

Educational Leadership Standards Preferred by School Administrators in Educational Leadership Development¹

Betül BALKAR² & Metin ÖZKAN³

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to determine the educational leadership standards considered most important by school administrators in order to develop educational leaders through educational leadership development programs. This study also aims to reveal the development needs of school administrators regarding the educational leadership standards required to be leaders in education. Scaling technique based on rank order judgments was used in order to determine the opinions of school administrators on the importance level of educational leadership standards which can be used to develop educational leaders. The study was performed on 132 school administrators working in the Gaziantep province of Turkey, who were participating in a post-graduate program of Educational Administration Supervision Planning and Economics (EASPE). According to the results, while the most important standard to be involved in educational leadership development programs is the creating of a school culture, the least important standard is administering school resources and processes. Based on the results, it is suggested that educational leadership development programs should be designed in accordance with the needs of school administrators as long-term programs.

Key Words: Educational leadership standards, Educational leadership development programs, Training school administrators, School administrators

 DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12973/jesr.2015.51.1>

¹ This study was delivered an oral presentation at Fifth Forum of Educational Administration held in Konya Necmettin Erbakan University on 12-13 September, 2014.

² Assist. Prof. Dr. – University of Gaziantep Education Faculty Department of Educational Sciences – b.balkar@gmail.com

³ Dr. - Educational Planner – University of Gaziantep Rectorate Building – ozkan.metin@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Rapid developments in the fields of science and technology may transform all social sub-systems. Economic, social and political dynamics make it obligatory to redefine educational leadership by transforming its very nature (Murphy & Shipman, 1999). Educational leaders have to respond to changes in social life in a swift manner, which is why changes over time of the works of leaders should be analyzed (Eacott, 2011a). Educational leadership has to be based on an understanding beyond techniques and control when handled in the direction of the development of education in modern times (Biesta & Miron, 2002). The changing nature of educational leadership results in the need for continuous change in the qualities that school principals should have in order to take on the role of an educational leader. At this point, leadership development programs come into play to ensure that educational leaders take on the attributes required for the changing needs of our times. Today, it has become a significant necessity for school principals to enroll in a leadership development program in order to be able to respond to social, demographic and political changes (Hale & Moorman, 2003). Leadership Development Programs are conducted by universities and other establishments that prepare principal candidates for the roles of school administrators and assistant administrators (Sanzo & Myran, 2012). The performance increasing function of leadership also increases the moral and material support provided by leadership development programs (Stone & Major, 2014).

Leadership development programs should be designed according to a certain philosophy in order to best serve their purpose and to provide expected benefits. The framework of leadership development programs affect the strategies used in designing such programs, as well as the structure of the program itself (Nicolaidou & Petridou, 2011). However, the requirement for leadership development programs to have a certain philosophy does not indicate that the programs should have a structure that cannot change. On the contrary, it signifies the necessity for using predetermined leadership standards according to the changing needs of such programs. The contents of leadership development programs are prepared within the scope of leadership standards. "Educational Leadership Standards" are used in training school principals as educational leaders. Educational Leadership Standards put forth the behaviors that school principals should portray, as well as the functions they should carry out as educational leaders. The leadership standards that shed light on the knowledge required for school principals simplify the transformation from school administration to leading for learning (Browne-Ferrigno & Johnson Fusarelli, 2005).

Tharenou and Lyndon (1990) determined that leadership development programs are beneficial. However, they also put forth that it is not possible to determine which content is more effective in such programs. Thus, it can be stated that the determination of leadership standards according to the changing conditions and the needs and experiences of the educational leader candidates will be more beneficial. In addition, leadership is accepted both as a study and an application area. That is why educational leadership programs should deal with what the learners know and what they think they know (Gunter & Ribbins, 2003). Effective leadership development programs should focus not on what the concept of leadership is at school, but to problem solving, effective workplace applications and the vocationalization of knowledge (Eacott, 2011b). The relationship is thus established between leader development and leadership development that can contribute to the development of human capital in organizations (Muir, 2014).

Even though, it is not thought to be correct to have a leadership standards set that are always taken as reference in the development of educational leaders as stated above; educational leadership development programs give importance to attaining learning experiences in the fields of “self-understanding, questioning, structuring organizations, understanding people and the environment” (Barnett, 1992, 147). Included within the scope of leadership capacity development programs are the development of: an understanding of policy development; skills related with education planning and inspection; observation and evaluation skills to support occupational development; the required administrative and inspectional skills to encourage teamwork and learning in the working environment; the evaluation and development of the personal and cultural values related with learning processes; and the development of cooperative working skills (Choy & Lidstone, 2013).

Leadership development programs are shaped in the direction of the needs of leader candidates and administrative applications, instead of content related to leadership. Theory is as important for educational leaders as the explanation of the status one faces. That is why, it is expected that theory will provide a framework to leaders in the analysis of the current situation during decision-making processes (Morrison, 2013). Thus, actions put forth in conjunction with theory should also be included in leadership education. In other words, reflection and evaluation should be made on the actions taught. When this occurs, school leaders will learn how to establish relationships between theories on administration and the skills they use during daily applications (Barnett & Brill, 1990; Barnett, 1995). Principals mostly seek action instead of knowledge, in other words they are more interested in the results than in theory. At this point, a perspective focused on action provides the more needed approach in the training of school principals. This perspective is important since it puts forth the amount of significance that school principals give to practicality, instead of scientific theories in their applications (Sergiovanni, 1991). To this end, Wong (2004) determined in his study that education programs for principal should be subject- or problem-based, with content determined in accordance with needs, simplifying critical and reflective thinking and integrating theory and daily applications.

The starting point of leadership development programs is the creation of value for program participants. In other words, the programs’ participants should feel that the program they have participated in is valuable to them (Stone & Major, 2014). It is not possible to state that the programs that participants do not give value to, are functional. Even though it is accepted that leaders have common properties, the properties of their workplace and their experiences set them apart from each other. Thus, the required leader profile varies with profile, culture and environment (Alkın & Ünsar, 2007; Çetin, 2008). Hence, the understanding to put forth educational leadership standards that are valid in every situation and environment might hinder the witnessing of proper results. At this point, accepting that there is only one way will be no better than sustaining the current structure at schools (English, 2012). Eacott (2011b) puts in a good word for this view, indicating that there can be no single method of teaching educational leadership. Leadership development should be treated with the consideration of experiences and understandings of individuals. Differences between working environments of school principals require that leadership standards used in educational leader development programs are determined pursuant to experiences and opinions of school principals. For sure, leadership competence on its own is not sufficient reason for school principals to undertake educational leadership training. They should also be willing to acquire such competencies (Mumford, Hunter, Eubanks, Bedell & Murphy,

2007). Such willingness of school principals can be ensured, as indicated above, by teaching them leadership competencies within the required context. In other words, they need use of leadership standards prepared in consideration of development domains in which they want to receive support.

Development requirements of school principals also vary depending on socio-cultural and socio-economic characteristics of the country. In other words, as is indicated above grounded on related literature, each leadership development program should be shaped in line with the individual needs of participants, as well as the organizational requirements. Therefore, a set of educational leadership standards, which include certain leadership traits determined in the wake of studies in other countries, should not be automatically employed in the development of Turkish school principals as educational leaders. Consequently, studies to describe leadership standards compatible with Turkish school principals are of the utmost importance. In this respect, in the study by Turan and Şişman (2000), they assessed the research about the training of educational administrators as leader, and stressed the importance of determining standards in future studies with regard to educational administration in Turkey, as well as the need to deal with such studies in social and cultural terms. In their study for the description of leadership standards among schoolmasters in Turkey, Aslan and Karip (2014) analyzed the leadership standards that schoolmasters should have in terms of educational, operational and school leadership. As for Arslan and Beytekin (2004), they studied educational leadership standards among primary school principals, and state that the schoolmasters assess administrative attitudes at a sufficient level with respect to educational leadership standards.

The objective of this study is to determine which educational leadership standards are considered more important by school principals in training them as educational leaders. Thus, we seek to determine the leadership standards which school principals require development on the most so as to become educational leaders. In this respect, we try to respond to the following research question: "How do school principals rank, in terms of importance, the educational leadership standards to be included in an educational leadership development program in order to undertake a role as educational leader?" The importance level of leadership standards emerging from this study will be particular to Turkey, where administrative homology governs the Turkish educational system due to its centralized structure. Consequently, such standards may serve instructive for educational leadership development programs to be applied across Turkey.

METHOD

This research study employs the scaling method based on rank order judgments, so as to determine the importance level attached to leadership standards by school principals for their training as educational leaders. In this respect, the study is of a descriptive nature.

Rank order judgments are considered a notable method in psychological research (Rajamanickam, 2002, 134). Such models are based on determination via ranking method of stimulation level regarding each stimulant of the participants (Kan, 2008). Therefore, since the scaling method with rank order judgment compels participants to make distinction in the most precise manner possible, it also provides a very high scale in cases where participants are able to make such distinction (Turgut & Baykul, 1992).

Participants are initially provided with all stimulants (scale items) so as to collect judgments based on rank order. The participant thinks simultaneously about all the provided stimulants and assigns a ranking number for each stimulant in order to sort them. The main principle of this method is that each stimulant can only be placed in a single position, regardless of whether it comes first, second or even last (Rajamanickam, 2002, pp.134-135). In other words, the participant simultaneously thinks about all the conditions and carries out gradation in line with the research objective. The obtained statistics become more solid since the participant makes a decision by considering all stimulants together, rather than one by one.

Use of the scaling method has gradually increased, thanks to the more reliable statistics it has known to yield. Scaling can be an effective method of determining preferences, especially in conditions which can vary depending on individuals in social sciences and humanities. In Turkey, various studies on educational sciences have to date, employed scaling methods that ground on ranking judgments (Bal, 2011; Güvendir, 2013; Özer-Özkan & Acar-Güvendir, 2013; Özkan & Arslantaş, 2013; Sungur-Gül & Özer-Özkan, 2013; Arslantaş & Özkan, 2014) and paired comparison judgments (Anıl & Güler, 2006; Öğretmen, 2008; Güler & Anıl, 2009; Özer & Acar, 2011; Polat & Göksel, 2014).

Study Group

The survey was conducted among 132 school principals chosen among those working in central districts of Gaziantep during the 2013-2014 school year and who are studying or have completed master's studies in Educational Administration Supervision Planning and Economy (EASPE). School principals in the study group were chosen via simple random sampling on a voluntary basis. There are two main reasons for preferring school principals who are studying or have completed master's studies in EASPE as the working group: Firstly, there is a need for participants to know leadership standards and relevant concepts, and can interpret them in an organizational manner; secondly, school principals are more likely to perceive EASPE programs as leadership programs. Accordingly, participants may pass more accurate judgments with respect to leadership standard prioritization regarding their own training as educational leaders. The study group includes 14 female and 118 male school principals.

Data Collection Tool

The data collection tool was prepared after analyzing educational leader and school principal training programs, as well as educational leadership standards in effect in various other countries. The relevant documents were analyzed via content analysis, and themes about educational leadership standards determined in the wake of thematic analysis. Frequency analysis was conducted in order to decide which prescribed themes will take place in the data collection tool to be used in the survey. Themes pursuant to content analysis, as well as their frequencies and sources of thematic analysis are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. *Themes, their frequencies and sources of thematic analysis with respect to educational leadership standards*

Themes	Frequency	Sources
Management of school processes and sources	17	Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2011; Connecticut State Department of Education, 2012; Florida Department of Education, 2011; Grand Canyon University, 2013; Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, 2012; National Association of Secondary School Principals [NASSP], 2001; National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002; National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), 2011; New Jersey Association of School Administrators (n.d.); Rhode Island Department of Education, 2008; School Administrators of Iowa [SAI], 2007; The University of North Carolina (n.d.); The Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008; Utah Education Network [UEN], 2011; WestEd and the Association of California School Administrators, 2004).
Collaboration with parents and school environment	16	
Ethical behavior in practices	16	
School vision development and sharing	15	
Establishment of school culture	15	
Leading the change	12	
Development of school educational capacity	9	
Preparation of professional development plan	5	
Creation of learning organization	2	
Ensuring teachers' professional development	2	
Effective use of technology	1	
Effective decision-making	1	
Possession of effective communication skills	1	
Capability for teamwork	1	
Capability of establishing educational policies	1	

According to examination of theme frequencies in Table 1, the frequency of the first eight items vary between 17 and 5, while the frequencies of the subsequent seven themes vary between 2 and 1. Since our study seeks to incorporate the educational leadership standards most commonly treated in relevant literature, and since there is a significant difference between the first eight and the subsequent seven themes, based on thematic analysis and frequency analysis it was decided to just use the first eight themes (educational leadership standards) for the scaling tool to be used in the survey. As Table 1 shows, there is an important difference between the frequencies of themes that are to be included in the scaling tool and those to be excluded. The eight educational leadership standards with the highest frequency were also introduced to specialists before finalizing the scaling tool comprised of the eight standards. In the form itself, the leadership standards are randomly listed as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. *Educational leadership standards within the scaling tool*

Educational Leadership Standards	
A	School vision development and sharing
B	Preparation of professional development plan
C	Management of school processes and sources
D	Collaboration with parents and school environment
E	Establishment of school culture
F	Leading the change
G	Development of school educational capacity
H	Ethical behavior in practices

The data collection tool concentrates on leadership standards preferred by school principals in their training as educational leaders; accordingly, demographic variables are not included. The objective was therefore to make participants focus directly on standards.

Data Collection

All data were collected in face-to-face environments with the personal participation of the researchers. The form was distributed to participants, and instructions verbally explained, before adding that participants should only make their decision after thinking about all the standards together.

138 school principals were asked to assign a ranking number from 1 to 8 (with 1 being the lowest ranked, to 8 being the highest ranked) for the given leadership standards at the beginning of the study. They had great difficulty in performing the ranking process, which took more time than expected; about 12 to 15 minutes in total. Some participants amended their marks before finalizing. During the ranking, six participants assigned the same grade for more than one leadership standard; consequently, their assessments were rejected and excluded from the analysis.

Data Analysis

A matrix of rank frequency was established in order to find out which leadership standards were given a certain rank and how many times. A ratio matrix was obtained via rank order judgments within leadership standards that can be used in training school principals as educational leaders. "z" values, which correspond to elements within the ratio matrix, were determined, before creating unit a normal deviations matrix. The sum of values that belong to each column was calculated on the bottom line of the unit normal deviations matrix, the averages of each "z" value along the columns in the mentioned line were calculated; thus, scale values were attained.

FINDINGS

This research established a scale to "determine the level of importance attached by school principals to leadership standards that can be used in their training as educational leaders," and the stages of scaling are explained respectively.

First of all, school principals were asked to rank leadership standards, which can be used in their training as educational leaders, pursuant to level of importance. The frequency values obtained regarding each leadership standard are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. *Frequency values regarding educational leadership standards*

Educational Leadership Standards									
r_i	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	TOTAL
8	2	16	30	13	0	0	16	55	132
7	0	16	56	13	6	9	4	28	132
6	3	34	11	37	4	10	13	20	132
5	2	26	11	28	6	13	32	14	132
4	23	21	10	19	10	12	34	3	132
3	34	9	8	17	19	25	16	4	132
2	34	6	6	5	29	42	5	5	132
1	34	4	0	0	58	21	12	3	132
	132	132	132	132	132	132	132	132	1056

Table 3 is a frequency table that shows the ranking of leadership standards by 132 school principals. r_i or R_i can be employed in scaling studies. This survey takes r_i as reference; accordingly, the ranking of frequency values was arranged from 8 towards 1. The column r_i in the frequency table shows the ranked leadership standards. According to the frequency

values shown in Table 3, educational leadership standard “E” (establishment of school culture) is ranked first with a frequency value of 58, therefore, more than any other leadership standard; whereas the educational leadership standard “H” (ethical behavior in practices) is the most common placed in eighth position with a frequency value of 55.

Table 4. *Unit normal deviations matrix (Z) with respect to rankings by school principals regarding leadership standards that can be used in their training as educational leaders*

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
A		1.178	1.445	1.234	-0.210	0.198	0.853	1.459
B	-1.178		0.447	-0.043	-1.148	-0.830	-0.326	-0.326
C	-1.445	-0.447		-0.504	-1.463	-1.184	-0.656	0.163
D	-1.234	0.043	0.504		-1.202	-0.886	-0.331	0.617
E	0.210	1.148	1.463	1.202		0.389	0.870	1.468
F	-0.198	0.830	1.184	0.886	-0.389		0.542	1.226
G	-0.853	0.326	0.656	0.331	-0.870	-0.542		0.779
H	-1.459	-0.564	-0.163	-0.617	-1.468	-1.226	-0.779	
Z _{total}	-6.158	2.514	5.535	2.489	-6.749	-4.082	0.174	5.387
Z _{mean}	-0.770	0.314	0.692	0.311	-0.844	-0.510	0.022	0.673
S _j	0.074	1.158	1.536	1.155	0.000	0.334	0.866	1.517

According to Table 4, the lowest Z_{mean} values are seen in leadership standard “E” with -0.844. In other words, educational administrators consider “establishment of school culture” as the most important leadership standard in their training as educational leaders. The beginning point of axis (point 0) was slid to point zero by means of adding the absolute correspondent of the lowest prescribed value (0.844) to all stimulant values; thus, S_j values were found. Scales values via alignment of S_j values from the smallest to biggest, and their orders, are obtained as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. *Ordered display of scale values*

	Educational Leadership Standards	Scale Value	Rank
E	Establishment of school culture	0.000	1
A	School vision development and sharing	0.074	2
F	Leading the change	0.334	3
G	Development of school educational capacity	0.866	4
D	Collaboration with parents and school environment	1.155	5
B	Preparation of professional development plan	1.158	6
H	Ethical behavior in practices	1.517	7
C	Management of school processes and sources	1.536	8

The priority of preference for leadership standards that can be used in the training of educational administrators as educational leaders is shown in Table 5. School administrators consider the leadership standard known as “establishment of school culture” to be the most important (with the lowest scale value). It is closely followed by “school vision development and sharing”. Again not far behind that is “leading the change” in third place among the leadership standards. The standard known as “management of school processes and sources” is in the lowest position of importance (with the highest scale value).

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research study determines the gradation of importance regarding educational leadership standards used in the training of school principals as educational leaders, based on the views of school principals. According to Nicolaidou and Petridou (2011), leadership development programs should respond to the roles, responsibilities and learning requirements expected from school leaders. Our survey also suggests that the determination of educational leadership standards in line with learning requirements of school principals will ensure a more effective leadership development program, designed in consideration of these standards mentioned. It is indicated that leadership development programs should comprise analytical, conceptual, emotional and spiritual aspects so as to train holistic leaders. In this respect, conceptual and emotional aspects of leadership can only be ensured within the context of the relevant profession (Quatro, Waldman & Galvin, 2007). Leadership development programs can be provided with analytical, emotional and spiritual aspects, only through an analysis about the effects of the administrative style of school principals, their in-school relations and working methods, on the administrators and employees of the school. Thus, it is possible to design programs which can be customized pursuant to the needs of each school principal and which are capable of meeting the requirements of administrators in various development domains.

In other words, a multidirectional development should be intended for the development of leadership competencies of school principals, in consideration with the socio-cultural traits of their environment. Leadership should not have a standardized structure, but one customized so as to conceive a social, cultural and political structure of leadership practices. The context in which leaders work, consists of power relations, assumptions of the post and the cultural structure of the working environment (Eacott, 2011a). Since working environments of school participants have different features, the socio-cultural spheres in schools necessitate different leadership competences. This is why it is impossible to talk about a single set of leadership standards that are applicable for any school or any school administrator. At this point, one cannot easily assert that the leadership standards, determined grounded on foreign studies, are enforceable for the profile of Turkish administrators or the socio-cultural atmosphere of Turkish schools. However, leadership standards within relevant literature are established in the wake of studies carried out abroad. Evidently, there is a universality of leadership characteristics and skills. Foreign studies should no doubt be taken into account so as to unearth leadership traits, skills and behaviors. Nevertheless, foreign-based sets or lists of leadership standards, which include only certain leadership traits, skills and behaviors, may be inadequate for Turkey. Leadership traits, skills and behaviors within the set of leadership standards should be varied depending on needs and circumstances. A set or list of leadership standards, which is formed to see which leadership traits are more important for Turkish school principals, or in other words, which has priority over others regarding development, should comply with the requirements and characteristics of Turkey and Turkish administrators. Therefore, the results of this study matter in revealing leadership standards compatible with the profile and working conditions of Turkish school principals.

School principals firstly want educational leader training programs to be designed within the framework of standards that focus on the establishment of school culture, school vision development and sharing, and leading the change. These standards include long-term

practices for school principals as educational leaders, and they are intended to improve leadership competences at an institutional level. Stone and Major (2014) put forth that leadership development programs serve the improvement of leadership competences at firstly the individual, and then the institutional level. Among the assessed leadership standards in the study, the preparation of professional development plans, which is most related with individual competence of the educational leader, is the sixth most preferred standard. In cases where the actions of a leader concentrates on self-development and the development of others, the participative, success-oriented and supportive aspects of leadership can be rendered most effective (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Nevertheless, the school principals in our study mostly prioritized leadership standards at the institutional level over individual; therefore, they link educational leadership with institutional development, rather than individual (personal) development. The general collective spirit of Turkish society may have led to such a result. The most preferred standards also necessitate participation of school stakeholders in the practices to be applied. Such standards do not include implementations that can be realized solely through the efforts of school administrators. Such a finding shows that school principals need to gain the support of school stakeholders.

The leadership standard called “leading the change,” is the third most preferred standard among school principals for a place in educational leadership development programs. In other words, the requirement for development in leading the change is considered as the third most important leadership standard. As organizational architects, educational leaders should assume the role of change agent within the organization, and adopt a change-oriented administrative approach instead of a more traditional one. They should allow for authorizing and participative practices that emphasize heterarchy, rather than adopting bureaucratic management processes (Murphy & Shipman, 1999). School principals, on the other hand, should possess the competence to lead the change if they are to adopt and implement a management style based on change and heterarchy. The prerequisite for leading the change is accurate analysis of the present situation. Educational leaders perceive leadership not only as control over their subordinates; accordingly, they should analyze the present situation and discover sources of motivation (Biesta & Miron, 2002). As the school principals put forth, a systematic support is needed so as to provide them with the various skills needed for leading the change.

Establishment of school culture is the most preferred and leading the change is the third most preferred of leadership standards of school principals. Leading change in schools cannot be considered independent from school culture. Leaders can realize organizational change only by changing organizational culture and using tools of motivation. Therefore, it is impossible to manage change without the support of school employees. The objectives of change determine how organizational culture will be amended (Tunçer, 2011). Dries and Pepermans (2012) indicate the leadership models used in determining leadership potential should include not only competences, but also situational variables such as interpersonal relations and organizational culture. In the course of school management processes, school leaders are expected to change institutional culture and start collaborative cultural development (Connolly, Connolly & James, 2000). Accordingly, an educational leader who wants to lead the change should be competent in establishing organizational culture.

The standard for “development of school educational capacity” took fourth place, following the standard “leading the change”. Bates and Eacott (2008) assert that “educational

and organizational change” is in the foreground among the subjects dealt with in teaching educational leadership. According to them, “organizational learning” becomes gradually dominant. School principals can contribute to an increase in both the academic success of students and the achievement of schools in general, by means of improving the educational capacity of the school. In this respect, Kanokorn, Pongtorn and Ngang (2014) indicate that schoolmasters are capable of efforts so as to enhance school quality through educational leadership. There are also studies that reveal the impact of leadership on student outputs (Coelli & Green, 2012).

The standard of ethical behavior in practices is in seventh position among educational leadership standards, according to the rankings of importance and need of development by school principals. Ethical behavior in practices is the second least preferred standard among school principals. The perception of school principals on whether any education is needed for ethical behavior varies depending on within which ethic system they assess ethical behavior at school and in human relations. School principals think they need such training less than most; therefore, they perceive ethic applications within the scope of individual ethics (conscience). In this respect, Wong (2004) found that principals expect leadership development programs to help them in making ethic decisions under rapid changing conditions. Relatively lower importance of the standard in the eyes of school principals may be construed as if they can fulfil ethic leadership. In this context, Gedikoğlu and Bülbül (2009) found that school principals display ethic leadership behaviors less than social and educational leadership behaviors.

Collaboration with parents and school environment is the fifth most preferred leadership standard. School principals need less development in the standard “collaboration with parents and school environment”, probably because they already consider themselves capable of collaboration. Collaborating with parents and school environment necessitates active employment of communication skills by school principals; accordingly, the rankings may suggest that administrators do not suffer any communication problems. Thanks to collaboration with parents and school environment, school principals are informally acknowledged as educational leaders and they can build positive relations with school stakeholders. Collaborative attitude of educational leaders reveal that they attach importance to the emotional aspect of leadership and to the socio-cultural structure of the school. School leaders often use their formal power. Nevertheless, it is more significant to use informal power based on human relations. At this point, we have to consider that each school has different characteristics, as well as different social and cultural traits, since it consists of people who share a certain approach (Moos, 2003). Educational leaders should attach importance to emotions, since teachers learn their role in school via emotional expressions. Emotions also constitute the basis for individual and social resistance. Therefore, emotions should also be treated within socio-cultural terms (Zorn & Boler, 2007). Collaborative attitude of educational leaders includes another message: It means they are open to obtaining information from various sources. Eacott (2011b) also points out the necessity for training leaders who can use information from various sources, interpret such information and can causally justify applications, pursuant to the necessities of the hour. In support for the finding of our survey regarding the importance of collaborative approach by educational leaders, Choy and Lidstone (2013) conclude that accepting and respecting the views of others are outputs of development programs for leadership capacity.

Management of school processes and sources is the least important leadership standard according to participating principals. Management of school processes and sources is among the routine administrative affairs of schoolmasters. School principals consider this standard less important than others, probably because they think they are competent in administrative affairs since they always have to deal with them. By contrast with the finding of lower importance attached to management of school processes and sources, Mullen and Cairns (2001) reveal that school leaders are expected to fulfil roles of establishing business partnerships and working on school processes and discipline. According to Piaw, Hee, Ismail and Ying (2014), organizational management is the leadership skill in which schoolmasters are the least competent, and schoolmasters need support with regard to distribution of resources, staff development, planning and management.

The following recommendations can be constructed based on the results of this research study's survey:

1. Educational leadership programs should be designed so as to incorporate the subjects in which school principals need improvement. Therefore, the content of educational leadership programs should be determined, grounded on analysis about the requirements of school principals.
2. The standards, which school principals think require most development, necessitate competence in long-term applications; therefore, educational leadership programs should be designed as long-running programs, repeated periodically.
3. The most preferred standards among school principals include the issues which they do not have the opportunity to implement within school management processes; accordingly, use of clinical approaches should be included within educational leadership programs.
4. The most preferred standards among school principals are those that can be realized through the support of school stakeholders; therefore, processes which are carried out with the participation of school stakeholders should be incorporated within educational leadership programs.

REFERENCES

- Alkın, C. & Ünsar, S. (2007). Liderlik özellikleri ve davranışlarının belirlenmesi üzerine bir araştırma. *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9 (3), 75-94.
- Anıl, D. & Güler, N. (2006). İkili karşılaştırma yöntemi ile ölçekleme çalışmasına bir örnek. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30, 30-36.
- Arslan, H. & Beytekin, O. F. (2004). İlköğretim okul müdürleri için eğitim liderliği standartlarının araştırılması. *XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı*. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi. 6-9 Temmuz 2004. Malatya.
- Arslantaş, H. İ. & Özkan, M. (2014). Öğretmen ve yönetici gözüyle etkili okulda yönetici özelliklerinin belirlenmesi. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 26, 181-193.
- Aslan, H. & Karip, E. (2014). Okul müdürlerinin liderlik standartlarının geliştirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 20 (3), 255-279.
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (2011). *Australian professional standard for principals*. <http://www.aitsl.edu.au/australian-professional-standard-for-principals>. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014.

- Avolio, B. J. & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315-338.
- Bal, Ö. (2011). Seviye belirleme sınavı (SBS) başarısında etkili olduğu düşünülen faktörlerin sıralama yargıları kanunıyla ölçeklenmesi. *Eğitimde ve Psikolojide Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Dergisi*, 2 (2), 200-209.
- Barnett, B. G. (1992). Using alternative assessment measures in educational leadership preparation programs: Educational platforms and portfolios. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 6, 141-151.
- Barnett, B. G. (1995). Portfolio use in educational leadership preparation programs: From theory to practice. *Innovative Higher Education*, 19(3), 197-206.
- Barnett, B. G. & Brill, A. D. (1990). Building reflection into administrative training programs. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 3, 179-192.
- Bates, R. & Eacott, S. (2008). Teaching educational leadership and administration in Australia. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 40 (2), 149-160.
- Biesta, G. J. J. & Miron, L. F. (2002). The new discourses on educational leadership: An introduction. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21, 101-107.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T. & Fusarelli, B. C. (2005). The Kentucky principalship: Model of school leadership reconfigured by ISLLC standards and reform policy implementation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4 (2), 127-156.
- Choy, S. & Lidstone, J. (2013). Evaluating leadership development using the most significant change technique. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 39, 218-224.
- Coelli, M. & Green, D. A. (2012). Leadership effects: School principals and student outcomes. *Economics of Education Review*, 31, 92-109.
- Connecticut State Department of Education (2012). *Common core of leading: Connecticut school leadership standards*. <http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/educatorstandards/ccl-csls.pdf>. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014.
- Connolly, M., Connolly, U. & James, C. (2000). Leadership in educational change. *British Journal of Management*, 11, 61-70.
- Çetin, N. (2008). Kuramsal liderlik çözümlerinin ışığında, okul müdürlüğü ve eğitilebilir durumsal liderlik özellikleri. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23, 74-84.
- Dries, N. & Pepermans, R. (2012). How to identify leadership potential: Development and testing of a consensus model. *Human Resource Management*, 51 (3), 361-385.
- Eacott, S. (2011a). Leadership strategies: Re-conceptualising strategy for educational leadership. *School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation*, 31 (1), 35-46.
- Eacott, S. (2011b). Preparing 'educational' leaders in managerialist times: An Australian story. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 43 (1), 43-59.
- English, F. W. (2012). Bourdieu's misrecognition: Why educational leadership standards will not reform schools or leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 44 (2), 155-170.
- Florida Department of Education (2011). *Florida principal leadership standards*. <http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/fpls.asp>. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014
- Gedikoğlu, T. & Bülbül, S. (2009). Liderlik standartları inanç boyutu açısından ilköğretim okulu müdürlerinin yönetsel yeterlikleri. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 182, 123-148.
- Grand Canyon University (2013). *College of Education school leadership preparation programs manual*. <http://www.gcu.edu/Documents/Education/Clinical-Practice-School-Leadership-Preparation-Programs-Manual.pdf>. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014

- Gunter, H. & Ribbins, P. (2003). The field of educational leadership: Studying maps and mapping studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 51 (3), 254-281.
- Güler, N. & Anıl, D. (2009). Scaling through pair-wise comparison method in required characteristics of students applying for post graduate programs. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 6 (1), 627-639.
- Güvendir, E. (2013). Prospective foreign language teachers' preference of teaching methods for the language acquisition course in Turkish higher education. *Education*, 134 (1), 25-34.
- Hale, E. L. & Moorman, H. N. (2003). *Preparing school principals: A national perspective on policy and program innovations*. Institute for Educational Leadership Washington, D.C. and Illinois Education Research Council, Edwardsville, Illinois.
- Kan, A. (2008). Yargıcı kararlarına dayalı ölçekleme yöntemlerinin karşılaştırılması üzerine ampirik bir çalışma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35, 186-194.
- Kanokorn, S., Pongtorn, P. & Ngang, T.K. (2014). Collaborative action professional development of school principals. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 77-81.
- Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education (2012). *Guidelines for the preparation of administrative leaders. Professional standards and indicators for administrative leadership*. <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/advisories/LeadershipGuidelines.pdf>. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014.
- Moos, L. (2003). Educational leadership: Leadership for/as Bildung? *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 6 (1), 19-33.
- Morrison, A.R. (2013). Educational leadership and change: Structural challenges in the implementation of a shifting paradigm. *School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organization*, 33 (4), 412-424.
- Muir, D. (2014). Mentoring and leader identity development: A case study. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25 (3), 349-379.
- Mullen, C. A. & Cairns, S. S. (2001). The principal's apprentice: Mentoring aspiring school administrators through relevant preparation. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 9 (2), 125-152.
- Mumford, M. D., Hunter, S. T., Eubanks, D. L., Bedell, K. E. & Murphy, S. T. (2007). Developing leaders for creative efforts: A domain-based approach to leadership development. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 402-417.
- Murphy, J. & Shipman, N. (1999). The interstate school leaders licensure consortium: A standards-based approach to strengthening educational leadership. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13 (3), 205-224.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals [NASSP] (2001). *21st century school administrator skills*. http://www.nassp.org/Content/158/21st_Cent_self_and_observer_asmt.pdf. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2002). *Standards for advanced programs in educational leadership for principals, superintendents, curriculum directors, and supervisors*. <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=jz0BsFs7A80%3D&tabid=676>. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) (2011). *Educational leadership standards [ELCC]. Educational leadership program recognition standards: Building level*.

- <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zRZI73R0nOQ%3D&tabid=676>.
Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014.
- New Jersey Association of School Administrators (n.d.). *New Jersey standards for school leaders*.
<http://www.njasa.net/domain/56>. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014.
- Nicolaidou, M. & Petridou, A. (2011). Echoing school leaders' voices in Cyprus: A study of novice school leaders' perceptions regarding leadership professional development. *Professional Development in Education*, 37 (5), 721-740.
- Öğretmen, T. (2008). Alan tercih envanteri: Ölçeklenmesi, geçerliği ve güvenilirliği. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6 (3), 507-522.
- Özer-Özkan, Y. & Acar-Güvendir, M. (2013). Öğrencilerin ölçme ve değerlendirme dersinin sunulmasında tercih ettikleri öğretim yöntemleri. *Eğitimde ve Psikolojide Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Dergisi*, 4 (1), 1-14.
- Özer, Y. & Acar, M. (2011). Öğretmenlik mesleği genel yeterlikleri üzerine ikili karşılaştırma yöntemiyle bir ölçekleme çalışması. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3 (40), 89-101.
- Özkan, M. & Arslantaş, H. İ. (2013). Etkili öğretmen özellikleri üzerine sıralama yöntemiyle bir ölçekleme çalışması. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15 (1), 311-330.
- Piaw, C. Y., Hee, T. F., Ismail, N. R. & Ying, L. H. (2014). Factors of leadership skills of secondary school principals. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 5125-5129.
- Polat, B. & Göksel, H. Ç. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının sosyal aktivite tercihlerinin ikili karşılaştırmalı ölçekleme yöntemiyle belirlenmesi. *Eğitimde ve Psikolojide Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Dergisi*, 5(1), 88-100.
- Quatro, S. A., Waldman, D. A. & Galvin, B. M. (2007). Developing holistic leaders: Four domains for leadership development and practice. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 427-441.
- Rajamanickam, M. (2002). *Modern psychophysical and scaling methods and experimentation*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Rhode Island Department of Education (2008). *Standards for educational leadership in Rhode Island*. <https://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Certification/Cert-main-page/Leadership-Standards-1292009.pdf>. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014.
- Sanzo, K.L. & Myran, S. (2012). Learning from the evolution of a university-district partnership. *Successful school leadership preparation and development* (Eds: K. Sanzo, S. Myran & A. H. Normore). Wagon Lane, Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing. pp. 165-182.
- School Administrators of Iowa [SAI](2007). *Iowa's school leadership standards and criteria 2007*. <http://www.sai-iowa.org/iowa-standards.cfm>. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). Constructing and changing theories of practice: The key to preparing school administrators. *The Urban Review*, 23(1), 39-49.
- Stone, G. L. & Major, C. H. (2014). Perceived value of university-based continuing education leadership development programs for administrators. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 62 (1), 3-16.
- Sungur-Gül, K. & Özer-Özkan, Y. (2013). Fen ve teknoloji özel alan yeterlilikleri önem düzeyinin öğretmen adaylarının görüşlerine göre belirlenmesi. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12 (4), 867-881.
- Tharenou, P. & Lyndon, J. T. (1990). The effect of a supervisory development program on leadership style. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 4 (3), 365-373.

- The Council of Chief State School Officers (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008. As adopted by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration*. Washington, DC.
- The University of North Carolina (n.d.). *Standards for Educational Leaders*. http://soe.unc.edu/academics/requirements/standards/NCDPI-ELCC_Educational_Leaders_Standards.pdf. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014.
- Tunçer, P. (2011). Örgütsel değişim ve liderlik. *Sayıştay Dergisi*, 80, 57-83.
- Turan, S. & Şişman, M. (2000). Okul yöneticileri için standartlar: Eğitim yöneticilerinin bilgi temelleri üzerine düşünceler. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 3 (4), 68-87.
- Turgut, M. F. & Baykul, Y. (1992). *Ölçekleme teknikleri*. Ankara: ÖSYM Yayınları.
- Utah Education Network [UEN] (2011). *Utah educational leadership standards*. <http://www.uen.org/k12educator/uels/>. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014
- WestEd and the Association of California School Administrators (2004). *California professional standards for educational leaders*. http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/cpsel_standards.pdf. Retrieval Date: September 1, 2014
- Wong, P-M. (2004). The professional development of school principals: Insights from evaluating a programme in Hong Kong. *School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation*, 24 (2), 139-162.
- Zorn, D. & Boler, M. (2007). Rethinking emotions and educational leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 10 (2), 137-151.

Okul Yöneticilerinin Eğitim Liderliği Geliştirmede Tercih Ettikleri Eğitim Liderliği Standartları⁴

Betül BALKAR⁵ & Metin ÖZKAN⁶

Giriş

Bilimsel ve teknolojik alanlarda yaşanan hızlı değişimler, tüm toplumsal alt sistemleri dönüştürmektedir. Ekonomik, sosyal ve politik dinamikler eğitim örgütlerinin niteliğini değiştirerek eğitim liderliğinin yeniden tanımlanmasını zorunlu kılmaktadır (Murphy & Shipman, 1999). Eğitim liderleri sosyal hayatı etkileyen tüm değişimlere hızlı bir şekilde yanıt vermek zorundadırlar. Bu nedenle liderlerin işinin zamanla nasıl değiştiğinin analiz edilmesi gerekmektedir (Eacott, 2011a). Eğitim liderliğinin değişen bir yapıda olması, okul yöneticilerinin eğitim lideri rolü üstlenebilmeleri için sahip olmaları gereken niteliklerde de sürekli bir değişim ihtiyacı oluşturmaktadır. Bu noktada eğitim liderlerine değişen koşullar bağlamında ihtiyaç duyulan nitelikleri kazandırabilmek için liderlik geliştirme programları işe koşulmaktadır. Günümüzde okul yöneticilerinin sosyal, demografik ve politik değişikliklere cevap verebilmeleri için, etkili bir liderlik geliştirme programına dahil olmaları önemli bir gereklilik haline gelmiştir (Hale & Moorman, 2003). Bu amaçla yürütülen Liderlik Geliştirme Programları, üniversiteler ve çeşitli kurumlar tarafından okul müdürlüğü ve yardımcılığı pozisyonlarına yönetici adaylarını hazırlamak için yürütülen programlardır (Sanzo & Myran, 2012).

Liderlik programlarının içeriği, belirlenen liderlik standartları kapsamında hazırlanmaktadır. Liderlik Geliştirme Programlarında, okul yöneticilerinin eğitim liderleri olarak yetiştirilmesinde "Eğitim Liderliği Standartları" kullanılmaktadır. Eğitim Liderliği Standartları, okul yöneticilerinin eğitim liderleri olarak göstermeleri gereken davranışları ve yapmaları gereken uygulamaları göstermektedir. Okul yöneticilerinin neleri bilmesi gerektiğine ışık tutan liderlik standartları, okul yöneticiliğinden öğrenme için liderlik yapmaya doğru bir değişimi kolaylaştırmaktadır (Browne-Ferrigno & Johnson Fusarelli, 2005). Katılımcıların değerli bulmadıkları ve ihtiyaçlarına karşılık alamadıkları liderlik programlarının işlevsel olduğunu söylemek mümkün değildir. Liderlerin ortak özellikleri olduğu kabul edilmesine rağmen, çalıştıkları ortamların özellikleri ve kendi deneyimleri onları farklılaştırmaktadır. Dolayısıyla ihtiyaç duyulan lider profili, kültüre ve ortama göre değişiklik göstermektedir (Alkın & Ünsar, 2007; Çetin, 2008). Bu nedenle her durumda ve ortamda geçerli olan eğitim liderliği standartları oluşturma yönündeki anlayış, eğitim liderliğinin uygulamada istenilen sonuçları doğurmasını engelleyebilmektedir. Bu bağlamda tek bir yolun doğru olduğunu kabul etmek, eğitim liderliğini okullarda sadece mevcut yapıyı sürdüren bir niteliğe sahip olmaktan öteye taşıyamamaktadır (English, 2012).

Okul yöneticilerinin gelişim ihtiyaçları, ülkelerin sosyo-kültürel ve sosyo-ekonomik özelliklerine göre de değişim göstermektedir. Bir başka ifadeyle her liderlik geliştirme programı, literatüre dayalı olarak yukarıda da açıklandığı gibi, katılımcıların bireysel ihtiyaçları ve örgütsel ihtiyaçlar doğrultusunda şekillendirilmelidir. Dolayısıyla Türk okul

⁴ Bu çalışma 11-13 Eylül 2014 tarihlerinde Konya Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi'nde düzenlenen Beşinci Eğitim Yönetimi Forumu'nda sözlü bildiri olarak sunulmuştur.

⁵ Yrd. Doç. Dr. – Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü – b.balkar@gmail.com

⁶ Dr. - Eğitim Öğretim Planlamacısı – Gaziantep Üniversitesi Rektörlük – ozkan.metin@gmail.com

yöneticilerinin eğitim liderleri olarak yetiştirilmesinde, başka ülkelerde yapılan çalışmaların sonucunda belirlenen belirli liderlik özelliklerini içeren eğitim liderliği standartları setinin kullanılması doğru değildir. Bu nedenle Türk okul yöneticilerine uygun liderlik standartlarının tanımlandığı çalışmaların yapılması oldukça önemlidir.

Bu araştırmanın amacı; okul yöneticilerinin eğitim liderleri olarak yetiştirilmelerinde kullanılan eğitim liderliği standartlarından hangilerinin okul yöneticileri tarafından daha önemli görüldüğünün tespit edilmesidir. Böylece okul yöneticilerinin eğitim liderleri olabilmeleri için hangi liderlik standartlarında gelişime ihtiyaç duyduklarının belirlenmesi de amaçlanmaktadır. Bu doğrultuda araştırmada; “okul yöneticileri, eğitim lideri rolü üstlenebilmeleri için tasarlanacak bir eğitim liderliği geliştirme programında yer alacak eğitim liderliği standartlarını kendilerine ifade ettiği önem açısından nasıl sıralamaktadırlar?” sorusuna yanıt aranmıştır. Bu araştırmada ortaya çıkan liderlik standartlarının önem düzeyinin Türkiye’ye özgü oluşturulması ve Türk Eğitim Sistemi’nde merkezi yapıdan kaynaklanan yönetsel benzeşikliğin hâkim olması, bu standartların Türkiye’de uygulanacak eğitim liderliği geliştirme programlarına yol gösterici olmasını sağlayabilir.

Yöntem

Bu araştırmada, okul yöneticilerinin eğitim liderleri olarak yetiştirilmelerinde kullanılabilecek liderlik standartlarına verdikleri önem düzeyinin belirlenmesi amacıyla sıralama yargılarına dayalı ölçekleme tekniği kullanılmıştır. Bu açıdan çalışma betimsel bir araştırma niteliğindedir. Sıralamaya dayalı yargıların toplanması için öncelikle katılımcılara, uyarıcıların (ölçek maddelerinin) tamamı birlikte verilir. Katılımcı verilen uyarıcıların hepsine birlikte düşünür ve her bir uyarıcıya sıra numarası tayin ederek sıralama yapar. Bu yöntemin ana ilkesi, ister birinci ister ikinci ister sonuncu olsun, her bir uyarıcının yalnızca tek bir yere yerleşebileceğidir (Rajamanickam, 2002, 134-135). Diğer bir anlatımla, katılımcı araştırma amacına uygun olarak tüm durumları aynı anda düşünür ve bir sıralama yapar. Katılımcının her bir uyarıcının yerine diğer uyarıcıları da düşünerek karar vermesi, elde edilen istatistiğin güçlü olmasını sağlamaktadır.

Araştırma, 2013-2014 eğitim öğretim yılında Gaziantep ili merkez ilçelerinde çalışan, Eğitim Yönetimi Teftişi Planlaması ve Ekonomisi (EYTPE) alanında lisansüstü eğitim görmüş ve görmekte olan okul yöneticileri arasından seçilen 132 okul yöneticisi ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışma grubunda yer alan okul yöneticileri gönüllülük esas alınarak basit tesadüfi örnekleme yöntemi ile seçilmiştir. Çalışma grubunun EYTPE alanında lisansüstü eğitim gören ve görmekte olan okul yöneticilerinden seçilmesinin başlıca iki nedeni bulunmaktadır. Bunlardan ilki katılımcıların liderlik standartları ve bu standartlar içinde geçen kavramları tanıması ve örgütsel anlamda yorumlamasına duyulan ihtiyaç; ikincisi ise EYTPE programlarının okul yöneticileri için liderlik programı olarak algılanabilirliğidir. Böylece katılımcıların eğitim lideri olarak yetiştirilmelerinde öncelikli olarak gördükleri liderlik standartları ile ilgili daha doğru yargıda bulunabilecekleri düşünülmektedir. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunda yer alan okul yöneticilerinin 14’ü kadın, 118’i erkektir.

Veri toplama aracının hazırlanmasında, öncelikle çeşitli ülkelerde uygulanan eğitim lideri ve okul yöneticisi yetiştirme programları ve eğitim liderliği standartları incelenmiştir. İlgili dokümanlar içerik analizi ile çözümlenmiş ve tematik analiz sonucunda eğitim liderliği standartlarına ilişkin temalar belirlenmiştir. Belirlenen temalardan hangilerinin araştırmada

kullanılacak veri toplama aracında yer alacağına karar vermek için ise, frekans analizi yapılmıştır. Frekans analizi sonuçlarının dikkate alınmasıyla veri toplama aracında en fazla frekansa sahip ilk sekiz eğitim liderliği standardının yer almasına karar verilmiştir. Veri toplama aracında yer alan eğitim liderliği standartları şunlardır: Okul vizyonu geliştirme ve paylaşma, mesleki gelişim planı hazırlama, okul süreçlerini ve kaynaklarını yönetme, veliler ve okul çevresiyle işbirliği yapma, okul kültürü oluşturma, değişime öncülük yapma, okulun öğretim kapasitesini geliştirme ve uygulamalarda etik davranma.

Verilerin toplanması sürecinde yukarıda hazırlanma süreci anlatılan form katılımcılara dağıtılmış, form yönergesinde belirtilen tüm hususlar sözlü olarak da açıklanmış ve katılımcıların tüm standartları birlikte düşünerek karar vermesi gerektiği belirtilmiştir. Okul yöneticilerinden formda yer alan liderlik standartlarını birbiri ile karşılaştırarak her bir standarda 1’den 8’e kadar sıra numarası tayin etmeleri istenmiştir.

Verilerin analizinde öncelikle hangi liderlik standartlarının katılımcılar tarafından hangi sıraya kaç kez konulduğunu gösteren sıra frekansları matrisi oluşturulmuştur. Okul yöneticilerinin eğitim liderleri olarak yetiştirilmelerinde kullanılabilecek liderlik standartlarına verilen sıralama yargularından oranlar matrisi elde edilmiştir. Oranlar matrisinin elemanlarına karşılık gelen “z” değerleri belirlenerek birim normal sapmalar matrisinin oluşturulmasına geçilmiştir. Birim normal sapmalar matrisinin en alt satırına her bir sütuna ait değerlerin toplamı alınmış ve bu satırdaki her bir “z” değerinin sütunlar boyunca ortalamaları hesaplanmış ve böylelikle ölçek değerleri bulunmuştur.

Bulgular

Araştırmanın bulgularına göre; okul yöneticileri, araştırmada değerlendirilen sekiz eğitim liderliği standardı arasından “okul kültürü oluşturma” standardını en önemli eğitim liderliği standardı olarak görmektedirler. Okul yöneticileri diğer eğitim liderliği standartlarını sırasıyla: “okul vizyonu geliştirme ve paylaşma”, “değişime öncülük etme”, “okulun öğretim kapasitesini geliştirme”, “veliler ve okul çevresiyle işbirliği yapma”, “mesleki gelişim planı hazırlama”, “uygulamalarda etik davranma” ve “okul süreçlerini ve kaynaklarını yönetme” şeklinde sıralamışlardır.

Tartışma ve Öneriler

Bu araştırmada okul yöneticilerinin eğitim liderleri olarak yetiştirilmelerinde kullanılan eğitim liderliği standartlarının önem sırası okul yöneticilerinin görüşlerine göre belirlenmiştir. Nicolaidou ve Petridou (2011), liderlik geliştirme programlarının; okul liderlerinden beklenen rollere, sorumluluklara ve öğrenme ihtiyaçlarına yanıt vermesi gerektiğini tespit etmiştir. Bu araştırmada da eğitim liderliği standartlarının okul yöneticilerinin öğrenme ihtiyaçları doğrultusunda belirlenmesi, bu standartların referans alınmasıyla tasarlanacak bir liderlik geliştirme programının etkililiğini sağlayabilecektir.

Okul yöneticileri eğitim lideri yetiştirme programlarının öncelikle; okul kültürü oluşturma, okul vizyonu geliştirme ve paylaşma ve değişime öncülük yapma standartları çerçevesinde tasarlanmasını istemektedirler. Bu standartların okul yöneticilerinin eğitim liderleri olarak uzun sürede gerçekleştirebilecekleri uygulamaları içerdiği ve kurumsal düzeyde liderlik yeterliklerinin geliştirilmesine yönelik olduğu görülmektedir. Stone ve Major (2014), liderlik geliştirme programlarının özellikle bireysel olmak üzere, bireysel ve kurumsal düzeyde liderlik yeterliklerinin geliştirilmesine hizmet ettiğini tespit etmişlerdir. Araştırmaya katılan okul yöneticilerinin bireyselden ziyade kurumsal düzeyde yeterliğe

işaret eden liderlik standartlarını daha öncelikli olarak değerlendirmeleri, eğitim liderliğini bireysel gelişimleri ile değil, kurumsal gelişimle ilişkilendirdiklerini göstermektedir. Bu sonucun ortaya çıkmasında Türk toplumunda bireyselden ziyade kolektif bir ruhun hakim olması etkili olmuş olabilir.

Okul kültürü oluşturma ve değişime öncülük yapma, okul yöneticileri tarafından sırasıyla birinci ve üçüncü sırada tercih edilen liderlik standartları olmuştur. Okullarda değişimin yönetilmesi, kuşkusuz okulların kültüründen bağımsız düşünülemez. Liderler örgüt kültürünü değiştirerek ve motivasyon araçları kullanarak örgütsel değişimi gerçekleştirebilirler. Bu nedenle okul çalışanlarının desteğini almadan değişimi yönetmek mümkün değildir. Değişimin amaçları örgütsel kültürün nasıl değiştirileceğini belirler (Tunçer, 2011). Eğitim liderleri örgütsel mimarlar olarak örgüt içerisinde bir değişim ajanı rolü üstlenerek geleneksel bir yönetim anlayışı yerine değişim odaklı bir yönetim anlayışını benimsemelidirler. Bürokratik yönetim süreçlerini benimsemek yerine heterarşiyi vurgulayan yetkilendirici ve katılımcı uygulamalara yer vermelidirler (Murphy & Shipman, 1999). Okul liderlerinden okul yönetimi süreçlerinde eğitimsel değişimi yönetme kapsamında; kültürü değiştirme ve işbirlikçi kültür gelişimini başlatma rolleri beklenmektedir (Connolly, Connolly & James, 2000). Bu nedenle değişime öncülük yapmak isteyen bir eğitim liderinin örgüt kültürü oluşturma yeterliğine de sahip olması gerekmektedir.

Okul süreçlerini ve kaynaklarını yönetme, yöneticiler tarafından en son sırada önemli görülen liderlik standardı olmuştur. Okul süreçlerini ve kaynaklarını yönetme, okul yöneticilerinin rutin yönetsel işleri arasında yer almaktadır. Okul yöneticilerinin bu standardı diğer standartlara göre daha az önemli görmelerinin nedeni, yönetsel işlerle her zaman ilgilenmek zorunda oldukları için, bu konuda kendilerini yeterli görmeleri olabilir. Okul yöneticilerinin okul süreçlerini ve kaynaklarını yönetme standardını fazla önemli görmedikleri bulgusunun aksine; Mullen ve Cairns (2001), okul liderlerinden; iş ortaklıkları kurma ve okul süreçleri ve disiplini üzerinde çalışma rollerinin beklendiğini tespit etmişlerdir. Piaw, Hee, Ismail ve Ying (2014) ise, okul müdürlerinin en yetersiz oldukları liderlik becerisinin örgütsel yönetim olduğunu tespit etmiş ve okul müdürlerinin kaynak dağıtımını, personel geliştirme, planlama ve yönetim konularında desteklenmeye ihtiyaçları olduğunu belirtmişlerdir.

Uygulamalarda etik davranma standardı, okul yöneticilerinin verdikleri önem ve gelişime ihtiyaç duymaları bakımından eğitim liderliği standartları arasında yedinci sırada yer almıştır. Uygulamalarda etik davranma standardı, okul yöneticilerinin en az tercih ettikleri ikinci standart olarak belirlenmiştir. Okul yöneticilerinin, okul yönetiminde ve insan ilişkilerinde etik davranmayı hangi etik sistem açısından değerlendirdikleri, etik davranma konusunda herhangi bir eğitime ihtiyaç duyup duymadıklarına ilişkin algılarını etkileyebilmektedir. Okul yöneticilerinin bu yönde bir eğitime diğer standartlara oranla daha az ihtiyaç duyduklarını düşünmeleri, etik uygulamalarda bulunmayı kişisel etik (vicdan) sistemi açısından algıladıklarını göstermektedir. Bu konuda Wong (2004) müdürlerin, liderlik geliştirme programlarından hızla değişen koşullarda etik kararlar verme konusunda kendilerine yardımcı olmasını beklediğini saptamıştır. Okul yöneticilerinin bu standarda diğer standartlara göre daha az önem vermeleri, etik liderliği gerçekleştirebildikleri şeklinde değerlendirilebilir.

Arařtırmanın sonularına dayalı olarak; okul yneticilerinin geliřime ihtiya duydukları konuları kapsayan eđitim liderliđi programlarının tasarlanması nerilmektedir. Eđitim liderliđi programlarının ierikleri, okul yneticilerinin ihtiyalarının analizine dayalı olarak belirlenmelidir. Okul yneticilerinin geliřime en ok ihtiya duydukları standartların srece yayılan uygulamalarda yeterlilik gerektirmesinden dolayı, eđitim liderliđi programları periyodik olarak tekrar eden uzun soluklu programlar olarak tasarlanmalıdır. Okul yneticilerinin en fazla tercih ettikleri standartların okul paydařlarının desteđiyle gerekleřtirilebilecek nitelikte olmasından dolayı ise, eđitim liderliđi programlarının uygulanmasında okul paydařlarının katılımıyla gerekleřtirilecek srelere yer verilmelidir.

Anahtar Szckler: Eđitim liderliđi standartları, Eđitim liderliđi geliřtirme programı, Okul yneticisi yetiřtirme, Okul yneticileri

Atıf iin / Please cite as:

Balkar, B. & zkan, M. (2015). Educational leadership standards preferred by school administrators in educational leadership development [Okul yneticilerinin eđitim liderliđi geliřtirmede tercih ettikleri eđitim liderliđi standartları]. *Eđitim Bilimleri Arařtırmaları Dergisi - Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 5 (1), 1-21. <http://ebad-jesr.com/>