

A PROJECT FOR DECENTRALIZING THE EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF TURKEY*

Ali YILMAZ**

ÖZET

Bu çalışma dört bölümden oluşmaktadır. Birinci bölümde, Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türk Eğitim sisteminin merkezi yapısı tarihsel süreç içerisinde ele alınmış, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'ün yeni Devlet için belirlemiş olduğu "Batılılaşma" bağlanunda Türk Eğitim sisteminin yapılandırılmasının temelini oluşturan düşünce irdelenmiştir. Eğitim sistemimizin bugünkü durumunun betimlenmesi çalışmanın ikinci bölümünü oluşturmuştur. Üçüncü bölümde ise; mevcut sistemin günümüz şartlarına uygun olarak yeniden organizasyonuna ilişkin bir model önerisi getirilmiştir. Bu bölümde önerilen modelin uygulama stratejileri dördüncü bölümde tartışılmış ve çalışma "sonuç" bölümü ile bitirilmiştir.

ABSTRACT

This study is composed of four sections. In the first section, central structure of the Republic era of Turkish educational system is considered in light of the historical perspective, and Westernization, which was determined to be the dynamic of the New State by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. In the second section, the current centralized structure of the system is discussed. A model for restructuring the present system to meet the current requirements is presented in the third section. Strategies for implementing the model, suggested in the previous section, are considered in the last part of the study.

I. History of The Turkish Educational Organization in the Era of Republic

A- Introduction

The present Turkish Educational System, which was established in 1923 based on the French system, is highly centralized one. The adoption of central control was not without reason. In order for the new republic to begin modernization and to catch up with the advanced countries of the West, it was absolutely necessary for an enlightened modernized central government to exercise control from the top in the enforcement of modernization in regard not only to education policies but also to all other state policies.

*Bu makale yazarın 1989 yılında Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Newyork Başkonsolosluğu Eğitim Ataşeliğine aynı başlık ile sunmuş olduğu geniş bir çalışmadan özetlenerek çıkarılmıştır.

**Yrd. Doç. Dr., 19 Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

However; today there is no reason to have such a centralized organization. The current centralization of education has been subject to criticism by some Turkish educators as well as by many of the visiting foreign advisors to the Ministry (Karagozlu, 1986).

From many points of view, the system should be decentralized. At least the local people should have chance to regulate and develop their schools by the educational boards. Indeed, especially in the last decade of this century, the increasing pressure from the local communities, compounded by increasing reform pressure from educators, has played a part in forcing the central authorities of the Turkish educational organization to decentralize the system and to increase community involvement in the local schools.

On this paper, only a few aspects of this matter are discussed. First of all, the history and missions of the Turkish educational organization is briefly explained. In the second part of the project, the present formal structure of the Turkish educational organization is introduced. A proposed change description of the Turkish educational system is identified in the third part of the project. And, finally, the implementation strategies are pointed out at the fourth stage of the project paper.

B- A Brief Historical Overview of the Turkish Educational Organization

Prior to the establishment of the new Turkish state in 1923, education in Turkey had proven inadequate. Not only was there widespread poverty and illiteracy, but there was also a great deal of apathy on the part of the people toward any educational improvement. During the last several decades of the Ottoman Empire and the very beginning years of the new state, educational provisions were negligible, and the illiteracy rate of the people exceeded 90 percent. In order to pave the way for a new state and a new society, it was necessary to transform the entire system, to provide a more effective administrative understanding, to change the organizational structures and curriculums, to establish educational authority, and to provide better and equal educational opportunity for the people.

Modernism through reformism has been an activating ideal of the new Turkish national state, which emerged after the Kemalist revolution of the first quarter of the twentieth century. Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and the Turkish leaders believed that the new state's educational system should be something different from the old something that grows out of our own nation (Karal, 1961). They conceived of education as the most important foundation. According to them, education makes a nation either free, famous and

enlightened, or poor and under the domination of others. They established a modern, secular and nationalistic system of schooling instead of the Ottoman's Islamic school system. Islamic and private system of schools, and essentially Islamic content and mode of thinking were transformed into a state, secular system with emphasis upon modern subjects and modern pedagogy. In fact, a transition and preparatory period was experienced with the need to adjust to the westernization and western civilization started during the last years of the Ottoman Empire. The foundation of the Turkish Republic on October 29, 1923 led to entry into the chamber of western civilization and culture, and western type institutions and elements adopted began slowly to form the Republican combination by merging with Turkish ones (Kazamias, 1969).

In seeking to modernize the educational institutions and especially modes of thinking and behaving, Ataturk and the Turkish leaders were introduced the centralized French educational system. At the beginning years of the modernization of the educational system, Ataturk and his companions looked at to the West, especially the French educational system for inspiration and guidance. Structure of the organization and control of the education, the curriculums and many of the ideas and practices of the educational system have been borrowed from the French educational system. In other words, established in the earlier years of the twentieth century, the Turkish educational system has been based on the French educational system.

Centralization of education was also suggested by John Dewey who was invited by the Turkish Government in 1924 to help the Turkish educators to reorganize the educational system. His suggestion was: "...it is obvious that in a country which has not had a general system of public education and where aim is to develop a system, in fact and not just on paper, of universal and compulsory public education where most of the communities are still ignorant as to the kind of education, and of teachers required, the Ministry of Education must take the lead" (Dewey, 1960, pp.4).

On this aspects; today's organizational structure of the Turkish educational system was established about some 70 years ago based on the French educational system. During these passing 70 years, there have been several changes in the organizational structure but in general, the fundamental structure has been preserved. Indeed, the present Turkish educational system is a clear example of a highly centralized structure where policy making and school administration are conducted and regulated at the ministerial level.

II. The Present Structural Framework of the Turkish Educational Organization

A- The Present Organizational Structure and Administration of Education

Both the current Constitution of the Turkish Republic and the Law of Unification of Instruction provided that all educational institutions are to be placed under the supervision and control of the state. The Ministry of National Education is the only executive power to supervise and control the educational institutions all over the country. As in most countries the Ministry of National Education remains the peak of the educational organization in Turkey. It is responsible for almost every type and level of education ranging from pre-primary, primary, secondary, vocational and technical education, religious education, higher education to non-formal education. That is, the power, and therefore the decision-making process, is devolved on the Ministry, particularly on the central organization of the Ministry itself. The Ministry is responsible for policy formulation, execution and review of policies on education. Preparation of development plans and projects for educational services is also its responsibilities. The Ministry provides broad policy decisions and the central organization, the province level organizations, and the local school level organizations are responsible for implementing these decisions. As an exception, the Ministry of Defense has right to open its own schools and to provide policy decisions. But still the ministry is responsible jointly with the Ministry of National Education for preparing the courses of study.

As could be seen, the organization of the Ministry is highly centralized and seems to suffer from the following problems:

1. Delegation of authority is not clearly defined, in practice, it is up to the Minister to decide how much authority will be delegated to lower levels.

2- Throughout the system, authority is not commensurate with responsibility.

3- Because the organization is heavily centralized, routine work and the decision-making process usually take a long time. Every bit of paper work must be signed by either the Minister himself or one of the undersecretaries.

4- Even though many branches of education require a high degree of specialization, there are no provisions to employ "specialist" in the educational administration, or anywhere within the Ministry of Education for that matter. Every person in the organization is considered to be a teacher,

and is usually paid accordingly.

5- Educational administration itself may be considered as a specialty. But, at the higher levels of the hierarchy, one usually finds not specialists but people who had experience at some lower levels of the system.

6- So far no serious research has been done to study the deficiencies of the administrative system; it has simply developed by trial and error.

7- The Constitution states that the responsibilities of cabinet ministers must be defined by an act. No such act has yet been prepared. The Minister has every authority on educational matters, just as other cabinet ministers have every authority on matters related to their ministries.

8- The constitution also states that the organization of each ministry has to be defined by a special act. Such act has not yet been prepared. (O.E.C.D., 1965, pp. 100).

1- Organizational Structure

The Law About Organization of Education (Law No. 789) defined the structure and functions of the central and local authorities and laid out certain provisions concerning the relations between the several units of the administrative arrangements. The present organizational structure of the Turkish educational system was established by this law. The law establishes:

1. A central Ministry and its General Directorates which are formed based on the types and levels of education and equip the Ministry with strong power and authority over the whole system of education;
2. A Board of Education as an independent, scientific, and professional overall policy making body;
3. Thirteen Regional Directorates of Education to which several provinces of the region are attached;
4. A Directorate of National Education in each province attached to the Governorship of the province; and
5. The types of schools at each level of education (The Law About Organization of Education. No.789).

Naturally, the structure established by the Law has been reorganized several times in order to adjust it to the emerging perceived needs as the system has developed. Some new departments were added, some were dropped, some were merged or some departments were divided into different ones. But, anyway centralized characteristics of the administration and departmentalized structures of the organization have remained.

The current structure of educational administration is a system that provides administrative supports for the implementation of educational ser-

vices. It consist of; 1) the central organization, 2) province level organizations, and, 3) local school level organizations (Kaya, 1984).

1.3- Central Organization:

As previously mentioned, the administration and control of Turkish education has been centered in the Ministry of National Education. The central organization of the Ministry, located in the capital, carries out most of the administrative responsibilities of the Ministry. It is headed by the Minister who is also a member of the Parliament and the Cabinet of Ministers. The undersecretariat conducts most of the administrative affairs of the Ministry. Unlike any other ministry, the Ministry of Education has two undersecretariats. This, in itself, creates some administrative difficulties. The Undersecretariat established some of its own service departments, parallel to those which were already existing in the central organization, such as the Board of Supervision, Accounting, Civil Defense, etc.

Established as an independent, scientific and professional body in 1976 by Law No. 789, the Board of Education and Instruction is another administrative body in the central organization. It has a research and planning section among several others.

The commission of General Directors was established in 1941, by Law No. 4113, as a coordinating body among the departments of the Ministry. It has continued to work as an overall administrative policy-making and decision body. The members of this commission are the General Directors of Primary Education, Secondary Education, Higher Education, Teacher Education, Private Education, In-Service Education, Fine Arts, Health and School Hygiene, Religious Education, Personnel, External Relations, and Physical Education.

Established in 1933 by Law No. 2287, Convention of National Education (Shura) is a large advisory body for the Board of Education and Instruction represented by all related institutions. It is supposed to meet at least once every three years.

In addition to these offices, there are a number of department heads and head of sections in the central organization of education.

1.2- Province Level Organizations

The governor of each of the sixty-seven provinces, who appointed by the central government, performs as the representative of the Minister of National Education as well as other Ministers. Educational organization at the province level is headed by the governor, and he or she is responsible to the Ministry of National Education regarding educational services in his or her province.

The second administrative department at province level organization is the Directorate of Education of province. It is headed by the Director of Education and he or she has several assistant directors in the department of education in the province according to its size. In addition, Director of Education of Province has an assistant officer in each town of the province. That is, each province is divided into sub-provinces (districts) called Kaza and each kaza has an Educational Office connected with the Directorate of Education of Province.

Another administrative body at the province level is the Education Council of Province that members are elected by the people over the province. People over the age of 20 have right to vote for the members of that council.

1.3- Local School Level Organizations:

The tight bureaucratic control over schools is typified further in the duties and powers of the local school administrator, school principal (Kaya, 1984). As a school administrator, the principal has two, three or more assistant principals to assist him.

Teachers Committee of each school is the other administrative body of local school level organizations. All the teachers of school are members of this committee. In addition to principal, assistant principals and teachers committee every school has to have a Teachers-Parents Association which is elected by the local people.

To summarize, the Turkish educational organization is divided three main parts which are the central organization, province level organizations, and local school level organizations. It is essential that there is a definitive hierarchical co-ordination among them. Non of them is independent regarding educational administration.

2- Administration Of Education

As explained earlier there is a centralized administrative pattern in Turkey. There are three levels administration in an absolute hierarchy. On this part of the paper, each level of administration will be re-examined according to administrative duties and responsibilities of their administrators.

2.1- Administrators of the central organization:

The minister, undersecretaries and their assistants, general directors and their assistants, department heads and their assistants, and ministry inspectors are high level administrators at the central organization.

2.1.1- The Minister: Being the member of the Parliament and the Cabinet of the Ministers, the minister is only executive head of education in

Turkey. Since the system is very centralized, the minister makes all final decisions affecting the administration of all the schools in the country. He/she must sign all orders, even those pertaining to relatively minor matters including personnel appointment for every level of educational institutions, financial management, and decision-making are his/ her most initial responsibilities. In order to carry out these responsibilities, he/she is advised by the undersecretaries, the Board of Education and Instruction, and the Commission of General Directors.

2.1.2- Undersecretaries: The Ministry of National Education, unlike any other ministry, has two undersecretaries who carry out most of the administrative and financial affairs of the ministry. Although the undersecretaries and the general directors carry out almost all the administrative functions of the ministry, the minister's approval in all cases is mandatory. One of the two undersecretaries is responsible for general education affairs all over the country, and internal and external affairs of the Ministry. The second one is responsible for all types of vocational and technical schools, teacher training institutions, and universities. To provide co-ordination among the ministry and other ministries, the parliament, and to give information about education to the General Assemble or the Commission of Ministries are his/her responsibilities. The two permanent undersecretaries theoretically are not political appointees but career educators.

2.1.3- Board of Education and Instruction: Consisting of six members, the Board of Education and Instruction prepares courses of study for all schools for submission to the Convention of National Education called Shura examines textbooks, and passes judgement on proposed legislation. In general, its duties are to examine and report to the minister any measure for the improvement of the educational system. It is an independent, scientific and professional body responsible for making all policy decisions and spiritually controlling the system (Bursalioglu, 1976). The board may not fully have the characteristics of an independent, scientific, and professional body but has performed very important functions in the process of overall policy-making.

2.1.4- The Commission of General Directors: The 12 General Directors of the ministry are permanent members of this commission. The commission considers matters relating to the administration of schools, and is especially responsible for the appointment and transfer of teachers and administrators in all kinds and levels of educational institutions. In addition, each general director is responsible for the routine works of his/her directorates such as education and instruction, administration, supervision, disci-

pline, communication between the central organization and local organizations, relationship among teacher-student-other staff, collection of statistical data related to the department.ect.. In order to carry out these duties, every general director has a number of assistant general directors, department heads and branch officers to assist the general director.

2.1.5- Convention of National Education (Shura): The Convention of National Education (in shortened form, called Shura) is made up of high officials in the ministry, rectors of the twenty-eight universities, deans of the colleges, heads of the educational departments of the universities, a number of ministry and elementary inspectors; school principals, teachers, and other specialists nominated by the minister. The total number of Shura members varies, but in general it exceeds three hundred. The committee discusses and advises on all matters of educational policy, especially on curriculum questions and school regulations. Since most of its members are career educators, this convention plays an important role in educational administration especially relating policy-making and curriculum planning. On the other hand, this convention is not a direct administrative body, but in general, an advisory one. Although it is supposed to sit at least once every three years, so far twelve convention have been held since 1933.

2.2- Administrators of Province Level Organizations:

The province level administrators of the Ministry of National Education are the Governor of the province, the Director of Education at province and his/her assistants, elementary inspectors, the representators of the Province Educational Board, and Educational Officers for sub-provinces (districts).

*** 2.2.1- The Governor:** The governor of province is the chief administrator in the province, but he or she is powerful only to the extent that the respective ministries in the central government delegate power to the local governments. Thus, the governor of any province is a representator of the Ministry of Education. Theoretically, therefore, the governor of the province is responsible for all educational activities in all over the province. One exception is higher education institutions which are directly under the administration of the central organization. The governor is assisted and advised by the director of education of the province, and the province education board. He/she evaluate the educational endeavors at the province through elementary inspectors.

2.2.2- The Director of Education: Appointed by the Minister, the Director of Education is responsible to the governor for all primary, secondary, religious, and vocational and technical education at the province.

Having been responsible for implementing the decisions, made in the Ministry, the Director of Education is a superior competent officer for coordinating, decision-making, planning and evaluating of education. In order to carry out these responsibilities, the director of education assisted by the province education board, three assistant directors at the province, and a number of education officers in sub-provinces.

Because of the centralized nature of the educational administration, the powers of the governor and the director of education are rather limited. They have no voice in the curricula, they cannot hire or fire the teachers and even some small details of educational administration are often determined by others from the Ministry of Education.

2.2.3- Educational Board: As an advisory body at the province level, the Educational Board has four essential and four accessory members elected by the people over the age of twenty. This body do not play direct role over educational administration, but advises and assists the governor and the director of education of the province. However, this body can be considered as an aspect of participatory management at the provincial level. On the other hand, as pointed out by Kaya (1984), generally the members of this board are managed by various local political units.

2.2.4- Directors of Districts: As mentioned earlier, each province is further divided into sub-provinces. In each sub-province there is an educational officer called Director of District appointed by the ministry and responsible to the provincial director of education for the administration of education.

2.3- Administrators of Local School Level Organizations: School principals, teacher committees, and teachers-parent associations involve school administration at the local level.

2.3.1- School Principals: The responsibilities of the school principal encompass administration of the affairs of the school and supervision of classroom instruction, but these duties are minutely prescribed by regulations issued by the central office. The director is authorized to inspect classes and the work of the teachers. He/she administers the finances of the school. He/she must hold meetings with teachers to discuss matters of school policy.

2.3.2- Teachers Committees: To establish the teachers committee in the school is compulsory for every school principal. All teachers are its member, and they participate in decision-making in schools through the teachers committee.

2.3.3- Teachers-Parents Associations: The members of this body is

selected by the parents and guardians of the pupils. This body is an advisory component for school administration.

III. Change Description

Since the system of schooling is closely related to the political administration in Turkey, it will be necessary to introduce briefly the structure of political administration of the country.

A- Political Administration of Turkey

Turkey has a population of a little more than 55 million according to the 1985 census, an area about the size of the states of Texas and Louisiana combined, and is administratively divided into 67 provinces called Vilayet. Each province is managed by the governor (vali) who appointed by the Ministry of Interior. The provincial government is composed of a number of directorates, such as director of education, director of health and social welfare, director of agriculture, etc. The governor has vast power of jurisdiction over the affairs within his/her province and responsible to the Minister of Interior.

Each province is divided into districts (kaza), which are headed by district governors (Kaymakam) who are appointed by the central government. The Ministry of National Education is represented by the Directorate of National Education in a province or district which basically has broad control over elementary schools a limited responsibility over secondary schools, and no right to control over higher education institutions in the district.

B. Necessities for Decentralization of Education in Turkey

As could be understood from the structure of political administration, essentially, neither the province level administration, nor the district level organization is fully equipped with the rights of control and evaluation of education. But the Ministry of National Education is the only executive power to organize, supervise and control the educational institutions all over the country. It carries out its task directly or through the directors of national education in the 67 provinces. Thus, the administrative organizational structure of the educational system in Turkey is based on centralization. Personnel of any rank, except the Minister, do not seem to have much freedom in relation to the educational practices within their jurisdiction. This is especially true for teachers who are at the lowest rank of this hierarchy.

Centralized system of educational administration tend to control the schools through the authority of the state. However, it is not possible in practice for a central government to take full responsibility for carrying out administrative affairs in such an area as education in which a large portion

of activities concerns the everyday life of citizens. It is inevitable that such matters come to be handled by an administrative organization that is close to the citizens. In addition, as Fantini (1973) pointed out, decentralized systems are prone to exercise leadership and guidance in stimulating local authorities to provide adequate educational facilities.

Suggesting the centralization of education of Turkey in 1924, John Dewey warned the Turkish educators by the following:

"...on the other hand, there is danger that too much and too highly centralized activity on the part of the Ministry will stifle local interest and initiative, prevent local communities taking the responsibilities which they should take; and produce too uniform a system of education, not flexibly adopted to the varying needs of different localities, urban, rural, maritime, and to different types of rural communities and different environments and different industries, such as pastoral, grain-growing, cotton, fruit, etc.; there is also danger that any centralized system will become bureaucratic, arbitrary and tyrannical in action, and given to useless records, requiring and filling useless reports from others, and in general what is termed in French 'papasserie' and in English 'red-tape'" (1960, pp.7).

As Bursalioglu (1976)) pointed out, centralization of education which was the most needed step taken toward the development of national education has now been subject to criticism by some Turkish educators as well as by many of the visiting foreign advisors to the Ministry, because it has started to act as an impediment to the trying of new ideas and ways in education. On the other hand, while everything is rapidly changing, it is meaningless to keep stationary the centralized characteristics of the Turkish educational system. If economic, political, and social contexts change rapidly, educational organizations as well as other organizations will change rapidly and routinely. Indeed, the most stable facts about organizations, including schools, and all the other kinds of educational institutions, is that they change. The people in organizations, the purposes of organizations, the environment of organizations the technologies and methodologies used by organizations rapidly change. In essence, change in existing organization is vital and necessary not only to meet the needs of the people in the organization but also to ensure organizational survival as well.

In general, centralized administration is one of the most clear characteristic of authoritarian governments. In other words, a country having an authoritarian regime usually develops a highly centralized system of educational administration, while a country having a federative, liberative or democratic type of government usually allows a considerable degree of freedom to local areas and exercises a minimum of administrative authority over them. The democratic form of government existing in Turkey seems to suggest a decentralized type of educational administration.

C- Revision of the Organizational Structure and Administration of Education

As outlined above, present educational administration in Turkey is an affair of the state. The current educational administration system is remarkably centralized and organized in subordination to general administration of the country. For those reasons, which were discussed earlier, our idea on this paper is that the school education administration in Turkey should be organized on a local or decentralized basis. However, it is fair to say that in a sense, this centrally controlled system of educational administration is very efficient in raising the standards of education in Turkey. In addition, a sense of local or public responsibility for education is not adequately developed, and an attitude of dependence on the central authority is emerged. These facts might be seen as barriers to the intended changes. But, on the other hand, By suggesting a change on the administrative structure, we do not mean that the present organizational structure of educational administration ought to be completely cancelled, but it should be reviewed. We only mean that, for the purpose of democratic education, the control of the schools should be widely dispersed rather than highly centralized. The idea of local control in educational administration should be strongly introduced. That is, the idea of autonomy for local and private schools and even universities should be emphasized. The present 'national control and local implementation' concept have to be eliminated, and a principle ought to be introduced whereby school management should become the full responsibility of the local bodies, for instance provincial or municipal boards of education.

Technical aid and professional counsel should be provided by the Ministry of National Education, but direct control over local schools should be greatly curtailed. To provide for greater participation by the people, educational agencies elected by popular vote should be created at both the province level and local school level. The functions of the Ministry of National Education and its central organization should be limited to such things as the provision of technical guidance and advice to the province level

boards of education and local school boards of education, the formulation of legislative proposals concerning education, and the carrying out of surveys and researches concerning education. Naturally; to fulfil these functions efficiently and democratically, a wide variety of advisory councils on such matters as curriculum, chartering of university and social education affairs should be established or maintained at the Ministry of National Education.

Regarding local autonomy in educational administration, it should be one of the matters to be handled by local public bodies independent of the National Government and having separate legal status. That is, schools established at the provincial level should be administered and managed under the responsibility of that province, and schools established at the sub-division (district or Kaza) level should be administered and controlled under the responsibility of that district or Kaza. In addition, in order to ensure the political and administrative neutrality of educational administration, boards of education ought to be established in every province and district, and these boards should carry out the affairs of education.

Up to here, the necessities for decentralization of educational administration of Turkey have been discussed and some advices were given over the revision of educational administration. As from here, every administration level will be discussed and some advices related to that level of administration will be given.

1- Central Organization of Educational Administration

Currently, the central organization of the Ministry carries out most of the administrative responsibilities of education in Turkey. The Ministry is a governmental office having direct responsibility for all aspects of education and controlling even the lowest level educational organs. What we advice here that, it should be basically a central organ with the main duty of planning national policy in education and providing guidance and advice to local educational authorities and institutions. It still should be the highest organ of educational administration with the duty of promoting the delivery and development of school education, social education, academic affairs, culture, and finance of education, but not necessarily having so wide competences as controlling all kinds of schools and other educational institutions. However, the Ministry of Education should issue the ministerial ordinances and curriculums which will be prepared by the Central Board of Education and Instruction.

The Ministry currently has two undersecretaries who carry out most of the administrative and financial affairs of the Ministry. In that case of all

establishing local authority over education, there will be no need for two undersecretaries but only one to help the minister. On the other hand, for preparing the courses of study for each level of educational institutions for examine the textbooks, and passing judgement on proposed legislation, the Central Board of Education should exist as an independent and scientific body.

Being made up of the rectors of the twenty eight universities, deans of the colleges, heads of the educational departments of the universities, a number of inspectors, school principals, teachers, and other specialists in the profession of education, the Convention of National Education (Shura) should also be existed but not as an administrative body. It should be a committee to discuss and advise such matters as educational innovations and curriculum planning. To the extent that it is supposed to met once every year instead of every three years. Nevertheless, there is no need for the Commission of General Directorates, but there should be a number of Teacher Consultants employed by the Central Board of Education and Instruction to provide guidance concerning such technical aspects of school education as curriculum and instructional activities.

In order to ensure the educational content which provides for equality of educational opportunity and the maintenance and improvement of educational standards, the national standards might be established by the Ministry of National Education.

2- Local Organizations of Educational Administration

As mentioned earlier, there are 67 provinces, each of which is further divided into a number of subdivisions (Kaza or district), in Turkey. Even though they are not career educators the governor of each province is the head of education in his/her province. That is why, in every province and in every district (Kaza) there should be a Board of Education, and local educational administration should be controlled and headed by this Board of Education. Having an important place and role in local education, the Board of Education might be a kind of administrative committee which has to be guaranteed independence from the head of the local public body in the exercise of its authority. Along with the Superintendent of Education and his/her staff, the Board of Education may be consisted of a number members, for example, 6 or 7 same as is in most states of the United States. The members of the Board of Education can be either directly elected by local people or appointed by the head of the local public body with the approval of the local assembly. The official authority of the Board of Education including authority

in all educational matters should not be handled neither by administrators of the central organization of the Ministry, nor by the governor of the province. Furthermore, the Board of Education should be allowed to establish its own regulations concerning matters under its authority.

Instead of the present Director of Education at the province level, the Provincial Superintendent, who could be appointed by the Board of Education, might be established. At the same token, instead of the present Director of Education at the district level, the District (or Kaza) Superintendent ought to be established. The District Superintendents would also be elected by the local people. The Superintendents of Education have to be career educators and ordinary full-time local public servant. They have to have great official authority for carrying out the actual activities of the Board of Education. In addition, along with the Superintendent and his/her staff, the Board of Education should supervise and carry out activities concerned with the curriculum and ordinances. The Board of Education should be able to establish regulations stipulating curriculum and supervision standards for the schools under their jurisdiction.

Regarding the building level administration, the same as the present structure, school should be under the management and administration of the school principal. The curriculum for each school should be compiled under the responsibility of the school principal, and then either be reported to the Board of Education or be submitted to it for approval. Furthermore, the curriculum for each school ought to be formulated with the participation of all teachers under the direction of the principal. The parents and local people could be had chance to participate the curriculum development and planning by the Parents-Teachers Committees.

D- A Possible Model to Decentralize the System:

As outlined at the previous part of the project paper, our recommendations for the Turkish educational system are not to be completely changed, but to be re-established or reviewed on the basis of decentralized characteristics. Indeed, we strongly believe that, the basic structure of the education system has not so far been significantly changed by decentralization. We recommend that the control of the schools should be widely dispersed rather than highly centralized. The present national control and local implementation concept have to be eliminated, and a principle ought to be introduced whereby school management should become the full responsibility of the local bodies. That is, administrative decentralization, community participation, and community control over the educational institutions are strongly encouraged. As Bray (1984) outlined, decentralization is a process in which

subordinate levels of a hierarchy are authorized by a higher body to make decisions about the use of the organization's resources, deconcentration, delegation and devolution. The implication for a central authority is that it has to deconcentrate when it establishes field units. Sometimes, deconcentration merely extends central government power and improves supervision. In essence deconcentration should be a stage towards greater local sensitivity and local influence. Delegation implies a greater degree of decision making at the local level, though power in a delegated system tends to rest with the central authority. The third category, devolution is the most decentralized because decision-making powers are formally transferred to the local bodies.

What we mean by administrative decentralization is a process whereby the system is divided into smaller units; the locus of power and authority remain with a single central administration. In contrast, in Turkey's case, currently, the central organization of education, Ministry of National Education, carries out most of the administrative responsibilities of education and controls even the lowest level educational organs. However, we advise that the central organization should remain with a single duty of planning national policy in education and providing financial support, guidance and advice to the local educational authorities and institutions. Since the administrative decentralization led to increase community involvement or participation which means the formation of advisory committees or groups, the principles of participatory democracy would have chance to exist in the organization. With the duties of promoting the delivery and development of school education, social education, academic affairs and culture, the central organization would still be the highest organ of educational administration.

Regarding the administrators or administrative bodies of the central organization, there is no need to have current two undersecretaries, but only one to help the minister to issue the ministerial ordinances and other routine tasks. On the other hand, as an independent and scientific body, the Central Board of Education and Instruction should prepare the courses of study, examine the textbooks, and pass judgement on proposed legislation. Not as an administrative body, but as a committee to discuss and advise such matters as educational innovations and curriculum planning, the Convention of National Education (Shura) should also be existed.

Instead of the current Commission of General Directors, there should be a number of Teacher Consultants employed by the Central Board of Education and Instruction to provide guidance concerning such technical aspects of school education as curriculum and instruction.

At the province level organizations, instead of the governor of the

province, the Boards of Education, at each of the sixty-seven province and at each of the numerous districts, would control and head the local educational administration. Having an important place and role in local education, the Boards of Education at each of the province or district have to be a kind of administrative committee which has to be guaranteed independence from the head of the local public body in the exercise of its authority.

Together with enough number of staff, a Superintendent of Education, who certainly should be a career educator, for each province and district can lead the Board of Education with the help and advice of the other members of the board who were elected by the local public or appointed by the head of the local public body with the approval of the local assembly. The Boards of Education at each province or at each district should be allowed to establish its own regulations concerning matters under its authority. The official authority of these Boards of Education including authority in all administrative matters would not be handled neither by the administrators of the central organization of the Ministry, nor by the administrators of local government.

As mentioned at the second part of this project paper, at each province and furthermore at each district level, there is a Director of Education who is directly responsible to the central organization for educational affairs in his/her province or district. What we advise is that the Provincial Superintendent at the province level, and the District Superintendent of Education at the district level ought to be established. Both the Provincial Superintendent and the District Superintendent have to be career educators and would be elected by the local people. They have to have great official authority for carrying out the actual activities of the Boards of Education. Along with the Superintendent of Education and his/her staff, the Board of Education should supervise, control, and carry out activities concerned with the curriculum and ordinances. In addition, the Boards of Education have to have right to establish regulations stipulating curriculum and supervision standards for the schools under their jurisdiction.

What we recommend for the building level administration is that, the schools should be under the management and administration of the school principals. The curriculum for each school should be compiled under the responsibility of the school principal, and then either be reported to the Board of Education or be submitted to it for approval. The teachers role and participation in curriculum planning and development should be strongly encouraged by the principals as much as by the Board of Education and Superintendent of Education. That is, the curriculum for each school would

be formulated with the participation of all teachers under the direction of the principal. The role of the parents participation in school education, administration, and curriculum planning and development has to be expanded through the instrumentality of the Parents-Teachers Associations.

IV. Implementation Strategies

A- Implementation of Proposed Organizational Change

Change is so important for organizations, but not so easy. Simply deciding that you want change in your organization does not mean it will occur. Attitudinal factors work against change among individuals who do not like to be disturbed. They prefer predictability, security, and a generous supply of order while tolerating limited amounts of instability and uncertainty. It is believed that the lack of motivation plays an important role in ineffectiveness of the change attempts.

In all cases, regardless of the type of change, in addition to the steps and procedure employed for developing the change, there is a parallel set of steps and procedures for its implementation. We believe that each change development plan should take into account the complementary set of steps necessary to ensure that the change is used. In other words, In each change efforts, there should be a parallel set of policies and procedures that address implementation and the change process is viewed as consisting of change proposal plus implementation.

Our assumptions and procedures for implementation of the planned change in the Turkish educational organizations as follows:

B- Assumptions For Implementation of the Planned Change

1. It is logical that the implementation of any planned organizational change is not an event but is a process that involves an interrelated set of conditions that can shift over time. However, until very recently, change facilitators, policy makers, and researchers tended to view change as an event. As Hall and Hord (1987) mention, policy makers would announce that a change was to occur on a particular date. The innovation would be delivered from the change agent to the whole organization. It was assumed that the bottom administrators and teachers used it appropriately. Summative evaluations were concluded during the first year of use, and the change was judged a success or failure. Somewhat different from the past, more recently it has become clear that there is a process involved in implementing educational change and that this process requires time.

Our proposed organizational change for the Turkish educational system is not an exception. It is beyond doubt that our proposed change is also a process and it will take time. Because there are phases and steps in the

process that can be used to plan and pace change. It would not occur suddenly in a day, in a month, even in a year. It will most probably take at least 4 - 5 years to implement this change.

2. It is believed that for change to be successful the perceptions of the participants must be understood by themselves and by the change facilitators. Otherwise, the change process will not be successful and that many worthwhile actions meant to support the change will be rejected by the participants and the other staff. By understanding concerns, change facilitators can be more certain that their interventions are relevant to the necessities of the change process. In order to ensure this, the administrators of educational organizations should pay attention the importance of planning and the planning process in effecting change. They should stress the needs to clearly identify needs, objectives, outcomes, and the resources required to support the change. Thus, they should encourage themselves to pay extensive attention to participatory planning. By doing this, they would get these advantages as increased clarity about the change, reduced initial resistance, less development of resistance during the process, and increased likelihood that effective mutual adoption of the change will occur.

In this present case, some conventions inspired by the universities and the professional associations might be planned in a certain time and place. Conferences might be given by the competent authorities, by the change facilitators, by the researchers, and even by the politicians to persuade and to understand the expectations of the people related to the proposed change.

3. We believe that the ultimate effectiveness of the change depends on whether the administrative personnel, the politicians, the educators, the teachers, the parents, and the lay citizens change to incorporate the new practice. Thus attention must be given to individuals and their acceptance of the new practice. In order to ensure this, the main principle is that subordinates should be persuaded and motivated rather than ordered, so that they actually want to behave in the new way. On this point the administrators of educational organizations are in charge of a monumental task.

As outlined by Gross, Giacquinta, and Bernstein (1971), there is usually resistance to change of any kind. It reveals that the major explanation offered for the success or failure of organizations to implement innovations assumes that members of an organization are initially resistant to change and that it is the ability of management or a change agent to overcome their resistance. The existence of pressure groups, resistance toward change at the centre and the abuse of decentralized power and authority at the local level are

some concerns that frustrate the proposed study. The change may be resisted by the central managers because they are afraid that their position will be weakened somehow or that they will be further from the center of power.

It is further assumed that this resistance constitutes the major obstacle to the implementation of the change. In order to overcome this resistance, and to implement this study of the decentralization system of administration in education in Turkey, the current administration must be willing to share its power with those who are charged to implement the change by allowing them to plan the implementation about the change. Responsibilities for facilitating change can not be overcome by only one individual or by only one group of individuals. Everyone can be a change facilitator, however including the politicians. Some political leaders, politicians, university faculties, central and local planning advisers, educational specialists, and researchers are supposed to be associated with the work on the decentralized system, frequently visiting, advising, and working with the educational administrators in the central organization, in the 67 provinces, and all the districts.

D- Conclusion

The present Turkish educational system, which was established in 1923 based on the French system, is highly centralized one. Although the administrative arrangements outlined in this paper bear the semblance of a balance between central and local administration of education, there is a centralized organization in Turkey. The central organization of the ministry appoints, assigns, disciplines, and removes the personnel at any level. It appropriates monies for the construction and operation of schools, and through a corps of ministry inspectors, it controls that the directives and regulations of the ministry are carried out. All of the local level administrators are responsible to the central organization. A tight bureaucracy exists in the system.

The adoption of central control was not without reason. In order for Turkey to begin modernization and to catch up with the advanced countries of the West, it was absolutely necessary for an enlightened modernized central government to exercise control from the top in the enforcement of modernization in regard not only to education policies but also to all other state policies. Today, however, there is no reason to have such a centralized organization. From many points of view, the system should be decentralized. It is thought that being centralized creates some problems regarding educational administration. At least, by being decentralized, the local people might have chance to regulate and develop their schools by the Education Boards.

We believe that the considerable inefficiency in the early days of decentralization will occur mainly because of the heavy burden placed on the local structure during the initial decentralization process. However, the Ministry of National Education has placed a high priority on the improvement of efficiency and success is apparent although the tasks involved are difficult and complex. Having more competence and responsibilities, the governors of each of the 67-province, the Province Superintendents of Education, the District Superintendents of Education, and the Boards of Education will probably spend a greater proportion of their time in their educational problems.

In sum, we are of the view that decentralization of education will promote increased participation of various groups in decision-making, although such participation has not always occurred according to the current vision of the system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Basaran, I. E., (1974). The Problems and Their Solutions of the Compulsory Education in Turkey. Unpub. Doctoral dissertation. Ankara: Ankara University, The Department of Education. (In Turkish).
- Bilgen, N., (1980). The Analysis of the Central Organization of the National Education in Turkey. Unpub. Doctoral dissertation. Ankara: Ankara University, the Department of Education. (In Turkish).
- Bray, M., (1984). Educational Planning in A Decentralized System: The Papua New Guinean Experience. Port Moresby: University of Papua New Guinea Press.
- Bursalioglu, Z., (1976). The New Structure and Attitude of School Administration. Ankara: Ankara University, the Department of Education Press. (In Turkish)
-, (1976). Theory and Practice in Educational Administration. Ankara: Ankara University, The Department of Education Press. (In Turkish).
- Dewey, J., (1960). The John Dewey Report. Ankara: Research and Measurement Bureau of the Ministry of Education.
- Fantini, M. and Gittel, M., (1973). Decentralization: Achieving Reform. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. B., & Berbstein, M., (1971). Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change. New York: Basic Books Inc. Publishers.
- Hall, G. E. and Hord S. M., (1987). Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Herriot, R. E. and Gross, N., (1979). The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change: Case Studies and Analyses. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Karagozoglu, G., (1986). Educational Supervision in a Developing Country: Turkey. The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).
- Kaya, Y. K., (1984). Educational Administration: Theory and Practice in Turkey. The Public Administration Institute of Turkey and Middle-East. Ankara: The Publication of T.O.D.A.I.E. No: 164., (In Turkish).
- Kazamias, A. M., (1969). Education and the Quest for Modernity in Turkey. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, (1965). Country Reports: The Mediterranean regional project. Turkey. Belgium: OECD.