala's (2013) distributed leadership approach in which traditional leadership role perception has evolved shared leadership practices to foster change and development. There is an awareness of a need to develop distributed leadership to change. Such a change may mean that leadership is no longer the work of one person, and this could lessen the managerial work and allow more time and resources to be allocated to the encouraging of pedagogical leadership through the support of both directors and teachers in PE schools. The more people share a common vision or passion, the more they bond together in a team or to an organization (Pemberton, 2009). Given that teachers and principals share a common goal of providing children with a qualified educational experience, the teachers' relationship with the principals is likely to be more positive than with supervisors. Turan (2016) suggests in-service training for school principals for more rigorous supervision in which teachers receive guidance and training. He further recommends to determine standards for monitoring and evaluation of teacher activities in classroom. When these standards are applied in schools each schools and teachers will receive score based on their performance in class with children. Schools should

also published each teachers score on their website so that parents can make their school and teacher preferences based on those scores. In this way both teachers' and principals' motivation would be increased in making effort to improve educational standards in their school.

Although the current study has addressed some previously unaddressed issues related to supervision process in pre-school education in Turkey. It also has certain limitations. First of all, the present study was conducted with the principals working in Van which is located eastern part of Turkey. This region is highly differed from Turkey. As such, findings of this study might be specific to that region. Besides, sample size of this study is quite small. Another potential limitation of the study is that data collection was limited to interviews, as observing beginning supervision process or investigating supervision documents may yield more a comprehensive understanding of the supervision process in pre-school education.

Suggestions

Independent schools contain only pre-school education classes rather than primary grades, while primary schools comprise of K-8 classes. Some primary schools have more than 1,000 students, and generally have only one PE class, resulting in the increased isolation of PE teachers. This lack of peer support is accompanied by a lack of support from the principal in primary schools; Meaning that nothing has changed for teachers working in primary pre-school classes, since in their schools, the principals tend to be from teaching branches other than early education. Accordingly, teachers in primary schools are still left on their own, and receive no feedback, constructive criticism or information. It is not possible to establish independent schools all over the country or to provide a physical separation between early education and primary schools, and so it is better to inform primary education principals about the aims, needs and requirements of early education. Some of the participating principals were influenced by the belief of the societal movement that early education was not optional, but rather essential in a child's life, and so attributed more importance to early education. Teachers working with those principals were more able to carry out their teaching practice with more comfort (Akdağ, 2012). Taking this into account, MONE could increase

the number of independent schools, or even in the long run, pre-school education may only be provided in independent schools for the sake of children.

The nature of the teaching profession is indeed demanding due to the responsibility of raising future generations (Krecic & Grmek, 2005). When teachers are under severe pressure to meet the diverse needs of children when budget cuts have resulted in material shortages, and when teachers are expected to assume greater decision-making roles, visits by primary school supervisors to inspect them places an additional burden on them. In this sense, teachers would feel more comfortable, free and empowered if it was the responsibility of their principals to supervise and guide them.

The Turkish educational system is highly centralized and is governed by complex legislation that involves a heavy load of paper work in which teachers struggle to learn and navigate through the bureaucracy. Akdağ (2014) states that teachers need someone to guide them through MONE's complicated bureaucracy, legislation and paper work. Moreover, they also need guidance in the form of practical information for the management of their classroom activities. A responsive principal with a pre-school education background could meet all of the needs of teachers. All principals are happier with the new regulations, having experienced several problems with the primary education supervisors under the former system. In summary, by focusing on the multidimensional aspects of the supervisory process, principals would be able to carry out both their own roles, and those of the supervisors' The Turkish National educational system has seen a number of recent fundamental changes; however this has not resulted in any noticeable improvements. These findings may provide insight to teachers, supervisors and principals with an interest in increasing the quality of schooling in Turkey.

References

Akbaba, S. (2002). Öğretmen yetiştirmede mesleki rehberliğin yeri ve önemi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 155-156,* 21-31.

Akdağ, Z. (2012). *Beginning early childhood education teachers' career perceptions, expectations, concerns and their experiences in public schools* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Akdağ, Z. (2014). Supporting new early childhood education teachers in public schools. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 10*(1), 35-48.

Arora, S. B. (2013). *Leadership in Early Childhood Special Education* (Unpublished Masters' Thesis). George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.

Balcı, F.A. (. 2011). Metaphorical images of school: school perceptions of primary education supervisors. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 44*, 51–70.

Başaran, İ. E. (2000). *Eğitim yönetimi*. Ankara: Feryal Matbaası.

Budak, Ş. (2009, Haziran) İlköğretim müfettişlerinin okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarının denetimine ilişkin görüşleri, 1'inci Uluslararası Katılımlı Denetim Sempozyumu'nda sunulan bildiri, Ankara.

Bush, T. (2012). Leadership in early childhood education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 41*(1) 3–4.

Büte, M., & Balcı, A (2010). Bağımsız anaokulu yöneticilerinin bakış açısından okul yönetimi süreçlerinin işleyişi ve sorunlar. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 16*(4), 485-509.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dağlıoğlu, E. (2008). Ülkemizde okul öncesi eğitim. *Eğitime Bakış Dergisi*, *12*, 45-53.

Ehren, M., Perryman, J., & Shackleton, N. (2015). Setting expectations for good education: How Dutch school inspections drive improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 26*(2), 296-327.

Fleming, J., & Love, M. (2003). A Systemic Change Model for Leadership, Inclusion, and Mentoring (SLIM). *Early Childhood Education Journal, 31*(1), 53-57.

Gürkan, T. (2006). *Okul öncesi eğitim denetim rehber kitabı, okul öncesi eğitimde denetim ve teftiş ilkeleri*. İstanbul: YA-PA Yayın Pazarlama.

Haktanır, G. (2008). Okul öncesi öğretmeninin niteliği. *Eğitime Bakış Dergisi, 12*, 22-40

Haser, C., Star, J., 2009. Change in beliefs after first-year of teaching: The case of Turkish national curriculum context. *International Journal of Educational Development 29*(3), 293–302.

Heikka, J., & Hujala, E. (2013) Early childhood leadership through the lens of distributed leadership, *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 21*(4), 568-580.

Karadeniz, O., & Ulusoy, M. (2015). 4+ 4+ 4 eğitim sistemi ile sosyal bilgiler eğitiminde ortaya çıkan kaotik durumlar hakkında sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin görüşleri. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi, 5*(1), *99-108.*

Kaya, Y. K. (1991). *Eğitim yönetimi*, Set Ofset Matbaacılık, Ankara.

Krecic, M. J., & Grmek, M. I. (2005). The reasons students choose teaching professions. *Educational Studies, 31*(3), 265-274.

Leithwood, K.A., Jantzi, D., Earl, L., Watson, N., & Fullan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership for large-scale reform. *School Leadership and Management, 24*(1). 57-79.

MONE (Ministry of National Education) (2010). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ilköğretim müfettişleri başkanlıkları yönetmeliği* (Ministry of National Education primary education supervisor regulation) Retrieved March 22, 2014 from http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/55.html

MONE (2014a). National education statistics - 2013-2014, formal education. Retrieved December 08, 2014, from http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/www/resmi-istatistikler/icerik/64

MONE (2014b). *2014- year replacement needs schedule of primary school supervisions.* Retrieved May 08, 2014, from http://personel.meb.gov.tr

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Pemberton, P. D. (2009). Perception of leadership in early childhood education: Supervisors Speak (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Nipissing University, North Bay, ON.

Resmi Gazete (2014). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı rehberlik ve denetim başkanlığı ile maarif müfettişleri başkanlıkları yönetmeliği. Retrieved April 05, 2017, from http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/main.aspx?home=http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2014/05/20140524.htm&main=http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2014/05/20140524.htm

Sabancı, A., & Ömeroğlu, M. (2013). Views of independent kindergarten teachers about inspection done by province inspectors. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 5*(3), 685-700.

Schomburg, R. L. (1999). Leadership development in early childhood education. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education,* 20(2), 215-219.

Strauss, A., J. Corbin (1990) *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. London: Sage

Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2000). *Supervision that improves teaching: Strategies and techniques* (2nd ed.). California: Corwin Press.

Şahin, B., & Dostoğlu, N. (2014). Evaluation of kindergarten group rooms in the context of size: Children and teacher's perspective in Turkey. *European Journal of Contemporary Education, 10*(4), 253-264.

Wa Ho, D. C. (2011). Identifying leadership roles for quality in early childhood education programmes. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice, 14*(1), 47-59.

Tok, T., N., (2013). Türkiye'de eğitim denetmenlerinin profili. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 33, 119-138.*

Turan, F. (2016). Okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarında eğitim öğretim faaliyetlerinin denetimi. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences, 7*(23), 94-119.

Uğurlu, C. T., & Abdurrezzak, S. (2016). Etkili okul ve okul liderliğine ilişkin öğretmen görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 22*(3), 401-428. doi: 10.14527/kuey.2016.016

Yavuz, M. (2010). Effectiveness of supervisions conducted by primary education supervisors according to school principals' evaluations. *The Journal of Educational Research, 103*, 371–378

Yin, Robert K. (2003). *Case study research, design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.

Yücel, H. (2009), Okul öncesi eğitimi öğretmenlerinin denetimi (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sivas.