

Full Length Research Paper

To what extent should schools be autonomous?

Süleyman Göksoy

University of Düzce, Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences, Educational Administration and Supervision, 81620 Düzce, Turkey.

Accepted 2 January, 2014

The aim of the research is to present school managers' viewpoints about "school autonomy" program in our country and accordingly determine the degree of school managers' autonomy request. The research was made by using scanning method. The research consists of school managers who are working in preschools, elementary schools, secondary schools and high schools in Istanbul center. The sample consists of 374 school managers who were selected by random sampling. The data were collected with the help of survey which was formed by considering budget, material and human resources of schools, which were in "school autonomy" program. This survey was developed by Eurydice European Unit. SPSS package software (frequency, percentage, average, standard deviation) was used in analysing the data. While comparing the quantitative data, t-test was used in order to find out the difference between two groups, One Way Anova Test was used in comparison of parameters between more than two groups and Scheffe Test was used to identify which group was making difference. They were also interpreted.

Key words: School, school autonomy, school management.

INTRODUCTION

Decentralized management advocates regard local government as a way to participate in society and provide schools financial support. On the other hand, decentralized management opponents think that giving central authority's power and responsibility to local units will spread the problems of the central to local units. They also indicate that local units with limited knowledge, skill and experience to cope with these problems will make them bigger and unsolvable (Çinkır, 2002, 101).

School is a special atmosphere which is created by educational process systematically. School has 3 different functions in social field (Başar, 2003). School runs the environmental resources (program, teacher, technology, etc), mainly student resource with the help of certain subsystems. It presents educational services and educated people as a growth and provides feedbacks. Accordingly, it is an open social system which tries to exist and makes necessary changes after reviewing program processes (Şişman and Turan, 2004). On the other hand, school

management is a limited space for implementation of educational management. The boundaries of this space are generally created by aims and structures of educational system (Bursaloğlu, 1998).

School-based management is a developing school approach which aims to increase the power and responsibilities of school members in areas of budget, personnel, education and training programs (Aytaç, 2000). According to school-based management strategy, it is inevitable to have mistakes and schools should be given power and responsibility in order to remove these problems as soon as possible (Cheng, 1993). Basic hypothesis in this practice is increased organizational democracy with the participation of managed people as a result of managerial decisions (Kepenekçi, 2003).

School autonomy is defined in different names both at home and abroad. School autonomy is the transposition of power to make decision and responsibility to school and school units. In literature, the concept of school

autonomy is school-based management, school-based governance, a school that manages itself, creative school, participatory management in school, local school management, decentralization, local management of school, shared decision making, self managing schools, participatory decision making/management, locally autonomous schools, devolution, restructured school. Although these concepts such as school-based management, school-centred management, self managing school, decentralized schools, participatory decision making schools include some different meanings, they define more autonomous management based on school, human, material, financial resources and their power and responsibilities according to these resources. Different concepts are also derived from different experiences of countries (Naidoo and Peggy, 2003; Yalçinkaya, 2005; Özdemir, 1996; Aytaç, 2000; Taymaz, 1995; Yemenici and Bayarak 2001; Özden, 1996; De Grauwe 2004; Aytac 2000). The concept, "Autonomy" will be used in the remaining sections.

The concept of school autonomy is defined in various ways. Autonomy, being independent from external audit in terms of management (Oguzhan 1993), is being able to set target and make decisions without violating rights of individuals, groups, organizations, regions, states and legal people (Demirtas and Gunes, 2002). Therefore educational institutions can not only make plans and programs to meet their needs but also take any managerial decision about execution with their wide participation in committee (Uysal 2003).

The aim of the research

The aim of the research is to show school managers' opinions about "school autonomy" program in our country. Accordingly, pre-school, primary school, secondary school and high school managers' opinions about autonomy in schools are studied.

This research tries to address the following questions:

- a) What are the pre-school, primary school, secondary school and high school managers' opinions about "management of human resources" from the fields of autonomy which will be given to schools?
- b) What are the pre-school, primary school, secondary school and high school managers' opinions about "management of financial resources" from the fields of autonomy which will be given to schools?
- c) What are the pre-school, primary school, secondary school and high school managers' opinions about "management of teaching-learning process" from the fields of autonomy which will be given to schools?

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

Method of the research is scanning model for it aims to detect the

current situation. Scanning models aim to describe a past or current situation just as it is. Topic of the research, *an individual or an object*, is defined in its own circumstances (Karasar, 2011)

Structure of the research

Managers, chief and assistant managers who are working in kindergartens, primary schools, secondary schools and high schools connected to Ministry of Education in Istanbul create the structure of the research.

Research universe

The universe of the study was composed of principals, head assistant principals and assistant principals employed in state pre, primary, secondary and high schools under the Ministry of National Education in Istanbul Province central districts. Number of administrators included in the universe in 2012-2013 academic years (the information was obtained from Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education, Strategy Development Unit on 07.04.2013. Total of 7164 administrators (principals, head assistant principals and assistant principals) are employed in state pre, primary, secondary and high schools under the Ministry of National Education in Istanbul Province in 2012-2013 academic year.

Study sample

Since it was difficult to reach the whole universe included in the study, sampling was necessary. The characteristics of the universe, distribution of the elements in the universe, their representative competence, costs, time, the features of the study and conditions of data analysis were taken into consideration in identifying the sample size (Kaptan, 1995; Karasar, 1994).

Simple random sampling, an element sampling technique, was selected in the research (Karasar, 1994; Kaptan, 1995). Therefore, each element in the universe was given an "equal" or "independent" choice for being selected (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2000; Ural and Kılıç, 2005; Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan, 2004; Arıkan, 2004). Hence, weight that will be allocated to each element is the same (Karasar, 1994; Arıkan, 2004; Kaptan, 1995; Çömlekçi, 2001; Gökçe, 1988). It was ensured that each selected school administrator was on the permanent staff.

A sample size consisting of 364 administrators was deemed efficient to represent the universe by utilizing the sample size ratio table (Ural and Kılıç, 2005; Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan, 2004) proposed by Gay (1996) and Sekaran (2003) regarding the appropriate size of a sample that can represent the universe. However, the sample size was determined to be 400 thinking that some of the questionnaires would be faulty and some losses would occur. Therefore, questionnaires were distributed to a total of 400 administrators and 380 administrator scales were returned. After examining the returned questionnaires, the questionnaires that were not appropriate for the purpose of the study were eliminated and the rest of the 374 questionnaires were evaluated.

During the selection of study sample, it was ensured that administrators participating in the study worked at least one academic year in their place of employment. The individuals participating in the study were all administrators. Personal information about the participants is provided in Table 1.

61 of the participating administrators were females and 313 were males. 32 of the participating administrators were in the age range of 21-30, 162 in 31-40, 121 in 41-50 and 59 were in the age range of 51 and higher. 158 of the participating administrators were principals, 33 were head assistant principals and 183 were

Table 1. Personal information about the participants.

Variable		f	%
Gender	Female	61	16.3
	Male	313	83.7
Age	20-30	32	8.6
	31-40	162	43.3
	41-50	121	32.4
	51 and higher	59	15.7
Profession	Principal	158	42.2
	Head Assistant Principal	33	8.8
	Assistant Principal	183	48.9
Graduation	2,3-years College	40	10.7
	4-year Faculty	261	69.8
	Masters Degree	69	18.4
	Doctorate Degree	4	1.1
Seniority	1-5 years	18	4.8
	6-10 years	49	13.1
	11-15 years	92	24.6
	16-20 years	71	19.0
	21 years and higher	144	38.6

assistant principals. 40 of the participating administrators had completed 2-3 year college, 261 completed a 4-year degree, 69 finished their master degrees and 4 had doctorate degrees.

Data collection tool

Eurydice European Unit developed a questionnaire with the cooperation of Portuguese National Unit and official representatives of Portuguese Directorate of Education (Eurydice 2007) and implemented a control phase in 2008 to ensure that the obtained information represented the national situation fully. Current study developed questionnaire items by making use of the content that formed the budget, capital and human resources dimensions included in the "school autonomy" concept developed by Eurydice European Unit. The process entails translating the text content from English into Turkish during questionnaire development:

Researcher and two translation experts translated the text into Turkish and the resulting work was examined with an expert to select the items thought to express them best. The Turkish form obtained in this manner was reexamined with 3 educators to discuss the appropriateness of each item in terms of Turkish expressions and necessary adjustments were made. As a last step, the questionnaire was implemented on a group of 45 participants composed of teachers and school administrators to identify intelligibility of the translation and feedback was obtained to finalize the scale.

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was established to be .851 which points to the reliability of the scale.

Statistical analysis of data

Collected data were analysed by using SPSS program. Descriptive

statistical methods (Frequency, average, standard deviation) were used in evaluating data. In quantitative comparisons of the data, t-test was used in order to find the differences between two groups; when there are more than two groups One Way Anova Test was used in order to compare parameters between groups; Scheffe Test was used in order to detect the different groups.

FINDINGS

Findings regarding the views of pre, primary, secondary and high school administrators about the autonomy that will be given to schools

"Regarding the management of the resources"

Table 2 presents the views of pre, primary, secondary and high school administrators about the extent human resources management should be autonomous.

Examination of Table 2 shows that school administrators "often" believe that autonomy should be provided in all items regarding "the autonomy of human resources management" except item 5 with an arithmetic means that changes between 3.77 and 3.92. Regarding item 5, school administrators expressed that they "rarely" thought autonomy should be provided for "Dismissal/Firing of teachers" with arithmetic means of 2.60.

In line with these findings, school administrators were found to seek autonomy regarding selection of educational administrators, identification of the duties and responsibilities of educational administrators, selection of teachers for available posts, assignment of teachers instead of the ones who do not show up for duty and payment of overtime, extra class fees to teachers; however, they believe schools should not be autonomous in terms of dismissing/firing teachers. This finding may be explained with the possibility that school administrators do not want to shoulder the responsibility of dismissing teachers from duty or firing them and do not want to experience possible conflicts with teachers.

"Regarding financial resources"

Table 3 presents the views of pre, primary, secondary and high school administrators about the extent financial resources management should be autonomous.

Examination of Table 3 shows that school administrators believe that the highest level of autonomy should be provided to "providing information communication tools" in item 4 (4,08 arithmetic means) but they "rarely" think management authority should be provided in terms of "borrowing" (2.23 arithmetic means).

School administrators state that autonomy should be provided in all areas of financial resources management other than borrowing of schools (Item 6, 2.23). School administrators state that they should have a voice in financial matters in school management and their

Table 2. “Administrator views regarding the autonomy of human resources management”.

Item	Statement	\bar{X}	SS
1	Selecting educational administrators	3.92	1.37
2	Identifying the duties and responsibilities of educational administrators	3.87	1.36
3	Selecting teachers for available posts	3.80	1.39
4	Assigning teachers instead of the ones who do not show up for duty	3.77	1.32
5	Dismissal/Firing of teachers	2.59	1.56
6	Identifying the roles and responsibilities of teachers	3.90	1.23
7	Paying overtime, extra class fees to teachers	3.87	1.36

Table 3. “Administrator views regarding the autonomy of financial resources management”.

Item	Statement	\bar{X}	SS
1	Making or spending money	3.43	1.40
2	Financial management	3.34	1.57
3	Providing information communication tools	4.08	1.34
4	Acquiring resources from donors and sponsors	3.27	1.64
5	Renting school's physical resources in non-educational times	3.14	1.53
6	Borrowing	2.23	1.43
7	Utilizing school's estate income	2.98	1.64
8	Utilizing school's movable property	3.09	1.63
9	Assigning educational staff with the private capital of the school	3.25	1.53
10	Assigning non-educational staff with the private capital of the school	3.30	1.56

Table 4. “Administrator views regarding the autonomy teaching-learning process management”.

Item	Statement	\bar{X}	SS
1	Identifying the compulsory courses and programs	3.50	1.38
2	Identifying the elective courses and programs	3.91	1.20
3	Selecting the teaching methods	3.90	1.19
4	Selecting the textbooks	3.98	1.14
5	Identifying the student evaluation criteria in compulsory courses	3.96	1.26
6	Identifying in-class evaluation criteria	3.99	1.24
7	Deciding on students' pass-fail	3.97	1.34
8	Taking part in organizing graduation exam and documents	4.02	1.23

authority should be increased but they are unwilling in matter such as borrowing. The findings may be interpreted that school administrators think that financial autonomy of the schools should not be unlimited.

“Regarding the teaching-learning process”

Table 4 presents the views of pre, primary, secondary and high school administrators about the extent teaching-learning process management should be autonomous.

Examination of Table 4 shows that school administrators “often” believe that autonomy should be provided

in all items regarding “the autonomy of teaching-learning process management” with an arithmetic mean that changes between 3.50 and 4.02. Findings may be interpreted that school administrators agree that management of teaching-learning process should be given autonomy.

Findings regarding demographic characteristics

This section analyzes whether there are significant differences between school administrators,' genders, ages, assignments, graduations and professional seniorities including teaching years and their views.

Table 5. School administrators' views in terms of gender variable.

Questionnaire	Gender	N	\bar{X}	\bar{X}	SS	sd	t	p
	Female	61	3,08		,744			
Total	Male	313	3,66		,596	372	6,64	,000*

*p<.05.

Table 6. School administrators' views in terms of age variable.

<i>f</i> , \bar{X} and <i>SS</i> Values					ANOVA RESULTS					
Score	Group	<i>N</i>	\bar{X}	<i>SS</i>		SS	<i>Sd</i>	<i>KO</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
	20-30 years	32	3.13	.718	B.groups	10.280	4	,450		
	31-40 years	161	3.50	.675	I.groups	151.326	369	,295		
Age	41-50 years	121	3.70	.625	Total	161.606	373		6.267	.000*
	51 years and higer	59	3.71	.515						
	Total	374	3.56	.658						

* p>0,05.

Gender variable

Table 5 presents the results of the t-test undertaken to identify whether there were significant differences between school administrators' views about autonomy and their genders.

Table 5 shows a meaningful difference between the views of female and male pre, primary, secondary and high school administrators regarding autonomy ($p < .05$). Compared to female administrators (3.08), male administrators (3.66) expressed the need for more autonomy in schools.

It is believed that male administrators' desire for more autonomy in schools or lower levels of autonomy desired by women administrators compared to male administrators may be caused by socio-cultural reasons.

Age variable

Table 6 presents the results of One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) undertaken to identify whether there were significant differences between school administrators' views about school autonomy and their ages.

As can be seen in Table 6, results of One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) undertaken to identify whether there were significant differences between the sample group of school administrators' views about school autonomy and their ages show that a statistically meaningful difference was found between the arithmetic means of the groups ($F=6,267$; $p < 0,05$). Below you can find the results of Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis undertaken to identify among which groups the differentiation of scores

were observed in terms of age.

As can be seen in Table 7, results of the Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis undertaken to identify among which groups the differentiation of views observed show that the difference of opinion occurred between 20-30 age range and 41-50 age range in favor of the 41-50 age range in $p < 0,05$ level and between 51 years and higher age range and 20-30 age range in favor of the 51 years and higher age range in $p < 0,05$ level. Therefore, compared to administrators in the 31-41 age range, the administrators included in 41-50 age range believed that more autonomy should be given to schools. No statistically significant differences were observed among the arithmetic means of other groups ($p > 0,05$).

Findings can be interpreted in such a way that school administrators want to have more authority and need to use more initiative in school management as they mature; therefore, they believe more autonomy should be provided in school management.

Assignment variable

Table 8 presents the results of One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) undertaken to identify whether there were significant differences between school administrators' views about school autonomy and their assignments.

As can be seen in Table 8, results of One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) undertaken to identify whether there were significant differences between the sample group of school administrators' views about school autonomy and their assignments show that a statistically meaningful difference was found between the arithmetic means of

Table 7. Results of Scheffe Multiple comparison analysis undertaken to identify among which groups the differentiation of scores was observed regarding "age".

Age (i)	Age (j)	$\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$	$Sh_{\bar{x}}$	<i>P</i>
20-30 years	31-40 yr	-.37073	.12388	.064
	41-50 yr	-.57189	.12730	.001*
	51 yr and higher	-.57893	.14146	.002*
51 years and above	20-30 yr	.57189	.12730	.001*
	31-40 yr	.20117	.07695	.147
	41-50 yr	-.00703	.10288	1.000

* $p < 0.05$.**Table 8.** School administrators' views in terms of assignment variable.

<i>f</i> , \bar{x} and <i>SS</i> Values			ANOVA results							
Score	Group	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SS</i>		SS	<i>Sd</i>	<i>KO</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Assignment	Principal	158	3.79	.648	B.groups	16.472	2	8.236	21.053	.000*
	Head Assistant P.	33	3.67	.542	I.groups	145.134	371	.391		
	Assistant P.	183	3.55	.619	Total	161.606	373			
	Total	374	3.56	.658						

* $p > 0.05$.**Table 9.** Results of Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis undertaken to identify among which groups the differentiation of scores was observed regarding "assignment".

Assignment (i)	Assignment (j)	$\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$	$Sh_{\bar{x}}$	<i>P</i>
Principal	Head assistant principal	.12236	.11971	.594
	Assistant principal	.43572	.06792	.000*
Head assistant principal	Principal	-.12236	.11971	.594
	Assistant principal	.31336	.11829	.031*

* $p < 0.05$.

the groups ($F=21,053$; $p < 0,05$). Below you can find the results of Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis undertaken to identify among which groups the differentiation of scores were observed in terms of assignment.

As can be seen in Table 9, results of the Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis undertaken to identify among which groups the differentiation of views observed show that the difference of opinion occurred between the group of principals and group of assistant principals in favor of the group of principals in $p < 0,05$ level and between group of head assistant principals and group of assistant principals in favor of group of head assistant principals in $p < 0,05$ level. Therefore, compared to administrators assigned to work as assistant principals, the admini-

strators assigned to work as principals and head assistant principals believe that schools should be given more autonomy.

Findings can be interpreted in such a way that school administrators want to have more authority and need to use more initiative in school management as they progress in their careers; therefore, they believe more autonomy should be provided in school management.

Graduation variable

Table 10 presents the results of One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) undertaken to identify whether there

Table 10. School administrators' views in terms of graduation variable.

<i>f</i> , \bar{x} and <i>SS</i> Values					ANOVA results					
Score	Group	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SS</i>		<i>SS</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>KO</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Graduation	2-3 years	40	3.39	.555	B.groups	2.350	3	.587		
	4 years	261	3.58	.684	I.groups	159.256	370	.432		
	Master's degree	69	3.56	.611	Total	161.606	372		1.361	.247
	Doctorate	4	4.00	.403						
	Total	374	3.56	.658						

* $p > 0,05$.**Table 11.** School administrators' views in terms of seniority variable.

<i>f</i> , \bar{x} and <i>SS</i> Values					ANOVA results					
Score	Group	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SS</i>		<i>SS</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>KO</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Seniority	1-5 years	18	3.29	.733	B. groups	19.095	5	3.819		
	6-10 years	49	3.16	.542	I. groups	142.510	368	.387		
	11-15 years	92	3.66	.726	Total	161.606	373			
	16-20 years	71	3.37	.432					9.862	.000*
	21-25 years	72	3.82	.740						
	26 years and higher	72	3.71	.519						
	Total	374	3.56	.658						

* $p > 0,05$.

administrators' views about school autonomy and their graduation.

Results of One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) undertaken to identify whether there were significant differences between the sample group of school administrators' views about school autonomy and their graduation does not show a statistically meaningful difference between the arithmetic means of the groups ($f=1,361$; $p > 0,05$).

Obtained findings show that school and level of graduation do not affect administrators' views. According to these findings, the views of administrators about autonomy of schools are parallel to each other in terms of graduation variable.

Seniority variable

Table 11 presents the results of One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) undertaken to identify whether there were significant differences between school administrators' views about school autonomy and their seniority.

As can be seen in Table 11, results of One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) undertaken to identify whether there were significant differences between the sample group of school administrators' views about school autonomy and their seniority shows a statistically meaningful

difference between the arithmetic means of the groups ($F=9,862$; $p < 0,05$). Below you can find the results of Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis undertaken to identify among which groups the differentiation of scores were observed in terms of seniority.

As can be seen in Table 12, the Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis was undertaken to identify among which groups the differentiation of views was observed. The different opinions occurred between group of administrators with 6-10 years of seniority and group of administrators with 11-15 years of seniority and group of administrators with 21-25 years of seniority and group of administrators with 26 years. This was in favor of the group of administrators with 11-15 years of seniority, the group of administrators with 21-25 years of seniority and the group of administrators with 26 years and higher seniority in $p < 0,05$ level. Whereas, the difference of opinion that occurred between group of administrators with 16-20 years of seniority and group of administrators with 21-25 years of seniority showed that the results were in favor of the group of administrators with 21-25 years of seniority in $p < 0,05$ level. Therefore, compared to administrators with less seniority (6-10 years), the administrators with more seniority (11-15 years, 21-25 years and 26 years and higher) believe that schools should be given more autonomy. No statistically significant differences

Table 12. Results of Scheffe Multiple Comparison Analysis undertaken to identify among which groups the differentiation of scores were observed regarding "seniority".

Seniority (i)	Seniority (j)	$\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$	$Sh_{\bar{x}}$	P
6-10 years	1-5 years	-.12132	.17151	.992
	11-15 years	-.49542	.11006	.001*
	16-20 years	-.20654	.11557	.670
	21-25 years	-.65909	.11525	.000*
	26 years and higher	-.54576	.11525	.001*
16-20 years	1-5 years	.08523	.16422	.998
	6-10 years	.20654	.11557	.670
	11-15 years	-.28888	.09830	.127
	21-25 years	-.45255	.10408	.002*
	26 years and higher	-.33922	.10408	.062

* $p > 0,05$.

were observed among the arithmetic means of other groups ($p > 0,05$).

Findings can be interpreted in such a way that school administrators want to have more authority and need to use more initiative in school management as they progress in seniority; therefore they believe more autonomy should be provided in school management. However, administrators with less seniority who are new in administrative duties have more reservations in terms of more autonomy in schools since they may not want to take more responsibility and authority.

DISCUSSION

Following results were reached in the research which aimed to determine the opinions of school managers about how much material and human resources in schools should be autonomous.

According to these findings, school managers think they should be given autonomy in choosing educational managers, determining educational managers' duties and responsibilities, choosing teachers to available quotas, entrusting new teachers in place of the ones who are not coming, determining teachers' duties and responsibilities and giving more work-hour and additional course fee. Findings are coherent with the results of Karadağ (2010) which say that central management structure is not functional enough and attendance of school staff to the process of school managers' decision making increases the quality of decisions. Managers think that they should not be given autonomy in dismissing teachers. Because they do not want to go into a discussion with teachers and they think that they have not enough knowledge on this issue.

Results are parallel to Turan et al (2010)'s research

which says that educational managers lack knowledge and create a culture on managing education from the center. School managers think that management of financial resources should be given autonomy in every field except for schools' getting into debt (6. Item, 2,23). These findings are parallel to the results of Karadağ's research (2010).

The research also supports the results of Tasar (2010). It says that funding reserved for education has given worldwide positive results in the use of demand canal and implementation examples will also give positive results in Turkey. It also supports the idea that financial resources reserved for education will be used by school-centred management.

Managers think that when they are given autonomy financially, they will have more power but they are also reluctant for some schools may get into debt. According to the findings, they think that schools' financial autonomy should not be unlimited. In Uz's research (2009), it is understood that primary school managers have some economical problems and they think positively about school-centred budgeting system. It supposes that government is dominant in creating budget income and school-centred budget process will have positive effect on educational quality and students' success. Male managers (3.66) demanded autonomy more than female managers (3.08) did. It is thought that this situation may have resulted from social and cultural reasons.

According to the findings, it can be said that school managers think that management of schools' teaching-learning process should be autonomous. These findings support the research of Kaya (2008) which aimed to get the opinions of teachers about school-centred management system. Similarly, in Yolcu (2010) school autonomy is regarded as one of the best structures of decentralization in educational management.

Findings show that managers who are older and have higher seniority want to have a voice in school management more than younger ones. Because older managers want to use initiative in management but younger ones do not want to take responsibility that much. These findings also support the researches of Summak and Rosan (2006), Olmez and Tombul (2011).

According to the findings of the research, the following advice is given:

- After material and human resources get ready qualitatively and quantitatively, schools should pass to autonomy implementation step by step.
- Autonomy implementation in school management should be used in pilot schools before spreading it to the whole country,
- School surroundings and school community should be informed about this issue.

REFERENCE

- Arıkan R (2004). Araştırma teknikleri ve rapor hazırlama. Ankara: Asil Yayın.
- Aytaç T (2000). "Eğitim Yönetiminde Yeni Bir Paradigma Okul Merkezli Yönetim", Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, Cilt 6, Sayı 21, ss. 55-81.
- Bursalioğlu Z (1998). Okul Yönetiminde Yeni Yapı ve Davranış. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Çömlekçi N (2001). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi ve istatistiksel anlamlılık sınamaları. Ankara: Bilim Teknik Yayınevi.
- De Grauwe A (2004). "School-Based Management (SBM): Does it Improve Quality?" [Http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001466/146639e.pdf](http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001466/146639e.pdf) (Erisim Tarihi: 25.3.2008).
- Duman A (1998). Eğitimin yerinden yönetimi. Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler Dergisi. 2:83-93.
- Dunham RB, Pierce JL (1989). Management, Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Erdoğan İ (2004). Yeni bir binyıla doğru Türk eğitim sistemi sorunlar ve çözümler. İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.
- Erkan H (1997). Bilgi Toplumu ve Ekonomik Gelişme, 3.Baskı, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, Genel Yayın No:326, Bilim Dizisi:8, İzmir, Haziran.
- Ertuğrul M (2000). Bilgi çağında işletmelerin yeni kaynağı: Entelektüel sermaye. Active Bankacılık ve Finans Dergisi (15):34.
- Eryılmaz B (1995). Kamu yönetimi. İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi.
- Eurydice (2007). School Autonomy in Europe policies and Measures, Printed in Belgium.
- Gay, LR (1996). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Beverly Hill, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gökçe B (1988). Toplumsal bilimlerde araştırma. Ankara: Savaş Yayınları.
- Kaptan S (1995). Scientific Research and Statistical Techniques. Offset Teknik Ankara.
- Karasar N (1994). Research Methods in Education. Ankara: Research Education Consulting Co., Ltd.. Sti.
- Karasar N (2011). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kesici İ (1993). Bilgi Toplumu Özellikleri, Bilişim, Mayıs.
- Köksal K (1999). Yerinden Yönetime Evet Ancak Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi (17):119-124.
- Kuran K (2005). Bir Değişme ve Gelişme Süreci Olarak Eğitimde Toplam Kalite Yönetimi ve Aktif Öğrenme İlişkisi, Ankara, Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi, Şubat, Sayı:317.
- Kurt M (2001), Bilginin Organizasyonlar İçin Değişen Anlamı ve stratejik Önemi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, Sayı 7, Afyon.
- Lee DY, Kim YG (2005). Validation of the knowledge management stage model: A triangulation approach. Proceedings of the 38th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS'05) - Track 8, 253a.
- Naidoo J, Peggy K (2003), Improving Education Management in the Context of Decentralization in Africa. Association for the Development of Education in Africa ADEA Biennial Meeting 2003 (Grand Baie, Mauritius, December 3-6, 2003).
- Oğuzhan F (1993), Eğitim Terimleri Sözlüğü, Gözden geçirilmiş ve Genişletilmiş Üçüncü Baskı, Emel Matbaacılık ve San. Tic. Ltd. Şti., Ankara.
- Özdemir S (1996). Eğitimde örgütsel yenileşme. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Özdemir S (1996), "Okula Dayalı Yönetim", Eğitim Yönetimi, Cilt 2, Sayı 3, ss. 421-426.
- Özden Y (1996). "Okullara Katılmalı Yönetim", Eğitim Yönetimi, Cilt 2, Sayı 3, ss. 427-438.
- Çinkır Ş (2002). "Eğitim Yönetiminde Yerleşmenin Üstünlükleri Ve Sakıncaları", Eğitim Araştırmaları Ağustos Sayı:8
- Karadağ N (2010). "İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Etkili Okul Bağlamında Olası Bir Okul Merkezli Yönetim Uygulamasına İlişkin Rol ve Sorumluluk Algıları" Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Kaya M (2008). "Okul Merkezli Yönetim Sistemine İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşleri" Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. İstanbul.
- Kepenekçi Y (2003). "Demokratik Okul", Eğitim Araştırmaları Bahar Sayı: 11
- Ölmez Ö, Ve Tonbul Y (2011). "Eğitim Yönetiminin Yerleşmesi Sürecinde Bir Uygulama: Eğitim Bölgeleri Danışma Kurulları", Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Yıl 11, Sayı 21, Haziran, 153-179
- Özgür HN (2005). Eğitim bölgeleri ve eğitim kurullarının oluşturulması ve çalıştırılmasına ilişkin etkinliklerin değerlendirilmesi (Hatay örneği). Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, Hatay.
- Öztürk Ş (2002), İlköğretim Okullarının Finansman Kaynakları (Ankara İli Polatlı İlçesi Örneği). Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Smith SC, Philip KP (1997). School Leadership, Handbook for Excellence, Third Edition, ERIC.
- Summak MS, Roşan Ş (2006). "Okul Temeli Yönetimin İlköğretim Okullarında Uygulanabilirliği". Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (KEFAD) Cilt 7, Sayı 2, 317-334.
- Şahin S (2003). Okul Merkezli Yönetim Uygulamaları. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi 9(36):582-605.
- Sekaran U (2003). Research Methods for Business: A Skill Buildings Approach. 4th Ed. New York: John & Wiley.
- Şimşek H (2000) "Eğitim Reformunun Görünmeyen Yüzü: Paradigmalar Savaşı" <http://www.hasansimsek.net/pdf%20makale%20metinleri.html>(erisim Tarihi:15.02.2008).
- Şişman M, Turan S (2004). "Eğitim ve Okul Yönetimi," Edit.: Yüksel Özden Eğitim ve Okul Yöneticiliği El Kitabı. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık, 2. Baskı.
- Taymaz H (1995). Okul Yönetimi. Ankara: Saypa Yayınları.
- TDK (2005). Türkçe Sözlük, Yay, Ankara.
- Thomas AS (1997). Entelektüel Sermaye, Mess Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Turan S, Yücel C, Karataş E, Demirhan G (2010). "Okul Müdürlerinin Yerinden Yönetim Hakkındaki Görüşleri" Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 3/1:1-18.
- Ural A, Kılıç İ (2005). Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve SPSS ile veri analizi. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Uysal M (2003). "Eğitimde Demokratikleşme". Eğitim Yönetimi ve Üniversitelerde Demokratik Yapılanma, Sempozyum, Eğitim-Sen Yayınları,
- Uz M (2009). "İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Okul Merkezli Yönetimin Bütçe Boyutuna İlişkin Görüşleri" Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Yalçınkaya M (2005). "Okul Merkezli Yönetim", Ege Eğitim Dergisi, Cilt 5, Sayı 2, ss. 21-34.
Yazıcıoğlu Y, Erdoğan S (2004). SPSS uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
Yemenici H, Coşkun B (2001). "Okula Dayalı Yönetim", Eurasian Journal of Educational Research.

Yolcu H (2010). "Neo-Liberal Dönüşümün Yaşandığı Ülkelerde Yerleşme Ve Okul Özerkliği Uygulamaları", ZKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt 6, Sayı 12, ss. 253-273.