

Chapter 8

The ‘Westernised’ Map of the Field of Educational Administration in Turkey and Dominant Perspectives in School Leadership Education



Kadir Beycioglu, Ali Çağatay Kılınç and Mahmut Polatcan

Abstract Although the development of educational administration has remained on the agenda for over a half century, it is apparent that the field has encountered a number of problems in Turkey. Strategies, legislative regulations, and various practices over school administrators’ training and assignment have long been debated, and problems encountered in school administration as long-term policies on the training and assignment of school principals could not be developed. This study focuses on the historical development of school administrators’ training and assignments in Turkey and on school administrators’ behaviours from Hofstede’s cultural perspective. Finally, a centralist approach in public administration and the understanding that teaching is the basis for being a school administrator which denotes that no formal in-service education is required for being appointed as a school administrator are two main factors that inhibit the development of school administration as a professional field in Turkey. Furthermore, the fact that school administrator practices have changed repeatedly in an inconsistent manner and that the common public opinion that exams for assignment of school administrators are far from objectivity come under criticism for a considerable amount of time in Turkey. On the other hand, in the context of Hofstede’s culture dimensions, it is possible to argue that the schools accept a large degree of power distance and feel uncomfortable with uncertainty. It is also reasonable to suggest that school administrators build stronger and healthier ties with other staff in the dimensions of collectivity, femininity, and indulgence.

K. Beycioglu (✉)

Faculty of Education, Dokuz Eylul University, Buca, Izmir, Turkey
e-mail: beycioglu@gmail.com

A. Ç. Kılınç · M. Polatcan

Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Letters, Karabuk University, Karabuk, Turkey
e-mail: cagataykilinc@karabuk.edu.tr

M. Polatcan

e-mail: mpolatcan@karabuk.edu.tr

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2019

E. A. Samier and E. S. ElKaleh (eds.), *Teaching Educational Leadership in Muslim Countries*, Educational Leadership Theory,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6818-9_8

Introduction

In the second half of the last century, educational administration became a scholarly field (Dimmock and Walker 1998a; Evers and Lakomski 1994; Gunter 2003). According to Hallinger and Leithwood (1996), recent years 'have been a time of questioning and introspection in the field of educational administration' (p. 98). As for Dimmock and Walker (1998b), the field 'as a field of research and practice has grown impressively over the last few decades.' (p. 379) and has been developing its theories and ethos.

While the field has been trying to construct a place for itself, there also have been different issues on the agenda of scholars in the field of educational administration. For example, English (2002), in his challenging article entitled 'The Point of Scientificity, the Fall of the Epistemological Dominos, and the End of the Field of Educational Administration', uses various symbols to refer to the issues in the field. Similarly, Maxcy (2001) points out that 'No one much cares about a science of educational administration anymore'. Besides, Leithwood and Duke (1999) report that the scholars of the field have remarkably concentrated extensively on leadership and school leaders. Of them, principal/leadership preparation is one of the most discussed issues among scholars in different contexts. Donmoyer (2001) and Beycioğlu (2012) speculated that some have been in search of a 'Holy Grail' to find a new way of leadership preparation or as Maxcy (2001, p. 575) explained, to find a 'solution to the errors of past theoretical systems'. In the end, we can claim that it is widely accepted that principal leadership is a key factor in schools and school effectiveness that begs the question of leadership preparation. The related literature provides us a summary of what is known about the preparation of principals from a range of educational settings, and educational researchers have emphasised that context matters in leadership preparation (Beycioğlu and Wildy 2015). As Middlewood (2010) argues, what principals can do depends on what they may do and this, in turn, is shaped by the educational system in which they work and by the local context (Huber and West 2002; Lumby et al. 2009; McCarthy 1999; Smylie and Bennett 2005).

In this chapter, we aim to provide a brief historical overview of the Turkish field, which is generally regarded as a field under the influences of Anglo-American perspectives, and the dominant leadership preparation approaches and practices in Turkey. We also aim to determine to what extent the culture and values of society affect the preparation of educational leaders based on Hofstede's (2001) cultural dimension theory that claims that cultures have various effects on organisations and individuals. By doing this, with the benefits of cross-cultural and cross-context studies of principal preparation in mind, the aim of this chapter is to contribute to the field from the perspective of the Turkish context as a Muslim and relatively a 'secular' country.

A Brief History of the Emergence and Development of Educational Administration in Turkey

It can be argued that the development levels of countries are related to the education systems they have as the quality of the education system of a country affects its economic growth, cultural development and political prestige in the international arena. As a matter of fact, most people base their countries' breakthroughs in different fields of education. The success of the economist who manages the economy or the politician who governs a country is directly proportional to the quality of education provided in this country. In this context, the improvement of the quality of education depends on the good administration of the system. The better the system is managed, the more the quality of education is expected to increase. In this regard, it can be said that although some advances have been made in the area of educational administration in Turkish Education System, the efforts on specialisation initiatives in the field are inadequate. It may be stated that the tendency can be summarised as 'being a teacher is the basis in the profession' restricts the development of the educational administration field.

Developments in the field of administrative studies have been reflected in the field of educational administration which is a sub-field and have led to the change of this field. Especially, with globalisation since the last quarter of the twentieth century, developments such as the information society, neoliberalism, multiculturalism, and standardisation have forced the field of educational administration to change. These developments have led to the creation of new expectations about the knowledge and skills of education and school leaders. This situation obliges the institutions training the education leaders to reorganise not only the curriculum but also the scope and methods of teaching (Balçı 2011). It can be stated that Turkey, which models the advanced Western countries in their founding philosophies, has also been affected by this development and change efforts. Moreover, it can be said that much research and many meetings for the development of educational administration are on the agenda. As stated in the literature, it is clear that some important decisions and practices taken by the authorities in the development process of educational administration are related to the results of such studies (Şimşek 2002; Üstüner and Cömert 2008).

There are debates as to whether or not educational administration will be an academic field (Balçı 2008; Örücü and Şimşek 2011). Balçı (2008) argues that educational administration is an academic field within the scope of the discussions in the literature. According to the author, the departments and the units of the field at universities, requiring expertise, conducting scholarly research, the presence of academic journals, and the organisations of members working in the field are indicative of educational administration as an academic field. However, Balçı points out that the discussion of whether educational administration in Turkey is a profession or an academic field is hidden in the historical roots of the field. As a matter of fact, the establishment of the Educational Administration Research and Development Association (EARDA), the Training Managers and Specialists Association (TMSA), the National Educational Administration Congresses (since 2001), and the National Council of

Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) meetings and reports can be evaluated as the indicators of the formation of an academic organisation in the field (Örücü and Şimşek 2011). According to Şimşek (2002) who categorises educational administration as a practice-oriented academic discipline, educational administration is a field of application of educational organisations' intended policies and decisions taken by using human and material resources effectively in accordance with the determined targets.

Policies and practices for the training of school administrators in Turkey have been the focus of a series of research projects (Acar 2002; Aksoy 2002; Ayrıl 2016; Balcı and Çınkır 2002; Balyer and Gündüz 2011; Işık 2002; Süngü 2012; Şimşek 2002; Şişman and Turan 2002). Research draws attention to the lack of continuity in the training and assignment policies of educational administrators in Turkey (Karabatak 2015). It can be clearly seen that concrete and coherent policies towards the training and assignment policies or practices of school administrators are not followed in other contexts either (Çelik 2002; Çınkır 2002; Özmen 2002; Şişman and Turan 2002). On the other hand, despite Turkey having a well-established management tradition of public administration, it is difficult to claim that it has a systematic structure for training and assignment of education/school administrators (Acar 2002; Balcı 2002; Şimşek 2002). Beycioğlu and Dönmez (2006) identified the problems that have been experienced in the field of educational administration in Turkey to be the lack of an effective consensus on the production of theoretical knowledge, of boundaries between the theories, of theories with practical applications, of sufficient theoretical resources, and of a disconnection between academicians. Most of the initiatives for training and assignment of school administrators are constantly being changed in line with the ideological aims of the dominant powers that hold enforcement. This finding verifies that although there are many different applied models for training and assignment of administrators in Turkey to the present time, there is not a national policy for the training of professional administrators (Baş and Şentürk 2017). As a matter of fact, the research conducted in this subject mostly refers to the training and assignment policies and practices of educational administrators in the developed countries (Balcı 2011; Pehlivan Aydın 2002; Çınkır 2002; Özmen 2002; Şişman and Turan 2002).

It can be reported that Turkey, which has 60 years of tradition for training and assignment policies of educational administrators, has prepared many legal texts (Beycioğlu and Wildy 2015) including advisory reports, regulations, and training programmes for educational administrators. With the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, one of the main focuses of Atatürk's era, who made great strides in terms of economic and political development, was education. Indeed, the first great revolution of the Founding President Atatürk who wants to adopt advanced Western educational practices in was Act no. 430 'Unification of the Educational System'. Later, the establishment of the 'Secondary Teacher Training School' (Gazi Education Faculty) in 1926 constituted a step in the specialisation period in education. In addition, Atatürk invited John Dewey, an important American educator, and requested him to prepare a comprehensive report about the Turkish education system. Some issues about the training of school administrators were addressed in this report

which included several findings such as the budget of the education system, training practices, teacher training, and curriculum practices. In subsequent periods, an institution, the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and Middle East (PAITME), was founded in order to follow the developments in the field of public administration in Turkey and conduct research on the management of public institutions (Beycioğlu and Wildy 2015; Receptoğlu and Kılınc 2014). For example, the reports of PAITME's Central Government Organization Research Project (MEHTAP) and Public Administration Research Project (KAYA) produced decisions and proposed solutions in all areas of public administration (education, health, culture, etc.) which are among the important milestones on administrative issues in Turkey. In addition, there were some decisions made about training educational administrators during the IV National Education Council, an advisory authority that produces proposals for solving problems in the Turkish Education System. Decisions and revised practices concerning the training and assignment of educational administrators in legal texts are very important in revealing the state of educational administration. In this context, it is necessary to address these extensive studies and practices for the training and assignment of education/school administrators (KAYA 1991; MEHTAP 1963).

In Dewey's Education Report on the restructuring of the education system of the Republic of Turkey, there is not an enlightening explanation for the training of educational administrators. However, it was emphasised that requiring budgetary expenditure from the upper-level ministry units for record keeping, building/facility maintenance, and repair expenses under the school principals' responsibility rather than training the school administrators causes unnecessary time and wastes energy. Therefore, this situation prevents school principals from spending energy on teaching tasks. Meanwhile, in order to resolve this problem, the assignment of two different principals, one for education and the other for administrative duties, in the schools especially in large cities was recommended (Dewey 1939).

It is clear that some of the recommendations in the MEHTAP, an advisory report on the training of educational administrators in Turkey, have been put into practice. This report's findings regarding qualifications of educational administrators at various levels of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) are remarkable. The report documents the majority of administrators who work for state schools and are professionally trained teachers. They are expected to play important roles because of a lack of expertise in educational administration, educational policies, and economic goals. Therefore, educational administrators who work in these positions need to be experts in the field. In this respect, it is not absolutely necessary for them to come from the teaching profession; however, it may be important to have teaching experience to be a school administrator at many levels of school. Ultimately, it was proposed that education faculties and departments in this area of expertise were opened to train educational administrators who would work in many positions of MoNE (MEHTAP 1963). Following the publication of this report, education faculties (Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences) and departments which train educational administrators (Hacettepe University, Department of Education) were opened (Eğitim-Bir-Sen 2017).

In the PAITME's KAYA report (1991) on the current status of the national education system, it was proposed that legal arrangements for the employment of experts and administrators working in teaching services were made. Accordingly, it is necessary to make arrangements for major branches (educational administration, educational psychology, educational planning, measurement and evaluation, curriculum development, etc.) which have arisen in the field. According to the report, these regulations will clarify the status, duties, and authorities in the field (1991). On the other hand, although there are various opinions on the training of the educational administrators in some national education, the training has become the main agenda item in the IV National Education Council (Eğitim-Bir-Sen 2017). In the council, it is proposed to increase the power of administrators and qualifications in educational administration, hierarchical progress, and promotion in the profession. In this context, it was decided that the cooperation with universities in the training of existing educational administrators and admission of the persons who have educational administration qualifications should be considered (Decisions of IV National Education Council 1993).

As a result, it can be said that educational administration in Turkey started with the MEHTAP report. Due to the report's recommendations, educational administration started to be established as an academic discipline at state universities. Undergraduate programme training students in Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics were closed in 1997 (Recepoğlu and Kılınc 2014; Üstüner and Cömert 2008). Şimşek (1997, 2002) indicates that the field in Turkey, which was created with great effort, cannot keep up with contemporary developments in the world, thereby remaining weak because of a centralised view of education, the traditional gap between theory and practice, and communication and cooperation problems between universities. Today, the field is represented by a course entitled 'The Turkish Education System and School Administration' given at the undergraduate level (Balci 2011).

One Step Forward Two Steps Back: The Preparation and Appointment of School Leaders in Turkey

School organisations have to reform themselves according to the need for change that arises due to academic developments. Indeed, with the emergence of the concept of school effectiveness or improvement or achievement (keeping in mind that the meanings of concepts may differ from one culture to another and here we use effectiveness) traditional school understanding has given way to contemporary school approaches. Besides having good teachers, one of the other dominant factors, for many scholars, in the effectiveness of schools is the school administrator. In this respect, the fulfilment of expected roles and duties from school administrators depends on the quality of education they had. Within this scope, the training of education and school administrators in the context of educational administration expertise in the Turkish

education system is ignored or not considered an important field by political makers (Balçı 2011). Because of this, the practices in selecting and assigning school principals have been a subject of constant debate. The relations between those who have been assigned as education/school administrators and the government have significant influences in the assignment process which results in poor management by non-specialist school administrators. However, contemporary education/school administration is a challenging field of study requiring expertise (Balçı 2008).

A number of solutions have been proposed for the training and appointment of school administrators in many studies conducted in Turkey. The suggestions in most of these have similar features: providing in-service training and graduate education programmes for school principals, curriculum development studies for the training of educational administrators, establishment of cooperation between academics and experienced managers in the training and assignment of administrators, developmental leadership after teaching experience, counselling, organisational structuring, effective organisation, implementation of curriculum in staff development areas, the inclusion of the candidates selected according to the results of written and oral examinations conducted by an academic committee in-service training programmes, an assignment system based on examination, the requirement of professional qualifications, and leadership traits and merit (Ezgün 2011; Aslanargun 2011; Altınay 2013; Aktepe 2014; Balçı and Çınkır 2002; Balyer and Gündüz 2011; Çelik 2002; Çetin and Yalçın 2002).

The training and assignment of school administrators have also been included in the legal regulations. The statement, 'Only the teachers and supervisors shall be assigned to the vocational services of the Ministry of National Education and school administrations' in the 18th article of the Act on the Organisation of the Ministry of National Education (1926) showed for the first time that school administration is not accepted as a profession, and those assigned to these positions are teachers or educators. This has been one of the obstacles to the professionalisation of educational administration in Turkey, hindering its development in the next periods, partly because educational administration has been perceived to be a temporary task (Eğitim-Bir-Sen 2017). The assignment of school administrators in the Turkish Education System has been determined by a number of regulations issued regularly from 1998 to 2018. Despite the criteria for determining the importance of knowledge, skill, and merit in their assignment, the general social tendency is that objectivity is ignored in the assignments.

In Turkey, the specialisation and examination practices to become an administrator in educational institutions came into force with the regulation on assignment and relocation of the administrators of educational institutions affiliated to the Ministry of National Education in 1998; in this context, objective evaluation criteria have been introduced in the assignment of school administrators requiring that teachers have at least five years of teaching experience to apply to the selection examination. Candidates who succeeded in the examination participated in a 120 h administrator training course which included theories of Westernised and/or Anglo-American perspectives on training school principals. On the other hand, according to the regulation, teachers who have at least five years of teaching experience and have graduated from the

department of educational administration or PAITME public administration graduate programmes were exempted from the candidate selection test and taken directly into the courses. Candidates who succeeded in the assessment test after administrator training were entitled to be appointed as school administrators (Official Gazette 1998).

Vice principals who needed to be assigned according to the examinations and some career steps of school principals were determined as well. Regulation in Official Gazette (2004) stated that the duties of the administrators who have completed the four-year period of office cannot be administrator in the same educational institution with the same title for more than eight years. In the evaluation form appended to the regulation, there are seven different evaluators for the educational administrators, whose period of office will be extended, consisting of the district director of national education, department chief who is responsible for human resources in the directorship of national education, department chief who is responsible for the educational institution to be evaluated, the most senior teacher in the educational institution, the teacher who has the least seniority in the educational institution, two teachers to be selected by the teachers' council, the president and vice president of the parent–teacher association, and the president of the student council.

Official Gazette (2007) can be considered as one step back because with the arrangements, the examination process in the selection of the school principal was cancelled and completing the candidateship of the teachers was seen enough in order to be assigned as a school principal. With the amendments published in the Official Gazette (2008), the administrator evaluation form was redesigned governing the appointment of school principals. Official Gazette (2009) reinstated the examination process and required at least eight years of teaching experience as a condition for assignment as a school principal. With the amendment made in the previous regulations, the duration of an appointment was limited to eight years and the condition of compulsory relocation depended upon the decision of the principal (Official Gazette 2004, 2007, 2008, 2013).

In addition, in the regulation on the appointment and relocation of administrators working in educational institutions affiliated to the Ministry of National Education in 2014 it was required that administrative duty is carried out within the scope of laws no. 657 and no. 652. Some conditions were required for those assigned as administrators: graduation from higher education, working as a teacher in the Ministry's institutions, having the required qualifications to be assigned as a teacher at the date of appointment, and being not suspended from his administration duty as a result of a judicial or administrative investigation in the previous four years of the assignment date. Moreover, those who will be appointed are required to have at least one of these conditions: served as principal or principal chief assistant for at least two years; as a founding principal, principal chief assistant, assistant principal or teacher having principal authorisation for a total of three years in the same or multiple positions; as department chief apart from the Ministry's education and training services or superior positions; or as tenured teacher in the Ministry for at least eight years (Official Gazette 2014).

Differently from the previous regulation, by 2007 at least four years of teaching was required for the appointment of administrators working in educational institutions affiliated to the Ministry of National Education. It was aimed to appoint the principal candidates based on written–oral examinations and an administration evaluation form. Written examination weights in the regulation are listed as information about regulations, analytical thinking and ability to perform analysis, the level of representability and merit, reasoning power and understanding skill, communication skills, self-confidence and ability of persuasion, liberal education, Atatürk's principles and reforms. The minimum passing score in the oral assessment was set at 60. Finally, in the 2018 regulation, at least one year of experience as a principal, assistant principal, or teacher having principal authorisation or experience as a department chief or superior positions in the central organisation of the ministry was required (Official Gazette 2017, 2018).

As a result, the assignment of school principals and assistant principals was determined by the regulations in Turkey. The fact that these regulations have been frequently changed shows that the central government has not developed a healthy and sustainable policy in the training and appointment of administrators. The common point in the appointment of directors in all regulations is the requirement of being a teacher. This is an indication that the concept of 'being a teacher is the basis in the profession' is reflected in the regulations. However, there are ambiguities about the extent to which examinations measure the qualifications of contemporary school administrators. In addition, it cannot be said that the public is sufficiently satisfied with the criteria of the oral examinations and transparency.

Hofstede's Culture Dimensions and School Principalship in Turkey: A Quick Evaluation

Culture is expressed as the lifestyles of societies. According to Balçı (2007), it is a set of premises, beliefs, and values that are applied consciously, semi-consciously, or unconsciously in a society. Tezcan (1985) refers to culture as a combination of material and spiritual values that people have created to adapt to the environment they live in. Hofstede (1997) described culture as a conventional mental software, viewing it not as heritage, but as acquired later on in life. Culture is the whole set of meanings that are accepted in a society over a certain period of time. The reflections of culture are symbols, languages, faiths, rituals, and myths (Hoy and Miskel 2010).

Cultural models such as Schein and Geert Hofstede's dimensions of the national culture model have been developed in the organisational culture literature (Eren 2004; Erkmen 2011; Özkalp and Kirel 2000; Şişman 2007). In dimensions of the national culture model developed through a research carried out with more than 100,000 IBM employees in more than 40 countries, Hofstede argues that administrative practices and theories are inevitably tied to national culture since they affect the business environment. Hofstede used a number of dimension continua to classify national

organisations: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism versus collectivism, long-term orientation versus short-term normative orientation, indulgence versus restraint, and masculinity versus femininity (Hofstede 1997, 2001). Power distance is about whether the power between employees is distributed equally or not. Uncertainty avoidance measure shows individuals behave in cases of uncertainty. Countries with high uncertainty avoidance tend to maintain rigid rules and structures in order to provide control, whereas those with weak uncertainty avoidance are less concerned with the structure and they show a greater tolerance for risk taking. Individualism versus collectivism focuses on social needs, group belonging, and loyalty, whereas high individualism attaches importance to individuals with autonomy and self-confidence. Long-term orientation versus short-term normative orientation is concerned with the degree of accepting the cultural values of the society. In indulgence versus restraint dimension which is the fifth one, cultures are divided into two as indulgent and restrictive. Finally, in the context of masculinity versus femininity, males are overwhelmed in the administrative positions in the societies where the masculinity level is high.

Turkey's scores on the Hofstede index are high on power distance and uncertainty avoidance, moderate in indulgence, masculinity, and long-term orientation, and low on individualism (Hofstede 2018). One of the aims of education is to transfer the distinctive culture of the countries to its citizens. Therefore, education and in particular, training educational administrators should be consistent with the social structure and culture of the society even in a country that does not provide structured professional training programs for principals such as Turkey. Şahin et al. (2017) pointed out that there are cultural differences in the training and appointment of school leaders in their study about the school leadership research. The culture of the school, which is a subsystem of education, consists largely of unwritten rules of the school. The values, norms, traditions, beliefs, and symbols of the school are the basic elements that make up the school culture (Bursalioglu 2010). A strong school culture arises as a result of the unity of the administrators and teachers around common values, norms, and beliefs which can also prevent the formation of harmful subcultures. School administrators can lead school cultures consciously or unconsciously through their practices. A school administrator who knows the power of school cultures can show a more successful organisational culture as Hofstede index also classified the culture in Turkey as a collectivist one that may help principals to create a collaborative school culture. As culture arbiter, administrators should set a philosophy and vision that reflects the belief that all learners can learn in schools. This understanding should not be determined and expressed only by the administrator, it should be done in a discussion platform, and a compromise must be reached on it (Çelik 2009).

Hofstede relates the low level of power distance and uncertainty avoidance which are the dimensions of culture to high level of justice among stakeholders, participation in decision-making processes, and trust and cooperation among employees. It was found in a number of studies that school administrators are not fair at a high-level justice in many researches about the behaviours of school administrators in schools in Turkey (Ay and Koç 2014; Altinkurt and Yılmaz 2010; Baş and Şentürk 2017; Oğuz 2011; Yılmaz and Taşdan 2009); employees do not have a high level of confidence

in their administrators (Ercan 2006; Gören and Özdemir 2015; Öksüzoğlu 2012; Öztürk and Aydın 2012; Taşdan 2012); the participation level of employees is not at a high level, and they do not go beyond the regulations (Can and Serençelik 2017; Demirtaş and Alanoğlu 2015; Özdoğru and Aydın 2012). This situation can be explained by school principals tending to exhibit the behaviours of traditional authoritarian school principals. However, it has been found that school principals show democratic leadership behaviours in many researches on leadership behaviours exhibited by school administrators (Bozdoğan and Sağnak 2011; Terzi and Çelik 2016). At this point, the contradictions between the results obtained in organisational culture research in Turkey have come to light. As a matter of fact, Hofstede (2001) argued that the low level of power distance and uncertainty avoidance is indicative of administrators demonstrating democratic leadership behaviours.

It can be concluded that school principals in Turkey give prominence to collective interest rather than individualism. In many studies, it has found that school principals exhibit value-based leadership and distributive leadership behaviours and share their responsibilities with teachers. These results support Hofstede's (1997, 2001) finding in analysing cultural dimensions that Turkish society is a collective society. Indeed, some studies report that school principals in Turkey share decisions, collaborate with each other, and establish a sincere relationship with their workmates; as a result, the findings point that educational institutions show characteristics of feminine culture (Baloğlu 2012; Korkmaz and Gündüz 2011; Yılmaz and Turan 2015). Çelikten (2004) investigated the small number of female school principals in Turkey and attributed the reasons to a lack of self-confidence of female principals, not being supported by the social environment, and an inability to choose between work and family.

Conclusion

In this conceptual paper, the historical development process of training and appointing school administrators and the behaviours of school administrators were discussed. In this context, a great deal of research has been done on the training and appointment of school principals in Turkey.

Although some have been done by the central government for the training of school administrators in Turkey, many have not been taken into consideration or have been delayed in the following periods. As a matter of fact, Dewey's suggestion for the training of school administrators remains superficial. However, in National Education Councils in the following periods and in the reports of MEHTAP and KAYA projects published by PAITME, it was demonstrated that school administration is a professional job and the individuals involved should be educated. Some school administrator training practices have been put into practice in line with the recommendations of these reports; however, in the following years, these practices were not maintained due to the understanding that 'school administration is not a profession'.

The selection and appointment of the persons who will be assigned as school principals and vice principals in Turkey are realised through regulations. The fact that these regulations are frequently changed shows that the central government cannot develop a policy for the training and appointment of administrators. The common point in all regulations in terms of the appointment of administrators is the requirement of being a teacher. This is an indication that the concept of ‘being a teacher is the basis in the profession’ is reflected in the regulations. However, it can be said that there are ambiguities about the extent to which examinations measure the qualifications of contemporary school administrators. In addition to this, it cannot be said that the public is sufficiently satisfied with the criteria of the oral examinations and the transparency of the process.

Finally, the assumption that leadership behaviours of school administrators in Turkey are influenced by the culture of the community is addressed in the context of the National Cultural Dimensions of Hofstede. No studies yet have been done on schools using Hofstede’s dimensions of power distance, associated with justice, equality and trust, and uncertainty avoidance. In this regard, it can be said that the level of power distance and uncertainty avoidance is high in the relationship of school administrators in Turkey. However, many studies have found that school principals incorporate employees into decision-making, cooperate with each other, and establish a sincere relationship with their workmates. These results can be expressed in terms of collectivism, femininity, and indulgence from the dimensions Hofstede’s model includes. When training education administrators is considered, it can be argued that programmes should be sensitive to cultural dimensions of the country context. As we previously indicated in this chapter, Turkish education system does not have a regular training programme for newly appointed educational administrators before service. They sometimes participate in local trainings that generally do not have core scopes of developing educational administrators. So, if any programme is provided in future, the above-debated issues could be considered in a possible curriculum.

References

- Acar, H. (2002). 21. yüzyıla girerken Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı’nda eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi ve geliştirilmesinde yeni yaklaşımlar. In C. Elma & Ş. Çınkır (Eds.), *21. Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı* (ss. 179–194). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Aksoy, H. H. (2002). ABD’de eğitim yöneticilerinin istihdamında aranan nitelikler, koşullar ve ücretleri. In C. Elma & Ş. Çınkır (Eds.), *21. Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı* (ss. 255–274). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Aktepe, V. (2014). Okul yöneticilerinin seçme ve yetiştirme uygulamalarına yönelik öğretmen ve yönetici görüşleri. *Turkish Studies*, 9(2), 89–105.
- Altınay, E. (2013). *Okul yöneticileri ve öğretmenlerin eğitim kurumlarına yönetici atamaya ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi (İzmir ili Çiğli ilçesi örneği)*. Okan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul: Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

- Altinkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2010). Examining the relationship between management by values and organizational justice by secondary school teachers perceptions. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 16(4), 463–485.
- Aslanargun, E. (2011). Türkiye’de okul yönetimi ve atama yönetmelikleri. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 6(4), 2646–2659.
- Ay, G., & Koç, H. (2014). Determine the relation between perception of organizational justice and level of organizational commitment: study case of teachers. *Journal of Business Turk*, 6(2), 67–90.
- Ayral, M. (2016). Okul müdürü yetiştirmede 2015: Sorunlar ve gelecek. In A. Aypay (Ed.), *Türkiye’de Eğitim Yöneticileri ve Maarif Müfettişleri Seçme, Atama ve Yetiştirme* (ss. 113–144). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Balcı, A. (2002). Türkiye ‘de eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi. In C. Elma & Ş. Çınkır (Eds.), 21. *Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı* (ss. 327–330). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Balcı, A. (2007). *Örgüt mecazları*. Ankara: Ekinoks Yayınları.
- Balcı, A. (2008). Türkiye’de eğitim yönetiminin bilimleşme düzeyi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 14(2), 181–209.
- Balcı, A. (2011). The changing context of educational administration and its effects on educational administration postgraduate programmes. *Education and Science*, 36(162), 197–208.
- Balcı, A., & Çınkır, Ş. (2002). Türkiye’de eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi. In C. Elma & Ş. Çınkır (Eds.), 21. *Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı* (ss. 211–236). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Baloğlu, N. (2012). Relations between value-based leadership and distributed leadership a casual research on school principals’ behaviors. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 12(2), 1367–1378.
- Balyer, A., & Gündüz, Y. (2011). Training school principals in different countries: A new model proposal for the Turkish Educational System. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Sciences*, 4(2), 182–197.
- Baş, E. A., & Şentürk, İ. (2017). The viewpoints of school administrators about the regulation for the assignment of principals in education institution associated with the ministry of education released. *Ondokuzmayıs University Journal of Education*, 36(2), 119–143.
- Beycioğlu, K. (2012). Will evers and Lakomski be able to find leadership’s Holy Grail. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 9(2), 349–362.
- Beycioğlu, K., & Dönmez, B. (2006). Issues in theory development and practice in educational administration. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 47(47), 317–342.
- Beycioğlu, K., & Wildy, H. (2015). Principal preparation: The case of novice principals in Turkey. In K. Beycioğlu & P. Pashiardis (Eds.), *Multidimensional perspectives on principal leadership effectiveness* (pp. 1–17). Hershey: IGI Global.
- Bozdoğan, K., & Sağnak, M. (2011). The relationship between leadership behaviors of elementary school principals and learning climate. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Educational Faculty*, 11(1), 137–145.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2010). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış (15. baskı)*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Can, E., & Serençelik, G. (2017). The investigation of pre-school education teachers’ participations in the school management. *Dicle University Journal of Ziya Gökalp Education Faculty*, 30, 525–542. <https://doi.org/10.14582/DUZGEF.791>.
- Çelik, V. (2002). Eğitim yöneticisi yetiştirme politikasına yön veren temel eğilimler. In C. Elma & Ş. Çınkır (Eds.), 21. *Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı* (ss. 3–12). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Çelik, V. (2009). *Okul kültürü ve yönetimi (4. baskı)*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Çelikten, M. (2004). Okul müdürü koltuğundaki kadınlar: Kayseri ili örneği. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(17), 91–118.

- Çetin, K., & Yalçın, M. (2002). MEB yönetici eğitim programlarının değerlendirilmesi. In C. Elma & Ş. Çinkır (Eds.), 21. *Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı* (ss. 49–57). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Çinkır, Ş. (2002). İngiltere’de okul müdürlerinin yetiştirilmesi: okul müdürleri için ulusal mesleki standartlar programı. In C. Elma & Ş. Çinkır (Eds.), 21. *Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı* (ss. 275–292). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Decisions of IV National Education Council (1993). IV. Millî Eğitim Şurası Kararları. https://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2017_09/29164715_4_sura.pdf. Accessed 09 June, 2018.
- Demirtaş, Z., & Alanoğlu, M. (2015). The relationship between participation in decision-making of teachers and job satisfaction. *Journal of Kirsehir Education Faculty*, 16(2), 83–100.
- Dewey, J. (1939). Dewey Education Report. [https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/eyayin/gazeteler/web/kutuphanedebulunan dijital kaynaklar/kitaplar/digeryayinlar/197000571turkiyemaarifihakkindarapor\(johndewey\)/0000_0000turkiyemaarifihakkindarapor\(johndewey\).pdf](https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/eyayin/gazeteler/web/kutuphanedebulunan dijital kaynaklar/kitaplar/digeryayinlar/197000571turkiyemaarifihakkindarapor(johndewey)/0000_0000turkiyemaarifihakkindarapor(johndewey).pdf) Accessed 09 June, 2018.
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (1998a). Towards comparative educational administration: Building the case for a cross-cultural school-based approach. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(4), 379–401.
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (1998b). Comparative educational administration: Developing a cross-cultural conceptual framework. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(4), 558–595.
- Donmoyer, R. (2001). Evers and Lakomski’s search for leadership’s Holy Grail (and the intriguing ideas they encountered along the way). *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(6), 554–572.
- Eğitim-Bir-Sen. (2017). *Eğitim yönetiminde liyakat ve kariyer sistemi raporu*. http://www.ebs.org.tr/ebs_files/files/yayinlarimiz/egitim_yonetiminde_liyakat_kariyer_sistemi.pdf. Accessed 09 June, 2018.
- English, F. W. (2002). The point of scientificity, the fall of the epistemological dominos, and the end of the field of educational administration. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21(2), 109–136.
- Ercan, Y. (2006). Okullardaki örgütsel güven düzeyinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16, 739–756.
- Eren, E. (2004). *Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi (7. Baskı)*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayın Dağıtım.
- Erkmen, T. (2011). *Örgüt kültürü*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayın Dağıtım.
- Evers, C. W., & Lakomski, G. (1994). Three dogmas: A rejoinder. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32(4), 28–37.
- Ezgün, C. (2011). *Cumhuriyetten günümüze ilk ve orta dereceli okullarda müdür atamalarının mevzuata göre değerlendirilmesi*. Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul: Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Gören, S. Ç., & Özdemir, M. (2015). Examination of secondary school teachers’ perceptions of organizational trust in terms of various variables. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 11(3), 793–801.
- Gunter, H. (2003). Intellectual histories in the field of educational management in the UK. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 6(4), 335–349.
- Hallinger, P., & Leithwood, K. (1996). Culture and educational administration: A case of finding out what you don’t know you don’t know. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(5), 98–116.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture’s consequences: comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2018). Hofstede Insights. www.hofstede-insights.com. Accessed 9 June, 2018.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C.G. (2010). *Educational administration: Theory, research and Practice* (S. Turan, Trans.). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

- Huber, S. G., & West, M. (2002). Developing school leaders: A critical review of current practices, approaches and issues, and some directions for the future. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 1071–1102). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Işık, H. (2002). Okul müdürlüğü formasyon programları ve okul müdürlerinin yetiştirilmesi. In C. Elma & Ş. Çınkır (Eds.), 21. *Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı* (ss. 25–36). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Karabatak, S. (2015). Training of school administrators in Turkey and investigation of the model. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(3), 79–107.
- KAYA (1991). *Kamu yönetimi araştırması raporu*. http://www.todaie.edu.tr/resimler/ekler/185a8f8def383a8_ek.pdf. Accessed 09 June, 2018.
- Korkmaz, E., & Gündüz, H. B. (2011). Indexing levels of distributive leadership behaviours of primary school principals. *Kalem International Journal of Education and Human Sciences*, 1(1), 123–153.
- Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. L. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In J. Murphy & K. S. Seashore (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 45–72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lumby, J., Walker, A., Bryant, M., Bush, T., & Björk, L. G. (2009). Research on leadership preparation in a global context. In M. D. Young, G. M. Crow, J. Murphy, & R. T. Ogawa (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (pp. 157–194). New York: Routledge.
- Maxcy, S. J. (2001). Educational leadership and management of knowing: The aesthetics of coherencism. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(6), 573–578.
- McCarthy, M. M. (1999). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy & S. K. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 17–35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MEHTAP (1963). *Merkezi hükümet teşkilatı araştırma projesi raporu*. http://www.todaie.edu.tr/resimler/ekler/bdfe5e3cddec94c_ek.pdf. Accessed 09 June, 2018.
- Middlewood, D. (2010). Managing people and performance. In T. Bush, L. Bell, & D. Middlewood (Eds.), *The principles of educational leadership and management* (pp. 135–150). London: Sage.
- Oğuz, E. (2011). The relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational justice and administrators' leadership styles. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 12(1), 45–65.
- Öksüzöğlü, M. (2012). Organizational trust in educational management: A case study of a high school in North Cyprus. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 49, 121–140.
- Örücü, D., & Şimşek, H. (2011). The state of educational administration scholarship in Turkey from the scholars' perspectives: A qualitative analysis. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 17(2), 167–197.
- Özdoğru, M., & Aydın, B. (2012). The relationship among elementary school teachers' participation in decision-making, their desire and motivation levels. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Educational Faculty*, 12(1), 357–367.
- Özkalp, E., & Kirel, Ç. (2000). *Örgütsel davranış*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Öztürk, Ç., & Aydın, B. (2012). High school teachers' perceptions of trust in organization. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(2), 485–504.
- Pehlivan Aydın, İ. (2002). Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nde eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi ve yönetici geliştirme akademisi örneği. In C. Elma & Ş. Çınkır (Eds.), 21. *Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı* (ss. 293–306). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Official Gazette. (1998). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı eğitim kurumları yöneticilerinin atama ve yer değiştirme yönetmeliği. Sayı: 23472 ve Tarih: 23.09.1998. http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/23472_0.html. Accessed 11 June, 2018.
- Official Gazette. (2004). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı eğitim kurumları yöneticilerinin atama ve yer değiştirme yönetmeliği. Sayı: 25343 ve Tarih: 11.01.2004. http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/egikuryon_1/egikuryon_1.html. Accessed 11 June, 2018.

- Official Gazette. (2007). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı eğitim kurumları yöneticilerinin atama yönetmeliği. Sayı: 26492 ve Tarih: 16.05.2007. http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/26492_0.html. Accessed 11 June, 2018.
- Official Gazette. (2008). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı eğitim kurumları yöneticilerinin atama yönetmeliği. Sayı: 26856 ve Tarih: 15.10.2008. http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/26856_0.html. Accessed 11 June, 2018.
- Official Gazette. (2009). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı eğitim kurumları yöneticilerinin atama ve yer değiştirmelerine ilişkin yönetmelik. Sayı: 27318 ve Tarih: 13.08.2009. http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/egikuryon_1/egikuryon_1.html. Accessed 11 June, 2018.
- Official Gazette. (2013). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı eğitim kurumları yöneticilerinin atama ve yer değiştirmelerine ilişkin yönetmelik. Sayı: 28573 ve Tarih: 28.02.2013. <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2013/02/20130228-12.htm>. Accessed 11 June, 2018.
- Official Gazette. (2014). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı eğitim kurumları yöneticilerinin atama ve yer değiştirmelerine ilişkin yönetmelik. Sayı: 29026 ve Tarih: 10.06.2014. http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/egikuryon_1/egikuryon_1.html. Accessed 11 June, 2018.
- Official Gazette. (2017). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı eğitim kurumlarına yönetici atama yönetmeliği. Sayı: 30046 ve Tarih: 22.04.2017. <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2017/04/20170422-6.htm>. Accessed 11 June, 2018.
- Official Gazette. (2018). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı eğitim kurumlarına yönetici görevlendirme yönetmeliği. Sayı: 30455 ve Tarih: 21.06.2018. <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/06/20180621-8.htm>. Accessed 08 July, 2018.
- Recepöglü, E., & Kılınç, A. Ç. (2014). Raising and selecting school administrators in Turkey, present problems and solutions. *Turkish Studies*, 9(2), 1817–1845. <https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.6136>.
- Şahin, I., Kesik, F., & Beycioglu, K. (2017). Chaotic process in the assignment of school administrators and its effects. *Elementary Education Online*, 16(3), 1007–1102.
- Şimşek (1997). 21. Yüzyılın eşliğinde paradigmalara savaş ve kaostaki Türkiye. İstanbul: Sistem Yayınları.
- Şimşek, H. (2002). Türkiye’de eğitim yöneticisi yetiştirilemez. In C. Elma & Ş. Çınkır (Ed.), 21. Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı (ss. 307–312). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Şişman, M., & Turan, S. (2002). Yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesine ilişkin başlıca yönelimler ve Türkiye için çıkarılabilecek bazı sonuçlar. In C. Elma & Ş. Çınkır (Eds.), 21. Yüzyıl eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sempozyumu bildirileri kitabı (ss. 239–254). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Şişman, M. (2007). *Örgütler ve kültürler* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Smylie, M. A., & Bennett, A. (2005). What do we know about developing school leaders? A look at existing research and next steps for new study. In W. A. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 138–155). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Süngü, H. (2012). Recruiting and preparing school principals in Turkey, Germany, France and England. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 2(1), 33–48.
- Taşdan, M. (2012). Turkish primary school teachers’ perceptions of organizational trust. *The New Educational Review*, 30(4), 176–190.
- Terzi, A. R., & Çelik, H. (2016). Relationship between perceived organizational support and leadership styles of school principals. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, 5(2), 87–98.
- Tezcan, M. (1985). *Educational sociology* (4th ed.). Ankara: Ankara University Press.
- Üstüner, M., & Cömert, M. (2008). An analysis of the graduate courses and theses in educational administration, supervision, planning and economics. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 55(55), 497–515.
- Yılmaz, K., & Taşdan, M. (2009). Organizational citizenship and organizational justice in Turkish primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(1), 108–126.
- Yılmaz, D., & Turan, S. (2015). Distributed leadership view in schools: a structural equation modelling study. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 21(1), 93–126.

Kadir Beycioglu is Associate Professor of Educational Administration at *Dokuz Eylul University Buca Faculty of Education in the Department of Educational Sciences, Izmir, Turkey*. His study topics are mainly on educational change, school development, and educational leadership. He is also interested in the ethical use of ICT in education. He is Member of the *International Study of Principal Preparation (ISPP) project and International School Leadership Development Network—Social Justice Leadership Strand by BELMAS and UCEA*. He has published several articles in leading international journals. He has also acted as Guest Editor for some international journals and books and has published a number of chapters. He is (Founding) Editor of the *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership (REAL, a journal by Turkish Educational Administration Society)* and has been serving as Member of the editorial board or as Reviewer for some leading international journals. He has been Member of the *European Educational Research Association, British Educational Leadership, Management & Administration Society*, and the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management.

Ali Çağatay Kılınç is Associate Professor of Educational Administration at Karabuk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Educational Sciences, Karabuk, Turkey. His research topics are mainly on educational leadership, school development, and organisational behaviour. He has published a number of articles in international journals including *Education and Science, Educational Studies: Theory and Practice*, and the *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. He has also published a number of chapters and participated in a range of national and international conferences on educational management and leadership. He has been serving as Reviewer for leading national and international journals and is also Member of editorial or referee boards.

Mahmut Polatcan is Research Assistant of Educational Administration at Karabuk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Educational Sciences, Karabuk, Turkey. His research topics are mainly on educational administration, organisational commitment, organisational socialisation, organisational social capital, and organisational cynicism. He has also published a number of chapters and participated in a range of national and international conferences on educational administration.