

Öğr. Gör. Melek ÖZER ÖLMEZ¹
Prof. Dr. Yasemin KIRKGÖZ²

INVESTIGATING MODEL PROPOSALS OFFERED FOR TRAINING AND APPOINTMENT OF TURKISH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN TERMS OF LEADERSHIP MODELS

Abstract

The notion that teaching ability and experience are necessarily an indication of being a good school principal is now outdated. Today's school principals are expected to be effective leaders who are able to manage the complexities of rapidly changing school environment and to develop good relationships with teachers and students for better school outcomes. Therefore, management and effective leadership are widely viewed as the key concepts in order to improve school outcomes. In the 21st century, policy makers and researchers in both developed and developing countries across the world including Turkey have been in quest of finding the best possible approach or model to train effective school principals for the sake of improving student outcomes. Additionally, the researchers have been trying to find out the best leadership behaviors that are most likely to produce favorable school and learner outcomes. This current study aims to compare and analyze the key components of suggested training models for school principals in Turkey in terms of leadership behaviors that these models aim to develop. In this study, document analysis that is one of the qualitative research methods was used to collect and analyze the data. 12 research studies conducted by Turkish authors were reviewed and the model proposals offered in these studies were compared. As a result, suggestions were offered for the process of training and appointing the school principals.

Key Words: Leadership models, school principals, training programs, appointment, Turkey.

TÜRK OKUL MÜDÜRLERİNİN YETİŞTİRİLMESİ VE ATANMASINA YÖNELİK SUNULAN MODEL ÖNERİLERİNİN LİDERLİK MODELLERİ AÇISINDAN İNCELENMESİ

Özet

Öğretme yeteneği ve deneyiminin iyi bir okul yöneticisi olmanın mutlak bir göstergesi olduğu düşüncesi artık geçerliliği olmayan bir düşüncedir. Günümüz okul müdürlerinin, hızla değişen okul ortamının karmaşıklıklarını yönetebilen ve daha iyi okul çıktıları için öğretmenler ve öğrencilerle iyi ilişkiler kurabilen etkili liderler olması beklenmektedir. Bu nedenle, yönetim ve etkili liderlik, okul çıktılarını iyileştirmek için yaygın bir şekilde anahtar kavramlar olarak görülmektedir. 21. yüzyılda, Türkiye dahil olmak üzere dünyadaki gelişmiş ve gelişmekte olan ülkelerdeki politika belirleyiciler ve araştırmacılar, öğrenci çıktılarını iyileştirmek için etkili okul müdürlerini eğitmek adına mümkün olan en iyi yaklaşımı veya modeli bulma arayışı içinde olmuştur. Bununla beraber araştırmacılar, istenilen okul ve öğrenci çıktıları üretme olasılığı en iyi olan liderlik davranışlarını bulmak için çaba göstermektedirler. Bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki okul müdürleri için önerilen eğitim modellerinin geliştirmeyi amaçladıkları liderlik davranışları açısından temel unsurlarını karşılaştırmayı ve analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Mevcut çalışmada, verilerin toplanması ve analizi için nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden biri olan doküman analizi kullanılmıştır. Çalışma kapsamında Türk yazarların yürüttüğü 12 araştırma incelenmiş ve bu çalışmalarda sunulan model önerileri karşılaştırılmıştır. Sonuç olarak okul müdürlerini yetiştirme ve atama sürecine dair öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Liderlik modelleri, okul yöneticileri, yetiştirme programları, atama, Türkiye.

Özgün Araştırma / Original Article

¹Sorumlu yazar/Corresponding Author, Harran Üniversitesi, Türkiye, melekozer@harran.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6088-3373.

²Çukurova Üniversitesi, Türkiye, ykirkgoz@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5838-6637.

INTRODUCTION

Educational leadership and developing school management have become the focus of policy makers in the 21st century because there is prevailing opinion that effective leadership makes a difference to students' learning and success. Rathert and Kırkgöz (2017) point out that leadership and management are regarded as two essential components in order to generate proficient teaching and successful learning. There is also a growing evidence that leadership behaviors have a significant positive effect on student engagement suggesting that school principals need to work with teachers in the instruction improvement process to enhance student learning (Louis et. al., 2010). Therefore, in both developed and developing countries across the world, policy makers and researchers have been in quest of finding the best possible approach or model to train effective school principals for the sake of improving student outcomes. Additionally, another tough question that needs to be dealt with has also been raised: "Which leadership behaviors are most likely to produce favorable school and learner outcomes?" (Bush, 2008, p.8). As a result of growing interest in school leadership over the past 20 years, researchers have developed some theories, which have resulted in emerging new models and redefining established approaches for further development (Bush & Glover, 2014). Consequently, increasing concerns about quality in education and desire for higher quality education has also made training of school principals a current issue in Turkey (Cemaloğlu, 2007).

Leadership, School Leadership and Management

Leadership is a broad term that is defined and perceived differently in different research areas. Therefore, it still continues to be studied as a concept that cannot be fully understood (Cemaloğlu, 2007). Although leadership has a number of definitions in literature, Bush (2008) states that the main component of these definitions is the process of influence. Yukl (2002) elucidates this concept as indicated below:

Most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a social influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person [or group] over other people [or groups] to structure the activities and relationships in a group or organization. (p.3)

835

After a growing realization that teaching experience alone is not enough to manage a school, the notion of being a leader at school has gained importance. This is due to the common thought that the quality of leadership creates a significant difference in student outcomes (Bush, 2007). As claimed by Cemaloğlu (2007), leaders and educators have similar goals in terms of discharging their personal and social responsibility. Thus, it is a must for a school principal to become a leader in order to provide effective management. At this point, it is necessary to define the concept of "school leadership." Bush and Glover (2003) propose a broad definition of this concept:

Leadership is a process of influence leading to the achievement of desired purposes. Successful leaders develop a vision for their schools based on their personal and professional values. They articulate this vision at every opportunity and influence their staff and other stakeholders to share the vision. The philosophy, structures and activities of the school are geared towards the achievement of this shared vision. (p.8)

Another concept that is related to leadership is management. Cuban (1988) defines this concept as "maintaining efficiently and effectively current organizational arrangements" (p.xx). Although management still precedes leadership in some countries, Bush (2008) states that both leadership and management are equally prominent for schools if they are to operate effectively and achieve their objectives.

School Principal Training Programs in International Context

Constitutively, there are two concepts affecting the process of selecting and appointing school principals: centralization and decentralization. The former refers to "concentrating in a central (top) authority decision-making on a wide range of matters" while the latter means "a shift in the authority distribution away from the central "top" agency in the hierarchy of authority" (Lauglo, 1997, as

quoted in Bush, 2008, p.4-5). In centralized systems, school principals are appointed based on qualification and teaching experience rather than leadership knowledge and skills; however, in decentralized systems such as Denmark, England, New Zealand, Portugal and Slovenia headships posts are advertised and there is an open competition for the post, which makes this selection process more competitive and the applicants are selected based on their qualifications and experience, and the job criteria (Bush, 2008). As Ylimaki and Jacobson (2013) state, accountability policies, decentralization requirements and demographic shifts have an effect on determining both the content and focus of leadership programs in different countries.

In this study, school principal training program in England with a decentralized system for the selection of school principals, training program in Malaysia based on similar framework with England but using a centralized system for the appointment of school principals and school principal training and appointing process in Japan with a centralized system have been examined in detail. Additionally, some other implementations in some European countries have been presented briefly.

In England, the importance of leadership in schools was confirmed by foundation of a national college for the development of school leaders in 2000. Bush (2006) describes National College for School Leadership (NCSL) as “an outstanding example of innovation in the preparation of educational leaders” (p. 508). The college offers the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) which became mandatory for new school principals in 2009 but converted into optional status in 2012. The main focus of the program is leadership practice rather than theory; therefore, it is not an academic course but a professional qualification (Bush, 2013). The report prepared by the Itaú Social Foundation and British Council through a collaborative field research project presents some details about the program offered by NCSL. The program takes between 6 and 18 months for applicants to complete the training, and it requires applicants to:

- Spend a minimum of nine days in a school in a different context from their own;
- Finish three basic study modules and two elective modules;
- Go through a final evaluation (Ingham & Dias, 2015, p.62).

In England, there exists proportionally diverse training including pre-service qualification programs, induction programs that support the initial phase as school principal, and in-service training programs for established school principals (Schleicher, 2012). After the abolishment of its mandatory status, the NPQH was revised and redesigned. The new program has been linked to Master's and other postgraduate qualifications, which was one of the criticism directed before. Besides, prospective school principals are expected to meet all three requirements: professional teaching experience, administrative experience and training for headship (Eurydice, 2013). In England, the teachers and the school principals are not civil servants and they are appointed by local authorities. However, selection of school employees and school principals are carried out by the school boards. School boards consist of stakeholders including representatives of teachers, parents, students and local authorities (Akin, 2012). Therefore, the school governing body informs the local authority, advertises the vacancy, appoints a selection panel and makes an interview with the selected applicants respectively (Eurydice, 2013). The selected applicants are expected to make a presentation (Bush, 2008) or take in charge of particular exercises and "to teach trial lesson" (Taylor & Rowan, 2003, p.69, as cited in Bush, 2008). After being appointed, new school principals are provided with allocation of funds to spend their training according to their own needs such as short or degree courses, mentoring and consultancy (Thody, Papanoum, Johansson & Pashiardis, 2007).

The principal preparatory program of Malaysia, the National Professional Qualification for Educational Leaders (NPQEL), is mandatory to those who expect to be a school principal (Ng, 2016). National Educational Management and Leadership Institution or Institut Aminuddin Baki (IAB), which is the country's main training and development center, is responsible for designing and implementing the NPQEL program that is based on the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) framework in England. Jones et. al. (2015, p.355) states that candidates in Malaysia are expected to be able to “display effective management and leadership practices and apply them to their

school” through this program which aims to ensure candidates develop leadership strategies by means of a professional development plan. Ng (2016) explains the program structure applied by the center as below:

The NPQEL programme takes five months to complete but is divided into three phases with six weeks of face-to-face sessions at IAB and 14 weeks of e-learning in the schools where they work... During the e-learning phase, participants carry out two consultation activities: a benchmarking programme of two weeks in another school and four weeks in their own school in Phase 1; and the attachment programme of eight weeks in Phase 2, which is carried out in their own school. (p.1006)

As regards to the selection of school principals in Malaysia, Ng (2016) states that principals are selected through time-based promotion in a hierarchical and highly centralized system in which school principals are promoted according to the candidates’ seniority.

Although NPQEL is compulsory to become a school principal, there exist some criticisms. Anthony and Hamdon (2010) claim that the majority of school principals are not posted as school leaders because they are either reappointed to a position parallel to their former position in a different school or back to their own school as an ordinary teacher. This claim was supported by a participant in the study conducted by Ng (2016) who stated “...Then the NPQEL also does not guarantee that I will be the principal” (p.1009). In conclusion, although NPQEL targets excellence in school leadership and make school principals high-performing leaders, it can be said that there are critical issues that should be handled by the authorities.

In Japan, school principal posts are based on seniority whereas school systems appoint principals based on merit in England (Gamage & Ueyama, 2005; Balyer & Gündüz, 2011). Therefore, in Japan traditional apprenticeship model has been used, which requires prospective school principals to “move through the ranks from classroom teachers to master teachers to heads of departments to assistant and deputy or vice principals and, finally, to school principals” (Gamage & Ueyama, 2005, p. 73). The study results conducted by Gamage and Ueyama (2005) revealed that Japanese school principals worked an average of 24.9 years as classroom teachers before being appointed as a principal. Therefore, it is clear that long teaching experience is required in order to become a school principal in Japan, which means that school principals must work as a teacher for a long time before being rewarded with principalship (Bjork, 2000). As a result, there is no way other than being a teacher to be appointed as a school principal, that is, there is no specific institution for pre-service training prior to being appointed as a school principal (Akin, 2012). The selected applicants are trained through in-service training at regional or local training centers. Besides, it is a requirement for the candidates to have a postgraduate degree (Balyer, 2013; Akin, 2012).

In other countries such as Greece, Cyprus, and Lithuania it is a must for school principal candidates to have both professional teaching experience and administrative experience. In Sweden, teaching experience is not a requirement; however, candidates have to take a specific training course which is offered by the Swedish National Agency for Education (NAE). Overall, in many countries such as Germany, Italy, Spain, Poland and Finland school principal training takes place before appointment. In the Czech Republic, France, Austria, and Slovakia new school principals can take this training after their appointment (Eurydice, 2013).

School Principal Training Programs in Turkish Context

In Turkey, initiations of training school managers dates back to 1920s and the first step was taken by Gazi Education Institution which trained prospective primary school teachers in order to supply manager, inspector and teacher needs of newly-established schools after written and oral exams (Türkmenoğlu & Bülbül, 2015). That training program included basic knowledge of teaching as a profession, management and inspectorship (Can & Çelikten, 2000). From 1923 to 2017, three main models have been implemented for training and appointing of school principals: apprenticeship model, educational sciences model and examination model (Turhan & Karabatak, 2015a). The period after the year 2007 could be regarded as a fourth model which is called “arbitrariness model” by Balcı (2008).

Apprenticeship Model: In apprenticeship model, the main principle was to teach experience and the idea of “teaching is the primary concern in profession” was emphasized (Balcı, 2008, p.198). That is, being a teacher was necessary and adequate to be a school principal. In this model, candidates were selected as school principals depending on their seniority and learnt how to manage either by trial and error learning or by following the previous examples (Ağaoğlu, Altınkurt, Yılmaz & Karaköse, 2012). This model was implemented from 1923 to 1970s (Şimşek, 2004).

Educational Sciences Model: This concept emerged in the late 1970s and was seriously adopted in academia. Bachelor’s Degree programs in Educational Management and Planning opened at many universities (Okçu, 2011). The main assumption is that management is a scientific study field; therefore, school managers should acquire academic knowledge in key areas such as organization, management and leadership (Şimşek, 2004). This model was implemented between 1970s and 1998 (Balcı, 2008).

Examination Model: In 1998, a two-phased examination system which required candidates to pass the first exam and then to complete a 120-hour-in-service training program in order to obtain a certificate after they could manage to get 70 points out of 100 (Sezer, 2016). Thus, Taş and Önder (2012) believe that 1998 regulation was the beginning of professionalism in educational administration in Turkey. However, this 120-hour-in-service training was annulled in 2004 and the examination system ended in 2007 (Turhan & Karabatak, 2015a). This model was implemented from 1998 to 2007 (Balcı, 2008; Turhan & Karabatak, 2015b).

Arbitrariness model: In this model, firstly, 120-hour-in-service training program was abrogated after the regulation of 2004 was legislated and the regulation of 2007 annulled school administration entrance exam. As a result, the appointment process of school principals comes to a point where there is no norm and standardization (Balcı, 2008).

According to an appointment and relocation regulation published in the Official Gazette dated 22 April 2017 and numbered 30046, requirements of being appointed as a school principal was listed as below:

1. Having a Bachelor’s Degree,
2. Continuing to serve as a teacher at the Ministry of Education on the final day of the application,
3. Being qualified to be appointed as a teacher from the same type of educational institution as the educational institution to be assigned and having lessons to be taught for one month from the same kind of educational institutions as the educational institution to be assigned,
4. As of the last day of the application, the applicant must not be taken over in the last four years as a judicial or administrative investigator,
5. In order to be assigned to the administrations of educational establishments outside the places where compulsory work is required, they must have completed compulsory work obligations according to the relevant legislation, deferred or exempted from this obligation.

Currently, no specific training is required for Turkish school principals before being appointed and there is no liable institution aiming to train school principals such as in England and Malaysia. In-service training programs are centrally offered by In-service Training Department of the Ministry of Education in Turkey. Some researchers have pointed out the shortcomings in these programs. Çinkır (2002, as cited in Gümüş & Ada, 2017) argues that the trainers are chosen among school principals or inspectors at local level, which causes to question the quality of the programs offered by nonspecialists. Korkmaz (2005) criticizes the content of training programs that are not sufficient

enough to satisfy school principals' needs in the 21st century. In their study, Özcan and Bakioğlu (2010) point out that although in-service training shows a certain increase in the development of the school administrator, this increase remains at a moderate level. Gümüş and Ada (2017) state that although there are some courses and seminars organized at central level, they are available for limited number of school principals, which makes it impossible for school principals who work in distant and different parts of Turkey to take advantage of these activities.

A typology for Leadership

In this paper, a typology adapted from Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (1999) and Bush and Glover (2003) was reviewed. It is the best known among the alternative ones (Bush, 2008) and includes nine leadership models:

Managerial Leadership: Leaders who adopt this type of leadership model simply focus on management responsibilities (Dressler, 2001). Therefore, it does not include the concept of vision because the most important thing for this type of leader is to manage existing activities successfully rather than thinking about a better future of the school. It is stated that this type of approach is appropriate for centralized or bureaucratic systems, which actually affects the efficiency of the system (Newland, 1995). It is also stated that this type of leadership may lead teachers to implement imposed changes without enthusiasm (Bush, 2003).

Transformational Leadership: The focus of this form of leadership is commitments and capacities of school members. According to Leithwood et al. (1999), transformational leadership consists of eight dimensions; building school vision, establishing school goals, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, modelling best practices, demonstrating high performance expectations, creating a productive school culture, developing ways of fostering participation in school decisions. When compared to the previous leadership, it can be said that transformational leadership is appropriate for autonomous schools. These types of leaders mainly give their attention to develop school outcomes. However, transformational leaders may become despotic due to its strong, heroic and charismatic nature (Allix, 2000). Nevertheless, the author supports the idea that if it works well, it will engage all stakeholders in the achievement of educational goals.

Participative Leadership: The key term for this form of leadership is "participation." It aims to bond the staff together and to diminish the pressure on the school principal. Moreover, teachers will accept and implement decisions if they contribute to these decisions which are directly related to their own job (Savery, Soutar & Dyson, 1992).

Interpersonal Leadership: West-Burnham (2001, as cited in Bush & Glover, 2003) claims that interpersonal intelligence which facilitates effective engagement with other people is a crucial component without which we cannot imagine conceptualizing a leadership model. Therefore, this form of leadership emphasizes the importance of collaboration and interpersonal relationships (Tuohy & Coghlan, 1997, as cited in Bush, 2008). That is, it mainly focuses on the relationships between leaders and teachers, students and other external stakeholders (Bush & Glover, 2003).

Transactional Leadership: The focus of transactional leadership is exchange of valued resources. According to Sergiovanni (1991, as cited in Bush & Glover, 2003), administrators and teachers could exchange needs and services in this process, and moreover, their wants and needs are discussed in order to strike a bargain. Principals are the formal leaders holding power in the form of key rewards such as promotion and references but they need to cooperate with teachers in order to manage the school effectively (Bush, 2008). However, as Miller and Miller (2001) assert, "interaction between administrators and teachers is usually episodic, short-lived and limited to the exchange transaction" (p.182).

Moral Leadership: This model of leadership assumes that values, beliefs and ethics of leaders are crucial (Bush, 2008). Management is considered a moral craft and moral dimension of leadership derived from normative rationality which is actually based upon the leader's beliefs and what he considers to be good (Sergiovanni, 1991, as cited in Bush & Glover, 2003). According to Greenfield

(1999), moral leadership in schools aims to bring stakeholders together around common purposes in a moral manner and to meet their needs.

Postmodern Leadership: This recent model of leadership focuses on subjective truths and experience of leaders and teachers; therefore, “there is no objective reality, only the multiple experiences of organizational members” (Bush & Glover, 2003, p.21). Bush (2008) suggests that leaders or school principals should be respectful of other stakeholders’ individual perspectives and they should avoid from hierarchy which has little meaning in this form of leadership. However, because the emphasis is on individuals rather than formal authority, it could be dangerous due to its pluralistic nature (Bush, 2008).

Instructional Leadership: This model of leadership mainly deals with teaching and learning, including the professional learning of teachers and student growth. Bush (2008) states that the emphasis is on the direction and impact of influence instead of its nature or source. Bush and Glover (2003) states that “leaders’ influence is targeted at student learning via teachers” (p.10). Hallinger and Murphy (1985) assert that the role of the instructional principal could be divided into three categories: defining the school mission, managing the instructional programme and promoting school climate.

Contingent Leadership: According to Bush and Glover (2003), aforementioned models of leadership are all partial and none of these models provides a complete picture of school leadership. Therefore, this model emphasizes that it is important to recognize the diverse nature of contexts and to adapt different leadership approach to a particular situation instead of adopting “one size fits all” view (Bush, 2008). Yukl (2002) supports the idea by saying: ‘the managerial job is too complex and unpredictable to rely on a set of standardized responses to events. Effective leaders are continuously reading the situation and evaluating how to adapt their behavior to it’ (p.234).

Aim of the Study

It is a fact that school principals need to be effective leaders who can manage the complexities of rapidly changing school environment and develop good relationships with teachers and students for better school outcomes. This current study aims to compare and analyze the key components of suggested training models for Turkish school principals in terms of which leadership behaviors these models aim to develop.

METHOD

Research Design

The research design used for this study is document analysis which is a qualitative method. Document analysis is “a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents—both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material” (Bowen, 2009, p.27). In this study, 12 research studies were reviewed and key concepts were determined. The identification of leadership models was based on the typology which was presented by Bush (2008).

Criteria for Selection of Studies

A set of criteria was used to analyze studies for the review. The studies were recent and had been published from the year 2003, included the word “model” and referred to the training school principals in the title. Any research study consisting of a list of suggestions rather than a model proposal was beyond the scope this study. All of the reviewed studies were conducted by Turkish authors.

Search Strategies

In this research study, data collection process was completed in three phases. The first phase was document search using the Harran University library database system, Google Scholar and Council of Higher Education Thesis Center to access potential academic journals, MA thesis and dissertations. To begin this search, the keywords such as model proposal, training, school principals, Turkey were typed and searching with these key words was conducted by using compounded terms. Each research paper was examined by reading the title and abstract and scanning the document. In this study, research studies carried out by Işık (2003), Cemaloğlu (2005), Yirci (2009), Kesim (2009), Ereş

(2009), Aslan (2009), Baş (2011), Balyer and Gündüz (2011), Altın and Vatanartıran (2014), Yavaş, Aküzüm, Tan and Uçar (2014), Turhan and Karabatak (2015a), and Sezer (2016) were addressed and analyzed.

Data Analysis

The first phase of the analysis was to understand the data more deeply. Each research study was read in detail by highlighting key findings and phrases. The focus of this phase was to code the data for common terms and to place reviewed documents into refined themes (Patton, 2002).

The second phase of the research study involved generating overarching categories included in model proposals and recurring themes for each category. Therefore, the data were categorized under the titles of content, training process, selection process, appointment criteria and focus and presented in Table 1. In this study, content referred to the course content of suggested model or program; training process included the duration, stages, and evaluation of the program and liable institution; selection process referred to procedure of selecting school principals before appointment and liable institution; appointment criteria involved candidate qualities, certificates and requirements of being appointed as a school principal and focus referred to aim of the suggested program.

The third phase of the analysis was to determine the leadership models that were implied by the reviewed model proposals. The possibility that some studies might adopt more than one leadership model was taken into account. The data were presented in Table 2.

RESULTS

Findings from 12 studies on new model suggestions for training and appointing school principals in Turkish context were examined in terms of components of models: content, training process, selection process, appointment criteria and focus.

According to the data presented in Table 1, two model proposals suggested by Cemaloğlu (2005) and Ereş (2009) were lack of content information while the rest of all models offered various courses mostly including theoretical knowledge such as general management, laws, managerial skills, administrative requirements and procedure. Other remarkable course contents in these studies were psychology (Aslan, 2009; Sezer, 2016; Altın & Vatanartıran, 2014); interpersonal relations (Aslan, 2009; Sezer, 2016); innovation (Aslan, 2009); research (Balyer & Gündüz, 2011); professional development (Yirci, 2009); student learning, effective teaching, instructional leadership, and coaching (Sezer, 2016); professional development (Yirci, 2009); oratory, elocution, art, ethics (Altın & Vatanartıran, 2014).

The findings of the present study also indicated that there should be cooperation between the Ministry of National Education (MONE) and the Council of Higher Education (COHE) in order to train school principals, as suggested by some of the reviewed studies (Isık, 2003; Yirci, 2009; Kesim 2009; Balyer & Gündüz, 2011; Sezer, 2016). The analysis revealed that three studies pointed out a liable institution, which is responsible for training school principals, named differently such as Educational Administration Academy (Baş, 2001), National Education Academy (Aslan, 2009) and School Principal Training Board (Yirci, 2009). The duration of the suggested models varied between 1-3 years and theoretical training and practice are combined in training process of some models (Sezer, 2016; Turhan & Karabatak, 2015a; Baş, 2011; Balyer & Gündüz, 2011; Aslan, 2009; Kesim, 2009). Although most of the models consisted of face-to-face education, the models offered by Turhan and Karabatak (2015a) and Kesim (2009) partially or completely benefited from e-learning. Some researchers such as Ereş (2009), Yirci (2009), and Balyer and Gündüz (2011) supported the idea of using mentor training while two of them referred to apprenticeship model, which requires moving through ranks from vice principal to school principal (Altın & Vatanartıran, 2014; Yirci, 2009).

The reviewed studies indicated that 3 out of 12 models did not include any data related to selection of school principals while Ereş (2009) only stated that there was a need for MONE-COHE cooperation during the selection process. Some researchers suggested that both written exam and oral exam/interview should be used to select school principals (Balyer & Gündüz, 2011; Altın and

Vatanartıran, 2014; Bař, 2011; Sezer, 2016). While Cemalođlu (2005)'s model included Compulsory Proficiency Exam for school principals, mentor school principal's advice (Yirci, 2009) and progress reports (Aslan, 2009) besides a written exam were suggested in two different models.

According to the data presented in Table 1, only 9 out of 12 models consisted of criteria to be appointed as a school principal. In some models suggested by Aslan (2009), Balyer and Gündüz (2011), Altın and Vatanartıran (2014) and Sezer (2016) teaching experience was a requirement to be a school principal. Another requirement suggested by most of the researchers was having a certificate. Altın and Vatanartıran (2014) and Aslan (2009)'s model proposals required Master's Degree in Educational Sciences while Bachelor's Degree was enough to be appointed as a school principal in Ereř (2009) and Sezer (2016)'s models. Two models offered by Cemalođlu (2005) and Aslan (2009) implemented gradual assignment in which school principals were initially appointed to C level schools, then they could move forward to B and A level schools.

In many of the reviewed studies, researchers clearly stated the focus or aim of their models. The data indicated that some of them mainly focused on theory and practice issues. Sezer (2016) put emphasis on effective and sustainable election system while Kesim (2009)'s model aimed to develop school principals' information technology competence (IT) competence and life-long learning besides aiming to train school principals who have a vision and support teachers for their professional development.

Table 1.
Comparisons of Model Proposals Offered for Training and Appointment of School Principals

Study	Model/Program	Content	Training Process	Selection Process	Appointment Criteria	Focus
Isık (2003)	Formation Program	theoretical dimension, technical dimension, problem solving, practice and competence dimensions	MONE-COHE cooperation		Certificate & Qualities stated by (ISSCL)	Effective school management & standardization
Cemaloğlu (2005)	A Training Model		Training Management and Supervisorship for BA or MA (for teachers). Simulations, case study, problem-based learning, clinical practice, common group activities, leadership practices, participation in decision-making process, communication skills. National and local in-service training programs (after appointment)	Compulsory Proficiency Exam.	Being teacher or government executive. Mean of ALES, 360 degree performance evaluation score, scientific works, award scores & achievement score. Gradual Assignment (C level, B level, A level schools)	
Ereş (2009)	Mentoring Model	School management	Comparing theory & practice. Being trained by mentors.	MONE-COHE cooperation	BA Degree in School Management	Turning theoretical knowledge into practice
Yirci (2009)	A Formal Mentoring Model	Current topics & Future plans for professional development	1-year training. MONE-COHE cooperation. School Principal Training Board is responsible for training new principals & in-service training. Board of Mentor Principals. Meeting with mentors every month. Apprenticeship process.	Written exam. Mentor school principal's advice. 843	Managing leadership skills. Ability to build relationships among people. Tendency to teamwork. Conflict resolution. Coping with people.	Qualified school principals. Needs analysis.

Table 1. (continued)

Study	Model/Program	Content	Training Process	Selection Process	Appointment Criteria	Focus
Kesim (2009)	Distance Education Model	Educational administration module (school management, school development, effective school etc.) Social sciences module (communication, human affairs, sociology) Administrative sciences module (time management, leadership) Educational Sciences module. (life-long learning, learning how to learn, research methods etc.)	1-year training program Five-year teaching experience. Face-to-face & e-learning MONE-COHE cooperation. Case study & e-portfolio for practice. Midterm (online) & Final (written & face to face)			IT competence. Life-long learning. To train participants who have a vision and guide teachers in their professional development process.
Aslan (2009)	A Training and Appointment Model for School Principals in Turkey.	Public administration, organizational innovation and change, efficient use of resources, motivation skills, meeting-time-crisis-stress management, conflict management, communication and personnel management-development, educational rules, administration and organization of schools, school development, managing differences, interpersonal relations, education system up-to-date problems, psychology, education programs.	National Education Academy is responsible for training. 2-year pre-service training (1-year theoretical training & 1-year intern period)	Written Exam. Progress reports. Being appointed by the Ministry.	Being a teacher or MA/PhD Degree in Educational Sciences. 2- year pre-service training MA or PhD Degree. KPDS & ALES scores. 5-year teaching experience. Achievement certificates Gradual Assignment (C level, B level, A level schools)	Turning theory into practice.

Table 1. (continued)

Study	Model/Program	Content	Training Process	Selection Process	Appointment Criteria	Focus
Balyer and Gündüz (2011)	Pre-service and in-service training model	managing school, managing education and training process, resolving conflict, organizing teamwork, developing communication skills and developing staff, theoretical knowledge, research, interpreting and evaluating research results, preparing portfolios, managing school programs and developing schools.	MONE-COHE cooperation. 2-year initial school principal training. 1-year mentor training (Except candidates having MA degree)	Written & Oral Exam.	Teaching Experience.	Overcoming theoretical and practice deficiencies
Baş (2011)	A Training Model	Theoretical management Educational science courses.	Educational Administration Academy is responsible for training. 1 year-theoretical training. Proficiency exam & portfolio. 1-year practical internship.	Written Exam & Interview.	Certificate of Educational Management.	Modern & global management mentality.
Altın and Vatanartıran (2014)	Sustainable Development Model	Efficient school management, leadership, psychology, sociology, effective communication, conflict management, a set of protocols, body language, legislation, technology use, oratory, elocution, art, ethics, general knowledge	One or two-year apprenticeship. In-service training.	Written & oral exam (objective, reliable and fair) 845	Three-year-teaching experience. MA Degree.	

Table 1. (continued)

Study	Model/Program	Content	Training Process	Selection Process	Appoinment Criteria	Focus
Yavaş et. al. (2014)	An Administrator Training Model	Diversity management & ideology-education	MONE is responsible for training. Practical training based on leadership. Long-Term Training Program based on project design.	An accountable-transparent selection model based on scientific and ethical standards. An independent committee is responsible for selection.		Being able to know and understand people.
Turhan and Karabatak (2015a)	Web-based problem basis school leader training (WB-PBSLT) model.	Real situations and problems. Based on individual needs, experince & personal interests. Cooperative learning.	Virtual environment Defining the problem; presenting the problem and finding solutions; and acquiring theoretical knowledge.			Practice precedes theory.
Sezer (2016)	Certificate Program	Student learning, effective teaching, instructional leadership, coaching, effective communication, human relations, school development, strategic planning, team management, crisis management, conflict management, problem solving, organisational change, curriculum development, professional development, budgeting.	MONE-COHE cooperation. At least 240-hour training based on theory and practice.	Written exam & interview. Election by school community (teachers, parents, students, school officals)	BA Degree. School management certificate. Five-year teaching experience. Completed projects. Human Relations &communication skills. Leadership characteristics. MA or PhD in educational administration	Certification. Effective and sustainable election system

Table 2. Leadership Models Referred by Suggested Training Models for Turkish School Principals

Author	Managerial	Transformational	Transactional	Moral	Participative	Interpersonal	Postmodern	Instructional
Isık (2003)	X							
Cemaloğlu (2005)					X	X		
Ereş (2009)	X							
Yirci (2009)	X					X		
Kesim (2009)	X	X				X		X
Aslan (2009)	X					X	X	
Balyer and Gündüz (2011)	X					X		
Baş (2011)	X							
Altın and Vatanartıran (2014)	X					X		
Yavaş et. al. (2014)						X		
Turhan and Karabatak (2015a)	X					X		
Sezer (2016)	X					X		X

In this study, 12 different model proposals offered for training and appointing Turkish school principals were analyzed to find out which leadership behaviours these models aimed to develop in terms of leadership models suggested by Leithwood et. al. (1999) and Bush and Glover (2003). The data presented under the title of “content” and “focus” were used to determine the leadership models. The findings were presented in Table 2. The results indicated that Kesim (2009) adopted four different leadership models while Aslan (2009) and Sezer (2016) referred to three different leadership models in their studies. The model proposal suggested by Cemaloğlu (2005) aimed to develop participative and interpersonal leadership behaviours while the other four studies conducted by Yirci (2009), Balyer and Gündüz (2011), Altın and Vatanartıran (2014), and Turhan and Karabatak (2015a) referred to the same leadership models; managerial and interpersonal leadership. Işık (2003), Ereş (2009) and Baş (2011) adopted only managerial leadership model whereas Yavaş et. al. (2014) aimed to develop interpersonal leadership behaviors through their training model. The results revealed that many authors adopted multiple leadership models rather than choosing one model, which could be interpreted that they adopted contingent leadership model whose focus on “situational analysis and

careful adaptation of leadership approaches to the specific event or situation” (Bush, 2008, p.23). However, none of the model proposals referred to transactional and moral leadership behaviors.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In Turkey, as suggested by Sezer (2016), it is difficult to say that an effective and sustainable training program and fair appointing criteria are available to satisfy school principals because of frequently changing regulations. Although in-service training programs are offered for school principals, a recent study conducted by Gümüş and Ada (2017) indicated that formal meetings were available as leadership development program for school principals; however, they mostly focused on managerial issues such as physical needs of schools and staff requirement. Additionally, the participants of this study claimed that the Ministry of Education had planned in-service training programs without conducting a need analysis. Due to some implementation problems, some researchers have attempted to design training models for Turkish school principals. However, the findings of this current research study indicated that researchers (Işık, 2003; Ereş, 2009; Yirci, 2009; Kesim, 2009; Balyer & Gündüz, 2011; Sezer, 2016) had offered iterative suggestions such as MONE-COHE cooperation, mentoring and written or oral exams and it seems that these model proposals are not applicable in practice, either. This situation can be attributed to the fact that there are a few empirical and extensive research studies to see the whole picture and to determine the needs of the school principals. Additionally, the analysis results showed that most of the studies have still been focusing on basically managerial leadership skills which are necessary but not sufficient by themselves although recent studies imply for the distribution of the authority instead of being authority and holding power. Another key word for effective school management is “vision.” Although in developed countries schools require a school leader who is able to vision a better future for the school, the results revealed that only one of the model proposals analyzed referred to training school leaders having a vision. However, a pleasing result emerged from the data analysis is that many of the researchers aim to develop good interpersonal relationships in school environment.

Bush (2008) suggests that training models should take the advantage of adapting leadership styles to the specific situation instead of adopting a “one size fits all stance” (p. 22). Therefore, policy makers and researchers should be aware that the notion of teaching abilities, experience and managerial skills are not necessarily an indication of being a good school principal. Today’s school principals are expected to be effective leaders who are able to manage the complexities of rapidly changing school environment and develop good relationships with teachers and students for better school outcomes. Thus, it can be suggested that before developing a leadership model, researchers should think of what kind of a leader they aim to train to meet the needs of the 21st century and also consider their national context to increase the quality of schools.

SUGGESTIONS

Initially, it could be a good attempt to start with establishing a liable institution and seven training centers in Turkey for each region that are responsible for training the school principals. Training centers could operate within some distinguished universities in the region that have sufficient and experienced staff who are expert in educational sciences and management. Benefiting from universities could also be a good solution because they are well supported and the government does not need to allocate large amount of money to train school principals. Another essential thing about the current situation is that it is important to focus on two important questions: Will previously assigned school principals continue to work as a school principal? or Will they need to undergo the new training program? If so, under what conditions? Therefore, the institution should include different program modules for new candidates and previously assigned school principals. The other reality about our country is that school principals in different regions may have different problems and need different solutions. Hence, the modules could include various courses and teaching methods such as face-to-face or e-learning to be able to satisfy school principals’ needs and to increase the quality of in-service training.

As the requirements of being appointed as a school principal published in the Official Gazette dated 22 April 2017 and numbered 30046 are taken into consideration, apart from being a teacher there is not a set of specific criteria in order to be appointed as a school principal. However, as Bush (2008) suggests, being a teacher is not a sufficient criterion for being a school principal, so they need

to be trained instead of throwing them into deep water. Therefore, it should be a requirement to gain a certificate before being appointed. At this point, the authorities need to give up appointing principals based on seniority. Hence, there is a need for fair, standardized and sustainable selection model including school principal posts based on merit. Besides, gradual assignment process (initially being appointed to primary schools, then school principals can move forward to secondary schools and high schools) could be prosperous solution to make the school principals more active during the process.

As a result, Turkey needs to urgently develop a leadership development program to increase the quality of schools. It is also necessary to determine which leadership behaviors should be developed in order to transform them into innovators for better outcomes.

Acknowledgement: This study is based on the doctoral seminar “Leadership and Management in ELT” held in the autumn term 2017/2018 at the ELT department of Çukurova University Adana, Turkey, and the course is delivered by the second author of this paper. A version of this paper is presented at the 13th International Congress on Educational Administration held in Sivas, Turkey from May 10-12, 2018 organized by Cumhuriyet University Faculty of Education and Educational Administration Research and Development Association.

REFERENCES

- Ağaoğlu, E., Altınkurt, Y., Yılmaz, K., & Karaöse, T. (2012). Okul yöneticilerinin yeterliklerine ilişkin okul yöneticilerinin ve öğretmenlerin görüşleri (Kütahya ili). *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 37(164), 159-175.
- Akın, U. (2012). Okul yöneticilerinin seçimi ve yetiştirilmesi: Türkiye ve seçilmiş ülkelere farklı uygulamalar, karşılaştırmalar. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12(2), 1-30.
- Allix, N.M. (2000). Transformational leadership: democratic or despotic? *Educational Management and Administration*, 28(1), 7–20.
- Altın, F., & Vatanartıran, S. (2014). Türkiye’de okul yöneticisi yetiştirme, atama ve sürekli geliştirme model önerisi. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(2), 17-35.
- Anthony, S., & Hamdon, S. (2010). Educational leadership preparation program for aspiring principals in Malaysia. Edu Press: Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Aslan, N. (2009). *Avrupa Birliği ülkelerinde ve Türkiye’de okul yöneticilerinin yetiştirilme ve atanmalarının karşılaştırılması ve bir model önerisi*. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.
- Balcı, A. (2008). Türkiye’de eğitim yönetiminin bilimleşme düzeyi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 14(2), 181-209.
- Balyer, A. (2013). Okul yöneticilerinin kariyer gelişim kararlarını etkileyen kurumsal ve kişisel faktörler. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11(1), 1-26.
- Balyer, A., & Gündüz, Y. (2011). Değişik ülkelerde okul müdürlerinin yetiştirilmesi: Türk eğitim sistemi için bir model önerisi. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim Dergisi*, 4(2), 182-197.
- Baş, M. (2011). *İngiltere’deki okul müdürü yetiştirme programının (NPQH) incelenmesi: Türkiye için bir model önerisi* (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.
- Bjork, C. (2000). The role of the principal and responsibility for improving the quality of teaching in Japanese schools. AERA Annual Meeting, New Orleans.

- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management*. 3rd edn. London: Sage Publications.
- Bush, T. (2006). The National College for school leadership: a successful English innovation? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7), 508–511.
- Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy and practice. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(3), 391-406.
- Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and management development in education*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bush, T. (2013). Preparing headteachers in England: Professional certification, not academic learning. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(4), 453-465.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2003). *School leadership: Concepts and evidence*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership & Management*, 34(5), 553-571.
- Can, N., & Çelikten, M. (2000). Türkiye’de eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi süreci. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 148(8), 43-50.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2005). Türkiye de okul yöneticisi yetiştirme ve istihdamı varolan durum, gelecekteki olası gelişmeler ve sorunlar. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(2), 249-274.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2007) Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stillerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(1), 73-114.
- Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Dressler, B. (2001). Charter school leadership. *Education and Urban Society*, 33(2), 170–85.
- Ereş, F. (2009). Okul yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesinde mentorlük. *Kafkas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(3), 157-165.
- Eurydice (2013). Key data on teachers and school leaders in Europe, 2013 Edition, Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: European Union. Retrieved October 1, 2017, from http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/key_data_series/151EN.pdf
- Gamage, D. T., & Ueyama, T. (2005, March). Professional development perspectives of principals in Australia and Japan. In *The educational forum* (Vol. 69, No. 1, pp. 65-78). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Greenfield Jr, W. D. (1999). Moral leadership in schools: fact or fancy? AERA Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada.
- Gümüş, E., & Ada, Ş. (2017). Okul müdürlerinin katıldıkları mesleki gelişim faaliyetleri hakkındaki görüşleri: Türkiye ve ABD örnekleri. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 43, 176-208.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behaviour of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–47.

- Ingham A., & Dias M. C. (2015). *The development of school leadership in England: Possible options for Brazil*. São Paulo, Brazil: Itaú Social Foundation & The British Council. Retrieved November 25, 2017, from https://www.britishcouncil.org.br/sites/default/files/final_schoolleadership_eng_v3.pdf
- Işık, H. (2003). Okul müdürlerinin yetiştirilmesinde yeni bir model önerisi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24, 206-211.
- Jones, M., Adams, D., Hwee Joo, M. T., Muniandy, V., Perera, C. J., & Harris, A. (2015). Contemporary challenges and changes: principals' leadership practices in Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35(3), 353-365.
- Kesim, E. (2009). *Okul yöneticilerinin uzaktan eğitim yoluyla yetiştirilmeleri için eğitim ihtiyaçlarına dayalı bir program modeli önerisi* (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.
- Korkmaz, M. (2005). Okul yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi: Sorunlar- çözümler ve öneriler. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(3), 237- 252.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., Anderson, S., Michlin, M., & Mascall, B. (2010). *Learning from leadership project: Investigating the links to improved student learning*. Retrieved October 27, 2018, from <https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.pdf>
- Miller, T.W., & Miller, J.M. (2001). Educational leadership in the new millennium: a vision for 2020. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(2), 181–189.
- Newland, C. (1995). Spanish American elementary education 1950–1992: Bureaucracy, growth and decentralization. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 15(2), 103–114.
- Ng, A. Y. M. (2016). School leadership preparation in Malaysia: Aims, content and impact. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(6), 1002–1019.
- Official Gazette. (2017). Date: April, 2017. Issue: 30046.
- Okçu, V. (2011). Türkiye'de okul yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi ve atanmasına ilişkin mevcut durum, beklentiler ve öneriler. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(37), 244-266.
- Özcan, Ş., & Bakioğlu, A. (2010). Bir meta analitik etki analizi: okul yöneticilerinin hizmetiçi eğitim almalarının göreve etkisi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 38, 201-212.
- Rathert, S., & Kırkgöz, Y. (2017). Examining leadership perceptions and practices to deliberate on educational policy implementation-an interdisciplinary approach. *International Journal on Lifelong Education and Leadership*, 3(1), 1-10.
- Savery, L., Soutar, G., & Dyson, J. (1992). Ideal decision-making styles indicated by deputy principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(2), 18–25.
- Schleicher, A. (Ed.), (2012). *Preparing Teachers and Developing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from around the World*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved October 30, 2017, <https://www.oecd.org/site/eduistp2012/49850576.pdf>

- Sezer, Ş. (2016). School administrators' opinions on frequently changing regulations related to appointments and relocation: A new model proposal. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 16(2), 335-356.
- Şimşek, H. (2004). Eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi: Karşılaştırmalı örnekler ve Türkiye için öneriler. Retrieved October 20, 2018, from <https://www.hasansimsek.net/indir>
- Taş, A., & Önder, E. (2010). 2004 Yılı ve sonrasında yayınlanan eğitim kurumları yöneticilerinin atama ve yer değiştirmelerine ilişkin yönetmeliklerin karşılaştırılması. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12, 171-185.
- Thody, A., Papanou, Z., Johansson, O., & Pashiardis, P. (2007). School principal preparation in Europe. *International journal of educational management*, 21(1), 37-53.
- Turhan, M. & Karabatak, S. (2015a). Okul liderlerinin web tabanlı yetiştirilmesinde problem temelli öğrenme: Teorik bir model önerisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 21(3), 395-424.
- Turhan, M., & Karabatak, S. (2015b). Türkiye’de okul yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi ve yurtiçi alanyazında sunulan model önerilerinin incelenmesi. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(3), 79-107.
- Türkmenoğlu, G., & Bülbül, T. (2015). Okul yöneticilerinin göreve geliş biçimlerinin okul kültürüne yansımaları. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(2), 526-549.
- Yavaş, T., Aküzüm, C., Tan, Ç., & Uçar, M. B. (2014). Günümüz okul müdürlerinin yeterliklerine yönelik veli görüşleri. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11(28), 123-137.
- Yirci, R. (2009). *Mentorluğun Eğitimde Kullanılması ve Okul Yöneticisi Yetiştirmede Yeni Bir Model Önerisi*. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek lisans Tezi). Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.
- Ylimaki, R., & Jacobson, S. (2013). School leadership practice and preparation: Comparative perspectives on organizational learning (OL), instructional leadership (IL) and culturally responsive practices (CRP). *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(1), 6-23.
- Yukl, G.A. (2002) *Leadership in Organizations*. 5th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.