An Evaluation of the New School Administrator Assignment System Applied in Recent Years in Turkey

Tarık SOYDAN
Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences
Ankara, Turkey

Abstract. As in a range of fields of the public life, an extensive reconstruction process within the education field is ongoing in today's Turkey and the changes made upon the educational administrator appointment/assignment system constitute one of the major dimensions of this process. Educational administrator appointment/assignment system in Turkey is a field where new regulations have been prepared, where numerous circulars have been issued and where extensive changes have been made upon all along the time. However, the changes made nowadays are on a level having an effect on all the school system radically by means of their sizes and qualities. This study, in which the new school administrator assignment system in Turkey is evaluated based on the views of the school administrators and teachers in terms of providing an objective evaluation, making a selection based on competences, improving the effectiveness of the school system and encouraging the school administrators and the teachers for professional development, is a qualitative research based on a survey model. Semi-structured interview and focus group interview techniques were used as the qualitative research techniques in this study. Working group of this study was consisted of teachers and school administrators who served at the state primary schools, secondary schools and high schools in 2014-2015 school year. Interviews were done with 34 people and a focus group discussion with 12 people was carried out within the scope of the study. As a result of the study, it was found out that the participants who have already taken administrative roles consider the system majorly positively while the other participants consider it clearly negatively. Doubts and criticisms of the participants, who took on administrative roles before the new assignment system but who were eliminated during the revaluation stage and appointed as teachers, towards the new system are more intense.

Keywords: School administrator; educational administrator appointment/assignment system; objectivity; competence; effectiveness.

Introduction

Almost all of the literature in educational administration mentions that there has been great shift in the World caused by technological changes, which has great impact on economy, social and political life. Also, this shift has had massive effects on education as a social institution. Besides the historical and social reasons, and the structure of the shift, it is obvious that education itself has great changes over time. Schools are the base of education systems. In order for school system to accomplish all its expected functions and aims, school administrators and teachers should effectively fulfil their missions.

School administrators' roles and responsibilities change over time as a consequence of changes in the world. School administrators are now considered to be more 'humanistic' rather than being bureaucratic leaders and are perceived as educational leader who can develop multitasking school systems (Lashway, 2003). In this context, it is very important to construct effective systems for training, selecting and placement strategies for school administrators.

Nowadays, there has been enormous amount of changes occur in Turkish educational system, and one of the important area of the reconstruction is placement and replacement of educational and school administrators. The policies of recruitment and/or placement of the administrators has been changed many times in Turkish history. For example, it can be observed that since 2003 there has been lots of new regulations regarding to school and institution administrators; however, each regulation causes different legal problems and some unjust treatment. Latest regulations in specific are resulted with many trials which are against Ministry of National Education. Yet, Ministry prefer to prepare another regulation in order to solve the problems caused by the previous one.

According to the regulation number 29494 and date 06.10.2015, people who can be assigned as an administrator, should be graduated from higher education, work for public education (for Ministry of Education) at that time, who has not been dismissed from his/her managing position as a result of a judicial and governmental investigation in the last four years. Also, people to be assigned as administrators are to have fulfilled, postponed or have been exempted his/her compulsory services (item 5)

According to the same regulation, under special conditions, people who are to be appointed as principals are to work previously as a vice principal, head vice principal for at least two years, founding principal, vice principal and teacher with managerial prerogative or head vice principal for at least three years. Besides, working as departmental administrator or higher positions at the ministry is also claimed (item 6). People to be assigned as head vice principal and vice principal should at least meet one of the requirements which are to have worked as principal, founding principal, head vice principal, vice principal or teacher with managerial prerogative; to have worked as departmental administrator or higher positions at the ministry; to have worked at the ministry at least four years including candidateship (item 7).

Among the candidates who meet the requirements mentioned above, people to be appointed for head vice principal and vice principal status are

selected according to the results of a written exam, people to be appointed for principal status are selected by results of the assessment and oral exam (item 13). People who have completed their 4-year mission as a principal or a vice principal or who worked in these positions at the same foundation for eight years and other candidates who fulfil the necessity for application can attend the exam. Those who score at least 75 out of 100 will be successful. The exam results will be valid for a year (item 14). People who have completed their 4-year mission as a principal or a vice principal or who worked in these positions at the same foundation for eight years will be assessed according to the form (Appendix 1) attached to the regulations (item 19). People to be summoned for interview will selected from the list starting with the highest score. Number of the people to be summoned for interview has to be three times greater than the necessary positions. Candidates will be evaluated according to the oral exam subjects and their weights which are presented in the form attached to the candidates' regulations (Appendix 2) (item 20). All administrators will be appointed for four years. They will not be allowed to work at the same place in the same position for more than eight years (item 27).

The very first steps for this new school administrator appoint system was taken with the number 652 The Legislative Decree on the Organization and Duties of the Ministry of National Education in 2011. According to this enactment, on the condition that school and foundation administrators are successful both at the written and oral examination, governor of the province will be responsible for their assignment. Their service time, performance and competence will also be taken into account in this process. These changes were placed in the regulation of administrator appointment and replacement at February 28, 2013.

School and foundation administrators will be appointed by the governor of the province based on the proposal of director of national education for four years according to the Law on Making Changes on National Education Fundamental Laws and Certain Laws and Secondary Laws, item 11, enactment 8, which was published in official gazette on March 14, 2014. Assignments in the context of this sub-section will not create any employee personal rights, assignment or promotion. Regulation which was prepared on June 10, 2014 based on the provision from laws made dramatic changes in school administrator assignment. According to this, assignments of school administrators will be conducted in every four years and both administrator assignment and administrator replacements will be conducted with oral exams and performance and evaluation forms instead of written and oral exams.

Those mentioned regulations were put into practice, significant numbers of school administrators were assessed and assignments were made according to the results of these assessments. School administrators who were considered unsuccessful were transferred to the teaching positions. Yet, there has been arguments regarding the application and the style of the application of this June 10, 2014 regulation. It was mentioned that competence, objectivity and fairness were ignored in the assessments made via oral exams, performance and evaluation forms. Furthermore, favouritism was the main criteria considered. That is why this implication caused many problems in school systems.

There has been a large body of relevant literature in Turkey regarding raising, selecting and appointment/replacement education administrators in educational administration field. On taking a closer look at the subdimensions of the issue, in some studies it is observed that, Can and Çelikten (2000), Balcı and Çınkır (2002) , Günay (2004), Cemaloğlu (2005), Recepoğlu and Kılınç (2014) and Altın and Vatanartıran (2014) conducted research studies about historical perspective of raising school administrators in Turkey; Turan and Şişman (2000), Başaran (2004), Yolcu and Kavalcılar (2005), Gümüşeli (2009), Arıkan (2007), Balcı (2008), Vural (2009), Ağaoğlu, Altınkurt, Yılmaz, and Karaköse (2012), Aslanargun (2012) and Demirtaş and Özer (2014) conducted studies regarding proficiency of school administrators; Yiğit (2008), Önder and Taş (2010), Taş and Önder (2010), Aslanargun (2011), Demir and Pınar (2013), Güçlüoğulları (2013) and Doğan, Demir and Pınar (2014) conducted studies about assessment of regulation for appointment/replacement of school administrators; Şimşek (2004), Şişman and Turan (2004), Thody (2007), Aslan (2009), Balyer and Gündüz (2011), Süngü (2012) and Akın (2012) studied different examples all over the World; Gümüşeli, (2001, 2006), Pont, Nusche and Moorman (2008), Leadership in education. (2011) and Aslan and Karip (2014) conducted studies on leadership and school leadership; Elma, Şener and Çiftli (2011), Özdemir and Yaman (2011), Tonbul and Sağıroğlu (2012), Nartgün, Bayraktar and Akkulak (2012) and Yılmaz, Altınkurt, Karaköse and Erol (2012) conducted studies related to rotation of school administrators.

It is considered to be inevitable to study this never ending reconstruction process from different views. The problem of this research is to investigate how the school administrator appointment/assignment policy which for the time being has a 'dynamic' characteristic affects the school systems.

Purpose

The main purpose of this study is to analyse and assess the existing school administrator assignment system based on the opinions of teachers and school administrators. Questions to be answered in this context as follows:

*How is the new administrator assignment system, in terms of

-providing an objective evaluation

-selection based on competence

-improving the effectiveness of school system and

-encouraging teachers and administrators for professional development.

*According to the dimension mentioned in the first question, what kind of a school administrator appointment system should be implemented?

Method

In this section, research model, study group, data collection tools, data collection process and data analysis methods utilized in this study are elaborated.

Research Model

This study is a qualitative research designed with a survey model. Survey model is a research approach which aims to describe a past or present situation as it was/is (Karasar, 2009). On the other hand, qualitative research is a research paradigm which uses data collection tools such as observation, interview and document analysis and wherein the qualitative aspects of events and phenomena are aimed to be revealed realistically and holistically in their natural contexts (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011).

In this study, semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews were used as qualitative data gathering techniques. Interview is a research technique based on asking direct questions and claiming answers. The most well-known form of interview is face to face conversation with either a single person or a group. In addition to face to face format, interviews can also be conducted via mailing, phone conversation or question form that can be filled by the subjects themselves (Punch, 2005). In this study, in order to access more participants, the question forms that are to be filled by the participants themselves were preferred.

Interviews can be classified according to their objectives, the number of participants, strictness of rules and to the subjects to be interviewed. Due to the strictness of the rules, they can be categorized as fully-structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews (Karasar- 2009). In this study, semi-structured interview form was used. In other words, when and where needed interviews were accompanied by sub-questions and brief explanations that guides and clarifies the participant responses.

In this study, focus group interview was another technique that was utilized. The reason why focus group interview was also used besides semi-structured interview form is that this technique makes it possible to gather deeper and more detailed data regarding some special issues. Focus group discussion -which is conducted about a predetermined and limited topic, in an environment in which participants feel comfortable and by a researcher who is an expert in his/her field and skilled at moderating the discussion- should be carried out with groups composed of 6 to 12 people (there is a risk with greater group of splitting sub-groups) whose awareness on the topic are high and who are willing to discuss at periods that last 1 to 2 hours around four or five main high-quality questions and if and when necessary by using also a number of sub-questions (Anderson, 1990; Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011 and Corrine, 2014).

Study Group

Study group of this research consists of teachers and school administrators working at the public elementary schools, public secondary schools and public high schools in Ankara during 2014-2015 academic year. Interviews and focus group interviews were carried out with 34 and 12 people respectively. While selecting the participants for both semi-structured interviews and focus group interview, a sampling method which yields maximum participant diversity was

used. Table 1 presents the information about participants who replied the interview request and filled the interview forms.

Table 1. Information about Teachers and School Administrators Replied and Filled the Semi-Structured Interview Form

Variable	Level	n
Workplace	Elementary School	9
	Secondary School	12
	High School	13
	Total	34
Gender	Woman	14
	Man	20
	Total	34
Professional Status	Teacher	21
	Vice Principal	8
	Principal	5
	Total	34
Seniority	1-5 Years	7
	6-10 Years	10
	11 Years and More	17
	Total	34
Education Status	Bachelor's	19
	Master without Thesis	8
	Master	7
	Total	34

As shown in Table 1, 9 participants work at the elementary schools, 12 of them work at secondary schools and 13 of them work at high schools. 14 of them are women and 20 are men. According to status variable, there are 21 teachers, 8 vice principals and 5 principals. Due to seniority; 7 participants have been working between 1-5 years; 10 of them 6 to 10 years and 17 participants have 11 or more years' experience. 19 participants have bachelor's degree, 8 of them have master degree without thesis and 7 participants have master degree with thesis.

In order to gather more detailed and deeper data regarding the issue of this paper, focus group interview was also conducted with 12 people. Table 2

presents the information about teachers and school administrators who attended the focus group interviews.

Table 2. Information about Teachers and School Administrators Attended the Focus Group Interviews

Variable	Level	n
Workplace	Elementary School	4
	Secondary School	3
	High School	5
	Total	12
Gender	Woman	4
	Man	8
	Total	12
Professional Status	Teacher	8
	Vice Principal	2
	Principal	2
	Total	12
Seniority	1-5 years	1
	6-10 years	2
	11 years and more	9
	Total	12
Education Status	Bachelor's	8
	Master without Thesis	3
	Master	1
	Total	12

As shown in Table 2, 4 participants work at the elementary schools, 3 of them work at secondary schools and 5 of them work at high schools. 5 of them are women and 7 are men. According to status variable, that there are 8 teachers, 2 vice principal and 2 principals. Due to seniority, 1 participant has been working between 1-5 years; 2 of them 6 to 10 years and 9 participants have 11 or more years' experience. 8 participants have bachelor's degree, 3 of them have master degree without thesis and 1 participants has master degree with thesis.

Data Collection Tools

In this study, two forms - an interview form composed of two sections and a focus group discussion form - were developed by the researcher. Data collection tools were developed in accordance with the changes brought about by the June 10, 2014 dated regulations. Latter regulation which was revealed on October 10, 2015 did not bring significant changes regarding the school administrator assignment system. The change that might have an effect on this study is the one in the latter regulation making the exams compulsory during the vice principal assignment process.

While draft forms were being developed and finalized, literature on data collection tools previously utilized in similar studies were reviewed; the opinions of 4 academicians who are expert in the field were appealed and the clarity and compatibility of the questions with the research objectives were tested with a preliminary study carried out with 3 teachers, 1 vice principal and a principal.

The very first sections of both data collection tools are to gather the personal information while the second sections contain interview questions. In this study, school administrator assignment system was evaluated via four categories such as providing an objective evaluation, making a selection based on competence, improving the effectiveness of school system and encouraging teachers and school administrators for professional development. Four main questions and a set of sub-questions were prepared for each category and one question and a number of sub-/clarifying questions were also added to these in order to be able to determine possible solutions/suggestions.

Data Collection and Analysis

Interview forms were delivered to the study group composed of the selected school administrators and teachers and then collected by the researcher. Focus group interview was conducted in a proper, clean and spacious classroom at the Faculty of Educational Sciences of Ankara University. Two recording devices were used to record the interview. Data gathered by the interview forms and recorded & transcribed interviews were filed as word processing documents. Finally, 41 pages of data gathered by the interview forms and 22 pages of focus group interview data were obtained. Both interview data and focus group interview data were delivered to the participants who were requested to confirm them. Next the collected, transcribed, filed and confirmed data was sent to and processed by an experienced academician who -after the analysis- was appealed for his opinions on the revealed patterns of themes and sub-themes. Firstly, gathered data were analysed by using descriptive statistics; secondly they were evaluated regarding the contexts in which they become meaningful. During the data analysis, opinions related to each question were grouped under themes, frequencies of salient themes were calculated and relevant stereotype participant responses/expressions/answers were presented and interpreted. Furthermore, in some occasions, they were also interpreted and evaluated in relation to the participants' personal information.

Findings

In this section, data gathered for this study was analysed with descriptive statistics, the themes were determined and the themes that emerged were evaluated with the subjects that are relevant. While assessing the research data, internal interpretations were partially presented. Internal and external interpretations regarding findings were presented in Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestion sections.

Findings from Data Regarding Semi-Constructed Interview Technique

Firstly, participants were asked what they think of new school administrator appoint system in terms of providing an opportunity to make an objective assessment. When the answers were analysed as negative and positive statements, it was seen that 30 participants considered the new system as negative in terms of its providing an opportunity for objectiveness while 3 participants supported the process as being objective. Only one participant answered with ambiguity. It was found out that participants' understanding of objectivity relies on measurement and evaluation (n=23). In this context, use of interviews which are used in new school administrator appoint system (n=16) and directorate of national education's power over selection and the style of commission selection (n=13) were mentioned to be problematic. Some common opinions regarding this issue as follows:

Especially, directorate of national education has high score ratio at re-assessment of administrators. It is clear that whoever the management wants will be selected. School administrator has every right when it comes to appoint a school vice principal (VP-4).

It is now revealed that people who are with different views and perform in different unions are expelled from management. There is no way they cannot transform the schools as they wish (T-13).

I do not think that this new system provides an objective assessment. Things were more or less the same before; but, competence has never been ignored this much. Everything now shares the will that the government wants (T-9).

How does the commission which is responsible for the oral examination of candidates who apply for the first time or for re-assignment get determined? How objective can a person who are appointed by directorate of national education be? (T-7).

A male administrator (P-3) who has 16 years' seniority and had been working as a teacher before the new appoint system presents really remarkable opinions: *"I do not consider this new system as objective. Individual fells not suited for the position, cannot see his/her future and therefore cannot make plans"*. A women participant (T-20) who has 15 years' seniority on teaching and a master graduate focuses on the favouritism and politicization in new school administrator appoint system *"In order to make an objective assessment, one should intend to do something in an objective and educational way. I do not think the intention here is*

educational. All they desire is to give positions to their people, people who support them".

Secondly, participants were asked whether the new school administrator appoint system selects people depending on their competence or not. When the answers were classified as negative and positive, it was seen that 2 participants support that the system relies on competence when selecting administrators while 3 participants partially agree this opinion. One participant decided not to express his/her opinion regarding this issue while one participant told that it solely depended on luck. The rest of the participants (n=27) consider new school administrator system not fair to select administrators based on competence. Participants consider selection depending on competence from measurement and evaluation process (n=18) and criteria (n=11). They frequently express their critics (n=17) about politicization and favouritism.

Some common opinions regarding this issue as follows:

This new system is not competence based as it does not evaluate people according to their seniority, level of education and exam results (T-27).

The only purpose of this new system is to give positions to their people (T-6).

As the criteria-in a very unofficial way- for the selection is 'people who support the ideology that the government has and who are members of a union which is heavily under influence of the government, favouritism as a selection criterion is not surprising at all (T-13).

In fact, luck plays a huge part. If there happens a good conversation between you and your assessors, then you can get high grades (P-2).

A male school administrator (P-5) who has 14 years' seniority remarks that "Appointed administrators are unfairly judged, as competence is not well understood. It is important to observe the success they have accomplished in the schools they worked rather than their personal characteristics"

Thirdly, participants were asked if the new system improves the efficacy of the school. When the answers were analysed as negative and positive, most of the participants (n=26) agreed that this new system will have/already has had negative effects on efficacy of the school. Two participants clearly expressed that this new system provides an opportunity to select 'active and hardworking' school administrators. Therefore, efficacy of the school will be improved. Another participant defended that people who are to be selected as an administrator should act in a harmony with directorate of national education of state and province. With this way, efficacy of the school could be improved. Some of the participants (n=5) demonstrated no clear opinion to be classified regarding this issue.

Some typical prominent expressions related this question are given below:

Those who are appointed are generally governing force's own followers. Tension and a chaotic atmosphere is arising at the school. There is no effectiveness as there is no qualification (T-18).

Problems arise as the school administrators are selected according to specifically fabricated criteria instead of qualification. Teachers fulfil their duties but school is not a

place where you only fulfil your duties, things like human relations, organizational climate have importance (T-19).

Difficulties will occur between the person and his/her colleagues inside the institution in terms of justice and equality and this will have an effect on school, student and even on the student's parents (T-15).

More effort is needed to be made in order to provide the intended competencies in the situation and performance assessment form. Thus, this reflects credit on the operation of the school (V-2).

I think that that those who do not know how to handle the duties of the position and who are brought to their position without deserving it (I think that the majority have these characteristics) cannot display an effective administration.

School administrator's establishing healthy relations with Province and District National Education Directorate provides some advantages for the school. For example needs of the school are met and this increases the productivity of the school (VP-4).

Having looked at the answers given to this question, clearly the attention taking finding is that the participants who obtained an administrative position as a consequence of the new assignment system generally tend to affirm the characteristics of the system.

The participants were fourthly asked how they interpret the new school administrator assignment system in terms of encouraging the school administrators and the teachers to improve themselves. Considering the answers to this question as positive and negative, the majority of the participants (n=26) think that the new school administrator assignment system does not encourage the school administrators and the teachers to improve themselves. While 4 participants stated the contrary, 4 of the participants did not provide a view that can be categorized as positive or negative. Considering the answers given to this question, the participants, along with the topics such as attaining in-service educational means (n=9) and as post-graduate study (n=8), mostly developed arguments to support their positive or negative views.

Some typical prominent expressions relating this question are given below:

The new system proposes a multi consideration. Gaining a good deal of competences and doing the business adequately are required to become the principal again. Therefore you make effort and improve yourself (V-2).

With regards to the administrators, the answer to the question of "What should I do to make them choose me?" is given as 'if I become a member of x union, if I fulfil whatever I told unconditionally and if I keep my good relations with the administrators" and this answer is sufficient. An administrator giving such an answer to this question is natural, therefore he/she does not need to improve himself/herself. On the other hand, this situation is not much different for the teacher (T-18).

The way for a teacher to become a principal goes through the interview and the result of the interview depends on the interviewers' initiative. He/she also does not need to improve himself/herself to become a vice-principal. Someone who has good relations with the principal or who knows some others who can pressure/command the district-province National Education Directorates or those who moves through unions can become a vice principal. These make teachers' effort unnecessary to go further (T-14).

Benefiting from in-service training brings points but it is not possible for everyone to reach these trainings (VP-6).

Besides thinking that self-development could not be completely achieved with the previous assignment system, I am of the opinion that the situation will become more desperate with the new system (T-6).

In this respect, the answer of a male participant, who, before the new system and currently has been officiating as a vice principal, who has 9 years of teaching and 6 years of administrating seniority and who studied masters with thesis, is such as to show the reality and summary of the situation: *"Why does he/she need to improve himself/herself!"*

Lastly, the participants were asked how the school administrators appointment/assignment system should be considering the measures of objectivity, selection based on competencies, improving the effectiveness of the school, and teachers' and school administrators' self-development, which were brought into question towards the participants in the first four questions of the interview form. The participants expressed that they found examination (n=24), seniority (n=20), post-graduate study (n=12) and decision/selection of the school constituents (n=5) important in terms of a selection based on objectivity and competencies. According to the participants, concrete criteria must be set and political/favouritist approaches must be avoided in the administrator assignment (n=13). One of the necessities that the participants put emphasis on either in the selection or the assignment of the school administrators is in-service training (n=11). Participants also suggested that the administrator candidates must be trained for a certain period of time by the experienced teachers (n=7) and a kind of administration job training system must be implemented (n=6). Lastly, some participants stated that the administrators must be monitored by the school constituents, particularly the teachers (n=5), moreover it would be good if the administrators could be "unseated" if needed (n=2).

Some typical prominent expressions relating this question are given below:

Examination must be held. In case an interview will be held, then the commissions must be built up with individuals representing all the walks, such as union representatives and academicians (T-21).

Competencies of the administrators must be objectively determined. This must be taken out of the effect of the power (T-15).

I think the problem in the assignments can be solved by appointing those who deserve to be appointed, by making an objective assessment (examination, seniority, educational background). In my opinion, assignment with a fair assessment will increase the effectiveness of the school as well as the motivations of the students (T-13).

Seniority must be given importance, experienced teachers must be given priority, and deficiencies must be overcome with in-service trainings (V-1).

The view uttered by a male teacher (T-12), who has 16 years of seniority within this context and who studied for master degree, is quite striking. According to this participant: *"School administrator must be selected by teachers' commission, students and students' parents among those who have certain competencies. He must be able to be unseated by the same way if necessary. This will allow the*

subjectivation of the teachers and the students on the decisions to be taken that will have impact on their lives by directly achieving the democracy at schools and it will allow the relationship among the teacher, the student, the students' parents and the administrators to be established more healthily."

Findings Based on the Data Obtained Through Focus Group Discussion

The participants were first asked how they interpret the new school administrator assignment system with regard to whether it provides opportunity for an objective assessment or not. Considering the answers given to this question as positive answers and negative answers, majority of the participants considered the system as negative (n=8) while some others indicated that the system had both positive and negative aspects (n=4).

In this regard, a male teacher having 11 years of seniority (T-1) claimed the assessment as a conclusion of the assignment results to be unfair: "*If we have a look at how the situation is now, the answer to this question automatically comes up by itself. More than 90 % of the principals and the vice principals officiating within the system are from Eğitim Bir Sen.*" Another male teacher (T-5) who became a principal before the new school administrator assignment system and who has 17 years of seniority, stated that there were other "factors" besides the unions: "*Actually the situation is not wholly composed of unions or the initiative of the district national education directorate. For example, in my school people were appointed by means of very much high factors.*"

The participants indicated their doubts mainly on the interview while considering the objectivity in terms of assessment and evaluation (n=9). For example, according to a female teacher (T-8) with 11 years of seniority, "*verbal examination is so irritating, while determining the related commissions distinctive point indicated is that the person who is to be interviewed must not be a relative. Being objective requires being standard but this standardization cannot be provided through verbal interview.*" According to a male vice-principal (VP-1) having 13 years of seniority, "*There is no other way to ensure objectivity but examination though there are claims that there is something brewing in the examinations, too.*" According to a female teacher with 12 years of seniority (T-7), who worked as a vice-principal and who is currently officiating as a teacher, assessment criteria inhibit making an objective assessment: "*You can already realize having looked at criteria through which they evaluate us that there cannot be objectivity.*"

While a male teacher (T-2), who officiated as a principal and who has 18 years of seniority, expressed his experience while explaining his views on the assignment process as "*the commission responsible for the assignment was consisted of newly appointed branch directors and they gave points which were below 75 to many people however, later on those who changed their unions among the ones getting lower than 75 points were appointed as principals getting points over 90*", a female teacher (T-6) with 6 years of seniority expressed her doubt about the objectivity of the system by saying "*parents are giving points to you over the parent-teacher association, how and from where does the district director of national education and branch directors know you, how do they evaluate your activity?*".

While a male director (V-2) with 16 years of seniority expressed his opinion by uttering "*when there are activities, there are branch directors. They observe and know the administrators*", a male teacher (T-5), who officiated as a principal before the new system and who has 17 years of seniority, disagreed with this opinion: "*The evaluator branch director has just started to officiate in his position for the last 1-2 months, he has never come to the school for even one day, he cannot even know where the school is if you ask, he has no idea what is being done at school.*" The assertion that District Director of National Education and branch directors attend the activities and know the administrator seems more problematic for the vice principals and especially the teachers who for the first time apply for being appointed as a principal than for those applying for being re-appointed as the principal. Because it does not seem possible to know these individuals by "attending the activities"!

With regards to the course of the assignment process, the points a male teacher (T-5) with 17 years of seniority, who served as a principal previously, expressed while conveying the evaluation process are quite striking: "*Now you have the 40 points which you got from the school. The points that were got from the head of the parent-teacher association, two teacher selected by the teachers' commission, the teacher with the highest seniority and the one with the lowest seniority… There are also the points that were given by the district director and the branch directors at the district national education. For example I got 40 from the school, they know me, they see what I do and what I cannot, I got 24 out of 25 from the district director. And the points that I got from the branch directors who were appointed to this position one or two months ago is two in total. Therefore I was left below 75. I went to the court. I got a motion for stay of execution. I was revaluated. This time the district director gave me a low point, too. His personal expression towards me was: "I could now give you the highest score this time because I am afraid". My school was selected as the district-wide best school for three consecutive years… There were people insisting to me during the revaluation process as: 'Resign from your union, you don't even need to register to our union, stay without any union for 10-15 days, you may re-join your union later if you want. We will have done your job'. I did not resign and I was considered unsuccessful.*"

One of the points that the participants doubt about in terms of the objectivity of the new assignment system is that the principals can determine their vice principals (n=5). Regarding this regulation which was changed by the by-law dated October 2015, a male teacher with 16 years of seniority (T-4) expressed his opinion as "*The principal's selection of his/her vice principal may create cohesion with his team and may increase performance, however, this team may discriminate the teachers who have different views and opinions at the school and this may create tension and problems within the school's system.*" and a female teacher with 8 years of seniority (T-3), for the same topic, stated that leaving the initiative for the selection of the vice principal into the hands of only one person, the principal, may damage the objectivity.

In order to address this topic within the course of the interview, the principals were asked if they have any limitations on selecting the vice principals. Technically, no other limitation was reported excepting the criteria for being a vice principal in the corresponding regulation. However, according to a male teacher having 17 years of seniority (T-5), who served as a principal before the new assignment system, there are some "limitations": "*Of course there*

are some limitations. You cannot select those whom the union does not approve as vice principal even if you want to. District National Education Directorates send lists as "Those individuals can become a vice principal." A male principal having 15 years of seniority (V-2) explained the fact that principals are granted with such an opportunity as: "*Carrying the business together. In terms of coordination. It was also brought to agenda in the seminars we attended. There were terrific conflicts between the principals and the vice principals. Inspectors said they could not focus on our own business anymore because of dealing with these. This system was brought based on this.*"

Another sub-dimension of the same topic is whether the principals have the power to discharge the vice principals whom they selected by themselves, or make them discharged from their positions. Because, how the things will proceed will be an important problem if serious disagreements occur. Vice principals will only be able to be discharged after an investigation as they are appointed by the confirmation of the governorate. In short, in the vice principal assignment system brought with the June 2014 regulations, there is technically no limitations for the principals on selecting the vice principals, but they don't have direct authorization to discharge the vice principals.

The participants, secondly, were asked how they evaluate the new school administrator assignment system in terms of competence based selection and the question was materialized as "Does this evaluation system give onto gaining the individuals, who have educational efficacy, whose human relations and organizational skills are high and who distinguish with their leadership skills, to the school system?" Considering the answers to this question as positive answers and negative answers, while the majority of the participants presented their opinions on the system not providing a competence based selection (n=8), some participants stated that the system partially provided competence based selection (n=3) and 1 participant did not give any opinion that could be categorized within this scope. Having looked at the answers to this question, the participants addressed the competence based selection generally in terms of assessment and evaluation process and criteria (n=10) and especially those who had given negative expressions on the system often made criticisms relating politicisation and favouritism (n=7).

In this regard, according to a female teacher (T-8) who has 11 years of seniority, administrator assignment system "is not a system for predicting the competency. If you are searching for competency somewhere, you exhibit the requirements of the competency normatively and you make job – duty analysis." According to a male teacher who has 18 years of seniority and who served as a principal before (T-2) "union belongingness of the individuals is rather determinant, not their competences." According to a female teacher having 8 years of seniority (T-8) "if your beard, clothes, lifestyle is in not a certain shape, they do not appoint you." What a female teacher having 5 years of seniority expressed is quite striking: "A principal from my school was discharged after the new evaluation system and a new principal was brought. One year passed but I still cannot understand what the new principal is good at doing."

According to a male vice principal having 9 years of seniority (VP-1) who finds the new system positive in terms of competence based selection, "the previous regulation did not involve the trainings the individuals participated,

from this point the new system actually includes points relating the prediction of the competences." Based on this point of view, the participants were reminded that the court, in the regulation for the teacher career steps in the past, cancelled the provision of the regulation relating with in-service training on the grounds that "everybody who wants should be able to reach the in-service training opportunities, however it is not like that" and they were asked "how the points obtained through the trainings received can be evaluated in this respect in the assignment of the school administrator." The participants generally indicated that reaching the trainings was not possible for everyone and they put emphasize on the fact that this caused injustice.

The participants were thirdly asked how they assess the new school administrator assignment system in terms of improving the effectiveness of the school system. Considering the answers given to this question as positive answers and negative answers, majority of the participants stated that the new system has influenced/will influence the school system in a negative way (n=8), and some other participants indicated that the system would improve the effectiveness of the school system by encouraging the administrator candidates and the administrators to improve themselves (n=3) and 1 participant did not give a clear opinion.

Regarding the effectiveness of the school system, some thoughts were asserted on that the new school administrator assignment system caused tension and polarisation at the schools. Fr example, the statement of a male teacher who has 18 years of seniority and who served as a principal before the new system (T-2) is as follows: "Currently, 4 teachers at my school have ended the term. They have disagreements with the administrators. They are always absent due to sickness." Similarly, a statement of a female teacher with 11 years of seniority (T-8) is quite remarkable: "We have similar situations, too. They are either on leave, or sick or they have dispatch note. Uneasiness in the school system creates such problems." In a similar way, according to a male vice principal having 9 years of seniority (VP-1): *"Tension and conflict is arising at the school system. It is being hidden with them being on leave, or being absent due to sicknesses."* Experiences of a male teacher with 11 years of seniority, who stated that tension and polarization arose after the new assignment system, is quite striking: *"I encountered something recently. Vice principal came to the classroom to make an announcement. And I realized that he was making the announcement of his trade union. I objected. He did not insist on much. There are more politics and polarisation at school compared to the past due to the system. People are treated according to their political views. Educational competencies, training activities are being left aside."* According to a male teacher who has 17 years of seniority and who served as a principal before the evaluation process (T-5), *"common purposes of the school is not coming to the forefront due to the increasing polarisation and grouping. Teachers, now, are trying to uncover each other's mistakes. Let's say a mistake was made while carrying out a formal duty. The opposite side is immediately choosing to write the minutes down and punish this person."* According to a female teacher who has 11 years of seniority and who gives a striking explanation on the same topic (T-8), *"teacher's lounge is sometimes not used as a common room. People are gathering in different rooms. We call them as 'parallel rooms'. There sometimes can be 4-5 different rooms. Even the tea is brewed separately."*

According to a male teacher who has 16 years of seniority and who presents his opinion on the effectiveness: *"Teachers must trust and respect the administrator for the effectiveness in the school system. If a teacher thinks that the administrator is brought to that position through favour and backstage activities and without deserving, he will not rely on the administrator's directions. He will not believe the administrator. Therefore the school system will not be effective."* Similarly, a male principal (V-2) having 16 years of seniority put an emphasis on another dimension of the topic: *"I agree with this opinion. But from another point of view! An unavoidable prejudice rises towards those selected and appointed. They condition themselves, no matter what you do, you cannot create a coherent working environment."*

A female teacher, who has 12 years of seniority and who officiates as a teacher while she had served as a principal in the past (T-7), put another dimension of the problem forward as follows: *"Experienced teachers now got back to being a teacher though they were school administrators in the past. Majority of the new teachers is not experienced. What will they do among these experienced teachers? It is difficult for them to make others respect themselves. It is also difficult to establish coordination."*

The participants were fourthly asked how they evaluate the new school administrator assignment system in terms of encouraging the school administrators and the teachers to improve themselves in the professional context. Considering the answers to this question as positive answers and negative answers, majority of the participants (n=8) are of the opinion that the new school administrator assignment system does not encourage the school administrators and the teachers to improve themselves. While 2 of the participants asserted the contrary, 2 other participants stated that the system partly encouraged the school administrators and the teachers. In this regard, like addressed in the analysis of the data obtained through semi structured interview form, the answers to the questions were mostly categorized as positive and negative, besides topics such as reaching in-service training opportunities (n=6) and post-graduate study (n=5) were also addressed.

Having looked at some answers to this question, according to a male principal having 16 years of seniority (V-2) *"teachers and principals who have doubts on being reappointed are participating the trainings unavoidably, the number of those willing to study post-graduate is increasing and this increases the quality of the teachers and the administrators."* According to a male teacher having 16 years of seniority (T-4) *"There is also the topic of self-development. Studying post-graduate is the most common way. You can either do that in a short period of time by paying, even from the distance, or you can do it giving your best. In this case, is the person really developed? People can obtain numerous diplomas and certificates without gaining administrative competencies. In fact there are many ways to obtain these in our country."* Similarly, the expression of a male teacher, who has 18 years of seniority (T-2), in the same direction is as follows: *"I have a friend, who is a teacher and administrator and who obtained 50 certificates in the last 10 years. By the way I cannot participate the same trainings, this is another issue."* Statement of a female teacher having 5 years of seniority (T-6) is quite striking: *"My school was left without principal for five months. Different forces competed and disagreements grew bigger. Finally they sent someone. No point of talking about self-development! The one lobbying better and making the bargain from above won."*

Similarly, on the topic of self-development through post-graduate study, while a male vice principal having 13 years of seniority (VP-2) said *"to me it encourages the individuals to study post-graduate, then makes them get more points"*, a female teacher having 11 years of seniority made a different remark as follows: *"To me it is not like that. This is my second license. I am not studying it for getting points. I don't think that they would appoint me even if I registered in that union. I got my first post-graduate diploma in 2006. What am I getting in return? Maximum 15 liras more in my salary."* According to a female teacher who has a 12 years of seniority and who serves as a teacher currently while having served as a vice principal before the new assignment system (T-7): *"That's right, people want to study post-graduate to become a principal from the beginning or to continue serving as a principal after revaluation, they want to attend the in-service trainings but whatever they do, the system works other way.."* Expressions of a female teacher having 8 years of seniority (T-3) are quite striking: *"In the current system, what can a person who knows that he is appointed for four years and who is aware that anytime he can be discharged do? In any case the superiors, province and district national education directorates are taking decisions. Frankly, I were in that position, would I rather focus on self-development or work with the authorities behind the scenes? Somehow or other I will be competing in this league after a short time."*

In the regard whether the new assignment system encourages individuals to professionally improve themselves, there were some remarks affirming or negating the system by placing the competition concept in the centre. For example, while a male principal with 15 years of seniority (V-2) asserted that the system brought competition and increased the motivation, there were also many remarks made oppositely. For example, according to a female teacher having 11 years of seniority (T-8), whenever there is a competitive system, the principal will try to lobby instead of improving himself/herself.

They participants were lastly asked how a school administrator appointment/assignment system must be in terms of objectivity, selection based on competence, effectiveness of the school system and encouraging the teachers and the school administrators to improve themselves professionally, which were brought forward in the previous four questions of the interview form. The participants, similarly with the analysis of the data obtained through the semi-structured interview form, indicated that they found examination (n=11), seniority (n=10) and post-graduate (n=7) important for an objective and competence based selection. According to the participants, concrete criteria must be determined (n=6), political/favouritism must be avoided (n=5) and in-service trainings must be given importance in the assignment of the administrators.

Having looked at some expressions given by the participants on this topic; according to a male principal with 16 years of seniority (V-2), *"examination must be carried out but trainings relating school administration must be provided after. Seniority must be effective; total years of working as a teacher must be 5 years or 7-8 years and another examination must be performed after the training."* According to a male vice principal with 13 years of seniority (VP-1), both written examination and verbal interview must be carried out. According to a male teacher who has 18 years of seniority and who officiated as a principal before (T-2), *"Knowledge of the person who is accepted to the verbal interview will already have been measured.*

Regulations, ceremonies… If you are carrying out such a verbal interview but still asking the regulations, then it does not mean anything. Psychological evaluations regarding whether he can carry the duties of the position out or not can be made by experts, by people from different disciplines. Or the person may be asked to solve a given case study related with the school system."

After the approaches bringing examination into the forefront, when the participants were asked *'Can school administration be degraded to efficacies that can be predicted by one or more examinations? For example isn't the application process needed to be considered, too?'* the participants were seen to refer to seniority factor. According to a male principal with 15 years of seniority (V-1), not only teaching experience must be required, "but also the condition of having served as a vice principal for a certain number of years must be established for being a principal."

The number of the participants who think that the interview as an evaluation method must be abandoned is not few (n=7). Having looked at the remarks of these participants, it can be said that the matter of who, how, and with what content will carry out the interview creates doubts. In this respect, the expression of a female teacher having 11 years of seniority (T-8) is quite striking: "What will we do if they again ask the elephants in the interview?" According to a vice principal who considers the interview as a method of evaluation and who has 9 years of seniority (VP-1), "interview instructions must be set, interviews must be recorded and they must be objective."

According to a female teacher who has 5 years of seniority and who brings the post-graduate education to the foreground (T-6), *"Post-graduate education must be effective but it must be quality!"* İn-service training is a suggestion that the participants often emphasize. In this regard, according to a male vice principal with 13 years of seniority "Administrators must be audited at the end of each year and in-service trainings must be conducted according to the determined needs."

In the interview, response to the remark of a male teacher with 11 years of seniority in which he stated points such as "base control, teachers and even students participating the process, resigning school administrator on certain conditions" was given as "reliance is needed".

During the interviews, one of the topics mentioned but not included in the research questions was 'professionalising the school administration'. In this regard, according to a male principal having 16 years of seniority (V-2), *"school administration must be taken out of the education class and the school administrators must be considered within the directorate class"*. Within the progress of the interview, the common answer given by the participants to the question asked by the researcher, which was *"how would it be to consider the school administration as a non-teachership based job?",* was "it would be bad". The participants generally consider having experienced the school system as a teacher as an essential requirement to become an administrator. In this regard, according to a male teacher, who officiated as a principal and who has 18 years of seniority (T-2), "those who will be school administrators must definitely have experienced the teacher's lounge." The answers given to "Must he become estranged against teachership, must he take one of his feet out of teachership?" were not clear.

While one part of the participants found professionalization essential, others found teachership and relations with the teachers essential. In this regard, remarks of a teacher having 16 years of seniority (T-4) are quite attention grabbing: "We are experiencing a strange situation. Those who were within the administrative staff before but have returned to become a teacher like us with the new evaluation system are experiencing a very strange situation. They are acting like as if they are in a disgraceful situation. They are trying to be appointed to another school immediately. So, teachership field must not be abandoned! It must be the main job on the basis."

Discussions, Conclusions and Suggestions

Nowadays, as in the all aspects of the public life, an extensive reconstruction process also in the education field is ongoing in Turkey. In this context, school administrator appointment/assignment system constitutes one of the important dimensions of the changes within the school system. The system, despite numerous administrator appointment/assignment system regulations prepared so far since 2003 (9 regulations in the years of 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2014 and 2015) and the circulars issued, is intensively discussed and criticised.

Based on the findings of this research, in which the new school administrator assignment system is assessed based on the views of the teachers and the school administrators over four dimensions, it was determined that the participants who have already taken on administrative roles consider the system majorly affirmatively and the other participants clearly consider the system negatively. Doubts and criticisms of those who had taken on administrative roles before the new system, but who were selected during the revaluation process and appointed as teachers, against the system are more intense.

The first topic addressed within the scope of the study was whether the system provided an objective evaluation or not. Objectivity is a term related whether another factor besides the efficacy of the candidates for the job/position is effective on the selection process. While some pretty general criteria, such as having the educational background and serving as a teacher for 3 years successfully, was established for being appointed as an administrator to the educational institutions before 1990s in Turkey, some standards have been started to be created afterwards (Aslanargun, 2011). As of 1999, for the first time competitive examination was brought for the administrator appointments. According to the regulation made, the candidates scoring 70 out of 100 or higher in the administrator competitive examination were considered successful and these candidates were given 5 years valid administration certificate and right to apply for the administrator positions at schools having vacancies within the permanent staff (Günay, 2004). Afterwards, as emphasized above, several regulations have been made, however an effective appointment/assignment system could not have been reached.

It can be said on this regard that one of the main problems is the "arbitrariness of the administration". Aslanargun (2012a) thematically examined 191 court decisions related with the criteria to be appointed as school

administrators and cancellation reasons and concluded that thoughts and applications on whether the Ministry of National Education and the judicial organs abided by law could reflect somehow a power struggle. Due to the fact that the State Council stopped the execution of the regulations prepared by the Ministry of National Education and appointments that were made retrospectively were cancelled, no appointments could be done principally and many schools were administrated by representatives between the years 2004-2010. Most especially, between the years 2008-2009, upon the cancellation of educational administrators appointment regulations, the ministry made direct appointments to the school and institution administrative positions based on the authorization that it can appoint the state personnel by transfer to the positions equal to their current one or higher regardless of the duty and title equality of the institutions, which is enacted by the 71st and 76th Articles of the State Personnel Law numbered 657. Among these appointments which were made without any criteria, some of the ones being submitted to the court were cancelled by the administrative courts. In this regard, the reasons put forth by the court were terms and notions such as accordance with the law, requirements of service, public welfare, equality, propriety, objectivity and authoritativeness. However, the Ministry defended the appointments that she made by similar reasons. (Aslanargun, 2012a, 354).

Regarding the new system, one of the points to be noted in terms of objectivity is that the system is built on "assignment" rather than "appointment". While appointment provides an institutionally and legally extended protection/assurance for the appointed person, the protection/assurance provided by assignment is proportional. This means that the initiative hold by the administration and the school administrator can be resigned arbitrarily at the disposal of the authority. Therefore, this may take the school system under the control of the politics.

According to the regulations dated October 2015, which is currently in force, among the candidates meeting the general and private conditions those to be appointed as head vice principals or vice principals shall be determined according to the result of a written examination; and those to be appointed as principals shall be evaluated through performance and situation assessment form and the result of a written examination. Objectivity of the system is not possible be mentioned due to a series of factors such as flexibility of the evaluation criteria, authorities assigned to carrying out the evaluation, the way of composing the commissions for the verbal examination and its proceeding. Yolcu and Arslan's (2015) work related with putting the verbal interview into use in order to predict the administrators' efficacies confirms this conclusion. Besides, findings reached within the scope of this study confirm the claims that system is being polarised.

In this regard, considering the results obtained by Doğan, Demir and Pınar (2014), the participants particularly put emphasises on the service duration and experience in terms of the assignment of the school administrators, they generally accepted and supported the written examination's objectivity, they rejected the verbal interview as it could lead subjective evaluation and they stated that governorate's presence in the assignment system would not be fair.

At one side of the doubts on the functions of the province governors, there is the fact that the province governors may act with their political powers and on the other side that they may not have the opportunity to know the candidates sufficiently.

Secondly addressed topic within the study was how the system would be considered in terms of making competence based selections. This brings the efficacies of the school administrators to the foreground. According to Başaran (2004), efficacy in the administration is being knowledgeable and skilled in the administrational notions and models, administration technology, human relations, establishment and improvement of the organizational structure, functions of the administration and administrational processes. This efficacy, from the stage of identifying the knowledge and skills related to the administration to the stage of applying the requirements of the administration, may be on different levels

School administrators have responsibility areas such as educational situation at school, physical conditions of the school, personnel affairs, student affairs, works related to accounting and belongings and assessment and evaluation (Taymaz, 2005). The mission of the school administration is to keep the school up according to its purposes by using all the human and material sources at the school efficiently. The principal's success on this mission depends on his view of school as a system of roles, and on adjusting his behaviours according to the roles and the expectations of the teachers and the other personnel in which he/she is always in contact with (Bursalıoğlu, 2005).

An examination of the literature indicates that it has commonly been emphasized that the topics of pre-service and post-service training for the school administrators, their selection and appointment in line with 'leadership efficacies according with the time' must be searched for and some standards must be established (Gümüşeli, 2006 ; Aslan ve Karip, 2014). In this regard, it was stated that the administrators, as educational leaders, have many duties and responsibilities such as having a vision, creating a positive learning and teaching environment at school, giving importance to professional development, improving interpersonal communication and collaboration to create a team atmosphere in the school, establishing good relations with the environment of the school, having strategic planning capacity, having the vision for being in the highest position at the school and making the school a part of life-long learning (Balcı, 2002).

It can be said that the new administrator assignment system has serious negative aspects in bringing profession members having the competencies indicated above to the school administration. Hence, according to the findings based on the data obtained within the scope of this study, the system generally has serious problems in terms of assessment and evaluation process criteria and is associated with polarisation and favouritism by the participants.

The topics of improving the effectiveness of the school system and encouraging the school administrators and teachers to improve themselves in the professional context, which were addressed within the scope of the study, were found to be significantly coinciding especially during the stage of focus

group discussion. Using the material and human sources in the most effective and efficient way for the organisational targets resides in identifying the functions of the administration (Taymaz, 2005). If a public institution is being addressed and if the notion of public service given importance, the term on which the functions of the administration is based must be effectiveness rather than activity and efficiency. Because, while the activity and efficiency is addressed as creating maximum quantity and quality with the minimum cost on the basis of input-output relations, effectiveness is a term based on targets. The aim in the public service is to achieve the public welfare.

According to the results obtained based on the findings of the study, the relation between the new assignment system and the effectiveness of the school system is considered as negative by the majority of the participants. While forming their opinions, the participants generally support their opinions with the thoughts that the selections are not made objectively or are not based on competencies and they emphasize on the tension arising/may arise at the school and the organisational climate being affected by this situation.

When addressing the new assignment system in terms of encouraging the school administrators and the teachers improving themselves in the professional context, factors such as in-service training, post-graduate study, developing various projects and/or taking roles in the projects come to the foreground. According to Bursalıoğlu (2005), if the mission of the administration is keeping the school up according to its purposes, the mission of school administration is also keeping the school up with its purposes. In order for the school administrators to fulfil their responsibilities and duties, they must know the notions and processes regarding the school administration and must be able to actualize them and they must have had academic education in this field.

Although the new assignment system technically seems to encourage the candidates for self-development, its standards which are deemed as encouraging are flexible and unclear, benefiting from the activities to which it is thought to be encouraging is unequal and the consequences of benefiting from the activities are uncertain.

"Arbitrary procedures" and flexible executions brought up by the school administrator assignment system brings non-objectivity during the assignment process and lobbying based on politisation during the post-processes into the foreground. Therefore the system is not a motivator for the education servants who want to pass the revaluation successfully or who becomes a candidate for administrative roles to improve themselves in the professional context.

One of the topics coming to the fore within the scope of the study was the professionalization of the school administration. According to Taymaz (2000), one of the biggest barriers on front of the professionalization and institutionalization of the administration in Turkish educational system is confusing the missions and values of the teachership and the administration with each other. "Teacher-administrator" type of profession emerged in Turkey. Individuals are educated for being a teacher, but they are expected to carry on both teachership and administration related efficacies and adopt these roles. According to Bursalıoğlu (1997), until the educational administration is cut free

from being an additional duty to the teachership, the school system will not be able to be made effective and efficient. School administrators must be educated according to the administrational requirements and then employed.

The topic of professionalization of the school administration was addressed as 'transferring from the educational statue to the administrative statue as a permanent staff" within the scope of the study. At one side of the problem, there are the argumentations given above. On the other side, there is gaining the required competencies for becoming an educational leader in the school system and "having experienced the teacher's lobby". From another perspective, when the administration is defined and designated as an area of expertise based on the current assignment system, numerous problems may occur considering the relativity and dynamism of the assignment. For example, what will the situation of someone who previously was within the administrative services staff but found "unsuccessful" during the administrator reassignment process be? During the study, an ironic solution suggested by a participant was taking these people into a "pool".

Following suggestions can be made on the school administrator appointment/assignment system through the conclusions based on the analysis of the data obtained during the study:

Primarily, school administrators must not be assigned, but appointed.

School administrator appointment system must be cleaned of political factors.

A general frame related to the efficacies of the school administrators and concrete criteria having certain borders and edges related to this frame must be created.

The "multi-evaluation" approach must be adopted in the selection of the administrators.

In this respect, teachership seniority/experience for becoming a school administrator, teachership experience/seniority as well as vice principal experience/seniority for becoming a principal must be a condition in general terms.

Examination and verbal interviews can be carried out for the selection of the school administrators. Examination and interview topics must be formed by the support of academic units and experts, examinations and interviews must be oriented at predicting the administrators' efficacies, and they must be conducted far from chicanes. For this reason, it can be helpful if the Ministry receives support from the corresponding units of the universities and includes the trade unions in the process equally.

In order to increase the effectiveness of the school system, the school administrator and the teachers must be encouraged to improve themselves. Post-graduate studies and in-service trainings must be given importance in this context and the educational opportunities must be accessible for all educational servants who are interested and who have efficacies.

As a research suggestion, it will be beneficial to carry out new studies aiming to resolve the relation between the school administrators and the school system by gathering different procedural preferences together.

References

Ağaoğlu, E., Altınkurt, Y., Yılmaz, K. & Karaköse, T. (2012). Views of the school administrators and teachers on the efficacies of the school administrators - Kütahya province. TED Education and Science Journal, 37 (164), 159–175.

Altın, F. & Vatanartıran, S. (2014).Suggestion of educating, appointing and continuously developing model in Turkey, Ahi Evran University Kırşehir Education Faculty Journal (KEFAD), Vol 15, Issue 2, August, 17-35.

Anderson, G. (1990). Fundamentals of Educational Research. London - Newyork: The Falmer Press.

Arıkan, G. (2007). Analysis on the policies and applications which ministry of national education follows in the process of appointing school administrators. Post-Graduate Thesis, Beykent University Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, Turkey.

Aslan, N. (2009).Comparison of education and appointment of school administrators in European countries and Turkey and a model suggestion. Post-Graduate Thesis, Gaziantep University Social Sciences Institute, Gaziantep, Turkey.

Aslan, H. & Karip, E. (2014). Improving the leadership standards of the principals. Educational Administration in Theory and Practice, 20(3), 255- 279.

Akın, U. (2012). Selecting and educating school adminstrators: Various practices from Turkey and selected countries. AIBU Journal of Social Sciences Institute, Vol:12, Year:12, Issue:2, 1-30.

Aslanargun, E. (2011). School administration and appointment regulations in Turkey. e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy (NWSA), Education Sciences. 1C0466, *6*(4), 2646-2659.

Aslanargun, E. (2012). Values which principals must have. Educational Sciences in Theory and Practice, 12 (2) [Special Volume]   Spring, 1327-1344.

Aslanargun, E. (2012a). Adjudications related with the appointment process of the school administrators and prominent values. Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 18(3), 347-376.

Balcı, A. (2002).Effective School - School Development Theories Practices and Research. Ankara: Pegem Publishing.

Balcı, A. & Çınkır, Ş. (2002). Training of educational administrators in Turkey. . Symposium of Educational Administrators. Ankara University Printing House.

Balcı, A. (2008). Scientification process of the educational methods in Turkey. Journal of Educational Methods in Theory and Practice. 14 (54), 181-209.

Balyer, A., & Gündüz, Y. (2011). Education of principals in various countries: A model suggestion for the Turkish educational system. Afyon Kocatepe University Theoretical Educational Science, 4(2), 182-197.

Başaran. İ. E. (2004). Human Relations in the Administration. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1997). Theory and Practice in the Educational Method. Ankara: Pegem Publishing.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2002). New Structure and Manner in the School Administration. Ankara: Pegem A Publishing.

Cemaloğlu, N.(2005). Educating and employing school administrators in Turkey: Current situation, possible future progress and problems. Journal of Gazi Faculty of Education, Volume 25, Issue 2, 249-274.

Corrine, G. (2014). Introduction to Qualitative Research. Ankara: Anı Publishing.

Demir, S. B. & Pınar, M. A. (2013). Analysis on the views of the administrators related with the content of the 2011 regulation about administer appointment and replacement and with the point scoring measures. International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, Volume 8/6 Spring 2013, 123-143.

Doğan, S., Demir, S. B. & Pınar, M. A. (2014). Regulation of 2013 ministry of National Education administrator appointment and replacement according to the views of the administrators. Journal of Theoretical Educational Sciences. 7(2), 224-245.

Elma, C., Şener, M. & Çiftli, S. (2011). Obligatory replacement of the school administrators: an assessment based on the views of the inspectors, administrators and teachers. Congress of 20th National Education Sciences. September 8–10, Burdur.

Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2001). Leadership areas of the modern principals. Educational Methods in Theory and Practice, Issue: 28, 531 -548.

Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2006). Leadership standards developed for the principals and the views of Turkish educationists relating this standards. http://www.agumuseli.com/dokumanlar/makale/okul_mudurleri_liderlik_sta ndart.pdf. Last Access Date: 12th March 2016.

Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2009). Primary school principals in Turkey: Their working conditions and professional profiles. International Journal of Sciences. 4(4), 239-246.

Güçlüoğulları, N. (2013). Evaluation of the views of the school adminstrators and the teachers on the appointment of the administrators to the educational Institutions. Unpublished Post-Graduate Thesis, Okan University Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul.

Günay, E. (2004). Evaluation of the views of the administrators and the teachers on the selection, education and appointment of the administrators for the educational institutions (Ankara Province Example. Unpublished Post-Graduate Thesis. Ankara University Educational Sciences Institute, Ankara.

Karasar, N. (2009). Scientific Research Method, Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Lashway, L. (2003). Role of the school leader: Trends and issues, Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 18(3), 240-58.

Law on Making Changes on National Education Fundamental Laws and Certain Laws and Secondary Laws (2014) http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2014/03/20140314-1.htm, Last Access Date: 10th September 2014.

Leadership in education. (2011). Country Background Report Germany. http://www.leadership-in-education.eu/fileadmin/reports/CR_DE.pdf, Last Access Date: 2th May 2016.

Nartgün, Ş. Z., Bayraktar, C. & Akkulak, H. B. (2012). Rotation perception of the educational administrators.. 7th Congress of National Education Administration. May 24–26, Malatya.

Özdemir, S. & Yaman, A. (2011). Evaluation of the views of the principals on the rotation practice in the educational administration. 6th National Education Administration Congress, April 16-17.

Pont, B, Nusche, D & Moorman, H. (2008). Improving School Leadership - Volume 1 - Policy and Practice. https://www.oecd.org/edu/school/44374889.pdf, Last Access Date: 1th May 2016.

Punch, K.F.(2005). Introduction to Social Researches – Qualitative and Quantitive Approaches, Ankara: Siyasal Publishing.

Recepoğlu, E. & Kılınç, A. Ç. (2014). Selecting and placing school administrators in Turkey, current problems and solution recommendations. Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic. Volume 9/2 Winter 2014, 1817-1845.

Robson, C. (2015). Scientific Research Methods. Ankara: Anı Publishing.

Süngü, H. (2012) Appointment and placement of the principals in Turkey, Germany, France and England. Sakarya University Journal of Education, Volume: 1, Issue: 3, 33-48.

Şişman, M. and Turan, S. (2004). Certain trends related with the placement of the administrators across the Globe and Turkey. Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences. Volume 2, Issue 1, 13-26, Ankara.

Şimşek, H. (2004). Educating educational administrators: Comparative examples and suggestions for Turkey]. Journal of Modern Education. Year: 29, Issue: 307, Ankara.

Taş, A. & Önder, E. (2010). Comparison of the regulations issued 2004 and after on the appointment and replacement of the administrators of educational institutions. Süleyman Demirel University Journal of Social Sciences Institute. Volume: 12, 171-185.

Taymaz, H. (2000). School Administration, Ankara: Pegem Publishing.

The Legislative Decree on the Organization and Duties of the Ministry of National Education (2011), http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2011/09/20110914-1.htm, Last Access Date: 12th November 2015.

The Regulation about the Administrators of the Education Institutions Affiliated to the Ministry of National Education (2014), http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/egikuryon_1/egikuryon_1.html, Last Access Date: 12th September 2014.

The Regulation about the Assignment of the Administrators to the Educational Institutions Affiliated to the Ministry of National Education (2015) http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2015/10/20151006-2.htm, Last Access Date: 17th November 2015.

Tonbul, Y. & Sağıroğlu, S. (2012). A research on the obligatory replacement of the principals. Educational Administration in Theory and Practice. 18(2), 313-339.

Thody, A.(2007). School principal preparation in Europe. International Journal of Education Management, Vol. 21, Issue: 1, 37-53.

Yıldırım, A. and Şimşek, H. (2011) Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences. Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.

Yılmaz, K. ; Altınkurt, Y.; Karaköse, T. & Erol, E. (2012). Views of the school administrators and the teachers on the obligatory replacement of the school Administrators. e-International Journal of Educational Research, Volume: 3, Issue: 3, 65-83.

Yiğit, F. (2008). Evaluation of the methods of the selecting the administrators adopted by ministry of national education during the Republic period. Post-Graduate Thesis, Sakarya University Social Sciences Institute, Sakarya, Turkey.