Necdet Konan, Büşra Bozanoğlu, Remzi Burçin Çetin

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

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.

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 developed 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)*

335

"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.