Content Analysis of Scientific Studies on Decentralization in Education and Educational Administration

Suphi Turhan[a], Ahmet Guneyli[b]

Abstract

The aim of the research is to analyze the positive and negative aspects of decentralization in education and national and international articles and postgraduate theses related to decentralization in education/educational management between 1995 - 2017 and to rewrite it within the framework of integrity. 41 national and international theses and 94 articles on the subject have been reached by the research. For the scientific studies reached, content analysis related to the positive/negative aspects of decentralization in educational management has been made. As a result of the analysis, the research was limited with 18 theses and 26 articles. As a result of the analysis performed with MAXQDA 10 qualitative data analysis program, conceptual codes related to the positive / negative aspects of decentralization in education management were determined and these codes were re-written into three thematic categories.

Keywords: Decentralization in Education, Decentralization in Education Management, Decentralized Management, Management

Introduction

The decentralization of public services varies from country to country. It is seen that most of the OECD (Economic Cooperation and Development Organization) countries have abandoned their central management understanding in terms of administration and transferred their powers to the local. Education, health, safety, etc. In order to increase the quality of services in the service sectors, all powers were transferred to local actors and great achievements were achieved by acting independently from the central government (Bakioğlu, 2014). Nowadays, when the services are highly diversified and concentrated, countries are trying to relax administratively by dividing themselves into small units. Some countries (Germany, France, Sweden, Switzerland, Russia, Spain, Italy, Belgium, etc.) maintain this governing structure with such names as self-government, autonomous, local government, regional administration, canton, autonomous, federal state, etc. (Uygun, 2007). Many of these countries, acting with the slogan of Gulbenkian Commission (2014: 78) By targeting the slogan "Be global in thought,

a,bSuphi TURHAN, Near East University, Institute of Educational Sciences
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet GUNEYLİ, Lefke European University, Faculty of Education

be local in action." These countries have shaped decentralization effort in the education management system before the report was published in 1995 and some of them shaped theirs after report was published.

Social and economic changes in the 20th century brought new concepts into the field of management. The most important of these is the concept of governance (Bulut, 2013). The concept of governance, which means managing together, is based on interaction and refers to the management mentality that provides communication between the manager and the managed (Görmez, 2005; Göymen, 2014; VanSant, 1996). The concept of governance was used as good governance in the World Development Report prepared by the 1989 World Bank (Bulut, 2013; Keskin, 2008). The concept of good governance includes concepts such as democracy, human rights, efficiency, effectiveness, responsibility, openness, market economy, participation, civil society, accountability, decision making, participation in decisions, public control, morality and merit in management (Bulut, 2013; Göymen, 2014). Bulut (2013) associates all these concepts with local governance and expresses this with decentralization in management. Associating

the concept of governance with decentralization is considered as an indicator of the transition to contemporary management. This is adopted as the definition of decentralization and is therefore explained as the transfer of management to local governments in terms of political, financial and administrative aspects (Bilgiç, 2009). In addition, Ortiz (2006: p. 136), it is mentioned that good governance is a good predictor for decentralization and there is a relationship between them. The concept of governance is very popular in the education sector, as in the whole sector. Many scientific studies and practices have been carried out in this field. These studies include the decentralization dimension of education and training management.

Decentralization in the education management system is a subject that has been discussed for a long time and is the subject of many theses, articles, books, and is always on the agenda in the education sector. Sometimes decentralization in education, sometimes decentralization in education management, and sometimes decentralization of education are included in the literature as 'school-based management'. These concepts, as a whole, represent the same things in content, in other words, they mean the decentralization of education in terms of politics, finance and administration. These concepts, as a whole, represent the same things in content, in other words, they mean the decentralization of education in terms of politics, finance and administration. Hanson (1997); Bucak (2000); Gershberg (2005); Görmez (2005); Zajda (2006); Bilgiç (2009); Gershberg, González, and Meade (2012); Ökmen, Çağatay and Görmez (2013); Popescu (2013) they define the decentralization as an area of public administration where collaboration, communication, coordination, democracy, justice, participation in decision, quick decision making, transparency, accountability, less bureaucracy, efficiency and efficiency find the best use.

Bilgiç (2009); Görmez (2005); Gershberg, Gonzalez and Meade (2012) examines financing the structure and functioning of local governments, management capacity of local administrators, personnel affairs, resource use, sustainability, permanent policy, workload, supervision, use of power, and public services in terms of providing it with the closest public organizations. According to these potentials, they evaluate the positive and negative managerial

works and transactions that they will create in

administrative aspects.

Bucak (2000); Falcão (2015); Papadopoulou and Yirci (2013) list the concepts that decentralization will bring to society in educational, social, financial and administrative aspects as development, change, innovation, responsibility, access, human rights, competition, equality of opportunity, financial participation, regional difference, quality of education, inequality, impact on development, national unity, implementation, flexibility, adaptation, representation, curriculum, training programs, motivation, It lists incentive, motivation, ownership, integration, development of democracy. The authors in question addressed the positive and negative contributions of these concepts in various ways with the formation of decentralization in the education management system

Today, decentralization of management systems has become a necessity rather than a proposal. This necessity is based on many reasons. Hanson (1997); Zajda (2006); Jeong, Lee and Cho (2017); Rauf et al. (2017) list these reasons as accountability, adding local power to decision-making processes, increasing efficiency in management and resource utilization, contributing to economic development through institutional modernization, sharing financial responsibility from the center to the local, supporting local democratization, enhancing local control by transferring authority to local administrations and improving the quality of education.

Gershberg (2005); Salinas (2014) explains the reasons for decentralization in education management as to meet local demands, prevent the bureaucracy, minimize the waste of resources, coordinate the government programs with the local, lower the cost of communication, mobilize the local dynamics, provide financial participation from the local, benefit from the local know-how and experience, increase the impact of local auditing, provide accountability, collaboration and transparency.

Again Florestral and Cooper (1997); Falcão (2015) states economizing, increasing management efficiency and flexibility, increasing revenues by diversifying revenues, delegating responsibility to the local, giving administrative responsibilities to the lowest local government unit, giving local people a say in matters of interest to them, as being aware of the difference of local diversity.

Decentralization does not only come to the fore with its positive aspect. It is stated that there are also negative aspects. For example (Hurst, 1985), states that many political parties, institutions and

pressure groups are closely interested in education, and these groups have different ideological structures, and they can be expected to engage in conflict in order to take power and deactivate others. It therefore draws attention to the disadvantage that decentralization plans may result in dominant groups increasing the influence of their ideological thinking with leaving out other groups. It is expressed that the pressure groups of education will go out of its purpose by entering the conflict area and which will have a negative impact on the future of the country. Oates (1999); Winkler and Gershberg (2000); Bardhan and Mookherjee (2006); Pollitt (2005); Oates (2005). In addition, Li (2017) states that funding in decentralization causes inequality of opportunity in education. Papadopoulou and Yirci (2013) state that decentralization can make it difficult to follow a single policy in educational management Venkataraman and Keno (2015: 165), which can make it difficult to overcome difficulties such as adequate financial support, lack of educated manpower, and low number of teachers.

Education is now too complex to be managed from a single center. With the central administration, education problems cannot be solved and become more and more complicated. Considering the advantages of local administration; It is clear that the transfer of the education management system to the locals will add significant advantages to the education system, which will increase the quality of education. For this reason, many developed / developing countries have localized their education management systems. They have increased the quality of education by mobilizing local dynamics (Bakioğlu, 2014). In addition, with the localization, participation of the public, local administrators and non-governmental organizations in education has been ensured and a participatory management approach has been created. Governance in participating administrations; the principles of common mind, transparency, accountability, participation, democracy, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability come to the fore and these factors make it easier to achieve the desired results. Participation contributes to the development of the culture of local democracy, which enables the development of country democracy and international reputation.

Due to the problems caused by the central government understanding of the organizational structure of the Ministry of National Education in Turkey, scientific studies, whose quality of education and productivity has fallen, reports, legal studies, were stated in council decisions and development plans. Especially the localization of the education management system, in the conduction of educational services in Turkey whose main responsibility has been given to the Ministry of Education, in order to educate the people of information age, by eluding centralism in the management structure based on participative management , in which authority will be transferred to the local level where work is being done and new regulations that become a necessity has been expressed by (Korkmaz, 2010: 9-10)."

Again, on the subject İlimoğlu (2014: 25); "Another reason for decentralization is that centralization produces disadvantages. Nowhere in the world are public services offered solely by the central government. If it is presented, it is not possible to achieve the desired quality and success." Todaie (1992: 166) "It points out that the decentralization of the education management system can be beneficial for reasons such as increasing efficiency and speed in education service and providing public contribution". Finally, Article 127 of the 1982 Constitution of the Republic of Turkey on the decentralization refers to the following requirements: "Decentralization; it enables people to exercise their basic rights, provides efficiency in production and consumption, and contributes to the development of democracy." (Anayasa, 1982). Except theses and articles related to decentralization of education management system rather than reported in Turkey, there are books, legislation and constitutional definitions.

In various periods, projects, reports, guidelines and law drafts have been made about the decentralization in educational administration system in Turkey. In all of these studies, positive and negative aspects of decentralization in education management have been covered. For example; The aim of the Reorganization of the Central Government Organization is to provide the most appropriate distribution of the powers and duties of the centralized structure, to create a realistic organizational structure and method, a systematic planning and coordination, an effective financial control and a well-functioning personnel structure (Todaie, 1966; Coşkun, 2005). The main purpose of the Public Administration Research Project is to provide various principles and recommendations for local government reform, to localize centralized-bureaucratic structures and to transform them into local government units that produce strong and democratic, effective and efficient services (Todaie, 1991; Coşkun, 2005). Turkey Industrialists and Businessmen's Association

in their 'Report on Education in Turkey' education dwelt on the factors that affect the quality and reduce the quality of education in Turkey showed central government as the most important factor (Tüsiad, 1990; Bucak, 2000: 57). The Ministry of National Education Council Decisions are advisory. Especially 8-19. in the decisions of council, suggestions were made regarding the transfer of authority in education, strengthening local governments and school-based management (MEB, 2018). Development Plans in Turkey are prepared at five-year intervals. In the 3-10th development plans, many plans were made regarding the transfer of authority including 'education' to local governments, but these were not implemented (Kalkınma Bakanlığı, 2017). The sections related to decentralization, which are dealt with in the decisions of the council and development plans, are mostly related to the positive aspects of decentralization. Article 123 of the Constitution is the most definitive example that there is not an obstacle to decentralization of education management in Turkey. Article 123; It was stated as "the establishment and duties of the administration are based on the principles of decentralization and decentralization" (Anayasa, 1982).

The problem of the research: In the scientific studies conducted on the decentralization of education and education management, the positive and negative aspects of decentralization in education management are intertwined. Problems are encountered while investigating positive and negative findings about decentralization in educational administration. In this context, this research was needed due to the necessity of evaluating scientific studies and reaching some judgments on the subject, where different opinions were raised.

Research Questions: In line with the main purpose of the research, answers to the following three questions were sought:
1. What are the basic concepts in scientific studies on the decentralization of education and training management? Can these concepts be divided into thematic areas?
2. What are the positive and negative aspects of decentralization in education management in the research related to decentralization in education and training?
3. What are the similarities and differences? between local and international sources regarding the decentralization of educational administration?

Method

The content analysis technique aiming to compile and rewrite the positive and negative aspects of the decentralization of education management system in the graduate theses and articles written between the years of 1995-2018 in Turkey and 2000-2018 in the international arena was used in the research in which the screening model was selected as the baseline on the qualitative research approach.

It is aimed to interpret the data, whose contents are close to each other, under thematic titles, to form an integrity by grouping the concepts in an easy-to-understand form (Creswell, 2012). In the processing of data obtained from written sources; Coding, theme creation, grouping of codes and themes, calculating frequencies and interpretation of the findings and definitions obtained are the way to follow the content analysis (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Quantitative and qualitative studies conducted with descriptive and content analysis methods were analyzed in detail and the general orientation in the field was determined (Çalık and Sözbilir, 2014). In this study, the data were analyzed in four phases as stated by (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013). These phases are the conceptual coding of the collected data, finding themes related to the data, organizing the conceptual codes and themes found, and defining and interpreting the findings. Encodings were made according to the concepts extracted from the data. At the final stage, inductive codes were created by the data obtained by examining the preliminary codes and data.

Population and sample

Between the years 1995-2018 the population of this research consists of 21 theses from Higher Education (Higher Education Council) National Thesis Center, 38 national articles obtained from Google Scholar search engine, Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) DergiPark database and 56 articles scanned in Web of Science, Scopus and Ebscho indexes on internationalization of education in the international arena between 2000-2018 and 20 theses accessible from PreQuest database. The sample of the study consists of 18 theses and 26 articles, which discuss the positive and negative aspects of decentralization of the education management system. Eight theses are international and 11 are national. Nine of the articles are national and 17 are international. The high sample size solves the generalization problem (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013).

Data Collection and Analysis

The National Thesis Center (YÖK), Google Scholar search engine, TÜBİTAK DergiPark database, Web of Science, Scopus, and Ebscho indexes examined 94 articles and 41 theses and 18 theses and 26 articles were detected, which included positive and negative aspects in education management. The data obtained from 18 theses and 26 articles were analyzed using the document analysis technique. Document analysis: It was carried out by following the steps of finding the document, checking its originality, understanding the documents, analyzing the data and using the data (Forster, 1994). The collected data were entered into the previously prepared data collection table. In this table, the name, author, publication year, publisher, genre, method, pattern and data collection tools of the thesis / article are included. For content analysis, MAXQDA 10 qualitative research data analysis program was used. In this research, document analysis technique was used. In document analysis, content analysis technique consists of determining goals, defining concepts, determining logical structure, determining coding categories, counting, interpreting and writing results (Bilgin, 2014; Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, and Demirel, 2014).

Validity and reliability
Validity: The scanned sources were written in detail in the data collection table and how the results were obtained was explained clearly. Direct quotations from scientific studies with document analysis are frequently included; The results of the research are tried to be reached from here as well (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013). Thus, the validity study of the research was conducted.
İnternal validity: The two researchers who carried out the study in the collection, analysis and interpretation of the data constantly questioned themselves and their research processes with a critical eye and checked whether the scientific results obtained from the analysis of their data reflect the truth (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013). For example, while creating the themes, the individual studies made by the authors were compared and a common conclusion was reached, a comparison was made with the previous research results and internal validity was obtained by collecting depth-oriented data. In addition, the results were viewed with a critical eye and the data were associated with the research questions.
External validity: Consistency was established between the research question and the conceptual framework established between the research results. The data collected at the end of the

research were analyzed with a qualitative data analysis program and the differences between the researchers could be eliminated. The opportunity to test the research findings in another research has been created. The research sample was diversified to allow generalization (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz and Demirel, 2014). The researchers informed the reader about all the stages of the research and provided the opportunity to generalize the research results to similar research. According to the research results, the reader can make generalizations to his own work or environment and draw some lessons and experiences for his own work and environment. This increases the generalizability of qualitative study results (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013).
Reliability: The role of the researchers is to find the positive and negative aspects of the decentralization of the educational management system in scientific studies for the purposes of research and to collect and analyze the data for the purposes. Researchers did not go beyond the detection of the positive and negative aspects of the education management system. Regarding the analysis of the collected data, the differences that may occur among the researchers are minimized. They decided each stage of the research together. For example, they decided together by discussing where and how the data would be collected, which data analysis programs to use, and how to determine the codes and themes. For example, code determinations have been determined separately and later combined to decide what the common codes might be.
Internal reliability: The researcher and the expert conducted the content analysis separately. As a result of the study, 45 codes were determined by the researcher regarding the positive and negative aspects and 39 codes were determined by the expert. As a result of the comparisons, it was seen that 35 codes are different in 10 codes that are common. In the evaluation made, consensus was reached on 38 codes. $\frac{\text{Compliance Number}}{Total}.100 = \frac{38}{45}.100 = 84,4$ (84.4%) compliance was observed. This is seen above the 70% rate stated by Miles and Huberman (1994), which are necessary for reliability.
External reliability: The method, steps, data

collection, processing, analysis, interpretation and results of the research are described in detail. Results and data are associated. Yıldırım and Şimşek (2013) states that this is an important step in terms of external reliability of the research. Thus, the researcher showed that the data he obtained was

not related to his own prejudices and thoughts, but to the data. Research data has been stored in such a way that others can be examined. It also states that storing the research data Yıldırım ve Şimşek (2013) is an element that increases the external reliability.

Findings

It consists of 21 thesis from National Thesis Center in Turkey (YÖK) between 1995-2018, 38 national article from the database of Google Scholar search engine, TÜBİTAK DergiPark and 56 articles scanned in Web of Science, Scopus and Ebscho indexes on internationalization of education in the international arena between 2000-2018 and 20 theses that can be accessed from the ProQuest database. The sample of the study consists of 18

theses and 26 articles, which discuss the positive and negative aspects of decentralization of the education management system. Eight of the theses

are international, 11 are national, 10 of the articles are national and 16 are international. As a result of the content analysis conducted without any discrimination, common concepts in the education management system in the positive and negative aspects of decentralization were identified. A conceptual analysis was made by determining how often the concepts passed in all theses and articles. The frequency of these concepts in positive and negative items was determined and added to Table 3 and Table 4. Scientific studies were digitized by type (Table 1) and methods (Table 2) and tabulated with their frequencies.

Table 1. **Distribution of Scientific Studies by Type**

Type	Frequency
Article	26
Master thesis	10
Doctoral thesis	8
Total	44

Table 2. **Distribution of Scientific Studies According to the Methods**

SCIENTIFIC STUDIES		n	%		n	%		n	%
Approach	Quantitative	5	11,4	Qualitative	36	81,8	Mixed	3	6,8
	Scanning	3	6,8	Status	25	56,8	Converging Parallel	-	-
Model	Relational	2	4,5	Action research	10	22,7	Explanatory sequential	1	2,3
				Phenomenology	1	2,3	Exploratory sequential	2	4,5

Bilgin (2014) attributes the reliability of the content analysis to the coding process and determines the frequency of the message items and expresses the items to be analyzed in frequency type. This method, which is called frequency analysis in short, enables the concepts to be expressed in numerical style. The frequencies obtained are placed in a frequency-based order. Concepts (codes) and frequencies of the positive and negative aspects of the education management system are shown in Table 3 and Table 4 with the content analysis conducted in the research.

Participation in the decision on positive articles 44, activity 33, development of democracy / democratic life 27, education quality 22, education finance / cost 21, local administrators / management capacity / staff 21, efficiency 20, on-site use of resources 20, responsibility 19, communication / coordination 19, the principle of the provision of public service by the closest public organizations, 'displaced solution' 17, bureaucracy 15, permanent policy-making 15, quick decision-making 14, development, change and innovation 12 and financial participation 10 items frequently repeated 10 or more. These concepts show that decentralization in education management system is more positive approaches. The 36 concepts

identified were positive concepts in the decentralization of the education management system. In some of these concepts, the authors mention the following in their related works;

Cooperation and management capacities of local level organizations are provided. (Atasayar, 2005: 19)

Decentralization means more representation of various political, religious and ethnic groups in the decision-making process; hence, it allows for more justice to be determined while locating resources and investments. (Usluel, 1995: 12).

Educational reforms in the developed and developing countries, especially in the last quarter of the last century, led to major transformations in schools. One of the most important of these changes was cooperation and power sharing between the members of the school community and the families. Participation came to the forefront in the process of sharing this change and power, followed a course parallel to the development of participatory democracy. The

development of decentralization and participation in education has also started to be seen as a requirement of participatory democracy (Şişman and Turan, 2003: 302).

Table 3. **Concepts and Frequency Distributions in Positive Aspects of Decentralization of Education Management System in Thesis and Articles**

		Frequency (f)
1	Participation in 1 Decision increases 44	44
2	Increases efficiency in management 33	33
3	Development of Democracy / Contributes to Democratic Life	27
4	Education Quality increases	22
5	Education Finance (Cost) is reduced and used correctly	21
6	Local Managers Increased Management Capacity and Qualified Personnel	21
7	Productivity increases in management	20
8	Resources Used On-Site	20
9	A sense of responsibility develops	19
10	Communication / Coordination increases	19
11	The principle of providing public service by the closest public organizations / Decentralized Solution	17
12	Bureaucracy is reduced	15
13	Making Permanent Policy becomes Easier	15
14	Making quick decision becomes easy	14
15	Development, Change and Innovation are accepted faster	12
16	Public Participation in Education Increases	10
17	Application Flexibility / Adaptation becomes easy	9
18	Curriculum / Training Programs are created more effectively	9
19	Competing interests increases	8
20	Representation increases	8
21	Workload decreases	8
22	Motivation / Incentive / Motivation increases	8
23	Cooperation increases	7
24	Transparency occurs	7
25	Equal Opportunities are provided	7
26	Impact on Development positively contributes	7
27	Supervision becomes easy, the power of the printing groups decreases.	7
28	Accountability is ensured	6
29	A sense of justice develops	5
30	National Unions are provided	5
31	Ownership / Integration is provided	5
32	Human Rights are adopted	4
33	Access to Education increases	3
34	Regional Differences disappear	3
35	Inequality disappears	3
36	Inequality disappears	3
	TOTAL FREQUENCY	451

Table 4. **Concepts and Frequency Distributions in Negative Aspects of Decentralization of Education Management System in Thesis and Articles**

		Frequency (f)
1	Permanent Policy Cannot Be Determined	28

2	Controls are Strengthened / Pressure groups are Strengthened	23
3	The Management Capacity of Local Administrators and the Quality of Personnel decrease	18
4	Education Finance (Cost) increases	17
5	Inequality increases	14
6	threats to the National Union	14
7	Responsibility decreases	10
8	Quality of Education drops	10
9	Effectiveness decreases	9
10	Participation in the Decision makes it difficult to make decisions	8
11	Not sustainable	7
12	Communication / coordination decreases	7
13	Regional Differences increase	6
14	Development, Change and Innovation becomes difficult	5
15	Productivity drops	5
16	Sense of justice disappears	5
17	Application Flexibility / Compliance disappears	4
18	Ownership / Integration becomes difficult	4
19	Collaboration decreases	3
20	Accountability	3
21	Bureaucracy increases	3
22	Resources not used appropriate	3
23	Development of Democracy / Democratic Life is damaged	2
24	Motivation / Incentive / Motivation disappears	2
25	Transparency vanishes	1
26	No Equal Opportunities	1
27	The principle of providing public service by the closest public organizations (subsidiaritis) / Decentralized solution is interrupted	1
28	Workload increases	1
	TOTAL FREQUENCY	186

Education inequalities will be eliminated, and the efficiency of the education system will increase (Kurt, 2006)

Providing more financial support to the schools of the local community can encourage participation and solve schools' financial problems (Papadopoulou and Yirci, 2013).

It Increases the level of motivation in the organization due to the participation of lower ranks in decision-making and execution processes (Shah, 2010: 285).

There are also negatives caused by the decentralization of the education management system. The concepts determined in these negativities and the frequency distribution related to these concepts are as given in the table below.

Permanent policy making in negative items 28, supervision / use of force 23, local administrators / management capacity / staff 18, education finance 'cost' 17, national unity 14, inequality 14, quality of education 10 and the responsibility has been repeated as high as 10 time. While the concepts of rapid decision making, financial participation, curriculum / education programs, competition, representation, impact on development, human rights and access are among the concepts that are seen as positive, they are not included in the concepts that are seen as negative. They repeated the concepts of the development of democracy / democratic life, motivation / incentive / motivation, the principle of providing public service by the closest public organizations (subsidiarite) / decentralization, workload, transparency and equal opportunities at a low frequency. In some of these concepts, the authors mention the following in their related works;

In societies that do not have sufficient experience in localization, there may be problems

in applications such as transfer of authority and responsibilities to local organizations and participatory management (Geçit, 2008: 18).

The fact that decentralization is synonymous with democratization hides its ideological dimension. Today, decentralization in education forms an important part of the governance process and prepares the conditions for global market actors to be

effective in organizing and delivering education service through non-governmental organizations (Topaloğlu, 2012: 37).

Local government can threaten national unity and integrity and may have a legitimate or illegitimate impact on ideological, religious or political interest groups (Usluel, 1995: 13-15).

It claims that decentralization may negatively affect the delivery of public services under certain conditions (Barrera-Osorio, 2003: 23).

It makes it difficult to follow a single policy in educational administration (Papadopoulou and Yirci, 2013).

Although decentralization efforts are important developments in expanding education service provision, difficulties such as adequate financial support, lack of educated manpower and low teacher ratio can make it

difficult to overcome (Venkataraman and Keno, 2015: 165).

In this content analysis on decentralization in the education management system, 36 positive

(Table 3) and 28 negative (Table 4) directions were determined. All of the negative aspects are included in the positive aspects. When a comparison is made, it is seen that the frequencies in the positive directions are higher than the frequencies in the negative directions (Table 3-4).

Permanent Policy Determination, Supervision / Use of Force, National Unity, Inequality codes have received a higher frequency compared to positive aspects. The frequencies of the other codes received higher frequencies higher than the negative direction frequencies (Table 3-4).

As a result of the analysis, it was observed that three themes were formed in the content analysis related to decentralization in the education management system. These are administrative, financial and political decentralization (Keskin, 2008; Arslan, 2013; Kurt, 2006; Papadopoulou and Yirci, 2013). Considering this situation, the positive and negative aspects of decentralization of the education management system are divided into three categories. Instead of political decentralization, the effect of decentralization in education management has been taken as the category name and entered in the table below.

Table 5. **Codes of Positive and Negative Aspects Related to Decentralization of Education Management System in Thesis and Articles and Categories Created**

Concepts of Education Management System;		
Concepts related to decentralization in administrative aspects	**Concepts related to financial localization**	**Concepts related to decentralization in terms of its impact**
1. Collaboration	1. Education Finance (Cost)	1. Responsibility
2. Participation in decision	2. Using the resources appropriate	2. Access
3. Quick decision making	3. Sustainability	3. Human Rights
4. Transparency	4. Efficiency	4. Competition
5. Accountability	5. Financial Participation	5. Equal Opportunity
6. Bureaucracy	6. Impact on Development	6. Regional Difference
7. Communication/ Coordination	7. The principle of providing public service by the closest public organizations (subsidiarite) / Local solution	7. Educational Quality
8. Auditing/Enpowerment		8. Inequality
9. Motivation/Incentive		9. National Unity
10. Development, Change and Renewal		10. Flexibility Of Practice/Adaptation
11. Workload		11. Representation
12. Local Managers/ Management Capacity / Staff		12. Curriculum/Education Programs
13. Permanent Policy Setting		13. Ownership/ Integration
		14. Development of Democracy
		15. Justice

In the content analysis related to decentralization in education management system, 36 positive and 28 negative directions were coded (Table 3- Table 4). All of the negative aspects are also included in

the positive aspects. Eight of the positive aspects (Rapid Decision Making, Financial Participation, Curriculum / Training Programs, Competition, Representation, Impact on Development, Human

Rights, Access) do not appear to be among the negative aspects since there is no negative. When a comparison is made, it is seen that the frequencies in the positive directions are higher than the frequencies in the negative directions. In addition, it is seen that the contents of the concepts are gathered under three categories in terms of meaning (Table 5). These categories will make it easier to create an integrity while recreating the positive and negative aspects of the education management system. Categorical structure will provide a holistic evaluation opportunity while developing data analysis tools and analyzing the collected data.

When Table 3 and Table 4 are compared, it is seen that Permanent Policy Determination, Control / Power Usage, National Unity, Inequality codes get a higher frequency negatively compared to the frequencies in positive directions. The frequencies of the other codes received higher frequencies in a more positive way than the negative direction frequencies. Based on the concepts, the positive and negative aspects of the thesis and articles have been revised and the positive and negative aspects have been rearranged and brought down below in the decentralization of the education management system:

3.1. Positive Aspects of Decentralization of Education Management System

1. Collaboration will contribute to working in communication and coordination (İlimoğlu, 2014: 23; Geçit, 2008: 17; Öz, 2013: 39; Ömür, 2017: 15; Gershberg, González, and Meade, 2012; Shah, 2010)
2. It will contribute to the development of rapid decision making by reducing bureaucratic work and transactions. (Türkoğlu, 2004: 4; Taşar, 2009: 111,112; Karataş, 2012: 155)
3. It will contribute to the development of a transparent and accountable management approach (Healey, Hanna, and Attalla, 2016; Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan, 2014: 47; Adubra, 2003; Winardi, 2017)
4. Participation in decisions will positively affect democratic life and develop a collaborative management approach. (Dolgachev, 2017: 94; Yildiz, 2016: 27; Winardi, 2017: 79; Shah, 2010: 284,285; Papadopoulou and Yirci, 2013).
5. It will contribute positively to the quality of education by ensuring more specific determination of the control and power usage areas (Ortiz, 2006: 217; Yildiz, 2016: 27; Kurt, 2006).
6. It enables them to take more responsibilities,

which ensures motivation, incentives and more motivation, and will increase the quality of service. (Shah, 2010: 284,285; Adubra, 2003; Türkoğlu, 2004; Ömür, 2017: 14,15; Dolgachev, 2017: 197).
7. By making them open to development, change and innovation, it will make it easier for them to keep up with the development in the fields of education and new management (Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan, 2014: 50; Winardi, 2017: 79).
8. It will contribute to the development of new policies by reducing the workload of the central government. (Papadopoulou and Yirci, 2013: 11,12; Shah, 2010: 284, 285; Atasayar, 2005, s. 18; Geçit, 2008, s. 17; Korkmaz, 2010, s. 22; Arslan, 2013, s. 73)
9. It will contribute to an effective personnel development by improving the management capacities of local administrators. (Gershberg, González, and Meade, 2012; Venkataraman and Keno, 2015: 165; Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan, 2014: 45; Shah, 2010).
10. It will ensure the on-site use of resources, the provision of public service by the nearest public organizations (subsidiarite), and the efficient use of educational finance by providing on-site solutions to problems. (İlimoğlu, 2014: 22; Türkoğlu, 2004; Özgen, 2011).
11. It will improve the capacity of determining sustainable financial structure and permanent policies. (Mwinjuma, Hamzah, and Basri, 2015; Winkler and Gershberg, 2000; Shah, 2010; Rauf, et al., 2017).
12. It will contribute to economic development by ensuring the financial participation of the people in education. (Winardi, 2017: 91; Popescu, 2013: 268; Odabaş, Tekdere, and Aktepe, 2016).
13. Effective and efficient use of financial resources will increase the contribution of education to the economy by increasing the quality of education. (Adubra, 2003; Winardi, 2017: 90; Maikish, 2010: 179)
14. It will ensure access to education to a higher level. (Ortiz, 2006: 217; Adubra, 2003; Li, 2017: 233-235).
15. By reducing the education to the local, it will ensure the elimination of educational inequalities by ensuring human rights and equal opportunities. (Ortiz, 2006: 217; Falcão, 2015; Papadopoulou and Yirci, 2013).
16. The participation of the people in the decisions, taking responsibility by providing financial support will make contribution to taking

educational ownership and integration with the education stakeholders and will have a positive effect on the development of the country (Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan, 2014; Shah, 2010)

17. It will contribute to the quality of education by ensuring that curriculum / education programs are formed locally. (Li, 2017: 233-235; Torres-Arizmendi, 2007: 222; Tekdere, 2013; Rauf, et al., 2017).

18. It ensures that implementation and flexibility are effective, improves competition, and will contribute to the reduction of regional disparities in its server. (Usluel, 1995, p.11; Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan, 2014: 45; Ortiz, 2006: 217; Türkoğlu, 2004; Jeong, Lee, and Cho, 2017; Ömür, 2017: 15).

19. It contributes to the development of justice, representation and democracy by improving public participation in educational administration. This will ensure the protection of the national union. (Adubra, 2003: 7; Taşar, 2009; Türkoğlu, 2004).

20. Considering decentralization as synonymous with democratization is an important part of the governance process, its effectiveness in the organization and delivery of education service through non-governmental organizations contributes to the development of democracy and the development of democratic life. (Şişman and Turan, 2003; Jeong, Lee, and Cho, 2017; Venkataraman and Keno, 2015; Healey, Hanna, and Attalla, 2016; Falleti, 2001; Shah, 2010).

3.2. Negative Aspects of Decentralization of Education Management System

1. Cooperation between central government and local governments will result in increased communication and coordination problems and inadequate central control. This will increase the workload of the central government. (Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan, 2014; Gershberg, González, and Meade, 2012).

2. Due to the high number of participating groups in educational institutions where participation is high, it will prevent rapid decision-making

mechanisms and will decrease belief in democracy. (Panagoret, Panagoret and Coporan, 2014; Türkoğlu, 2004: 5; Tekdere, 2013; Dolgachev, 2017).

3. The bias of the members and managers of school administrations or local institutions responsible for education, especially with the effects of political parties, non-governmental organizations or various interest groups, will

eliminate transparency, openness and accountability. (Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan, 2014; Özgen, 2011: 51,52; İlimoğlu, 2014: 28).

4. It will cause most bureaucrats and politicians in the center to think that their power will decrease due to localization. It will bring the bureaucracy in the center to the local and education services will be disrupted. (Papadopoulou and Yirci, 2013; Usluel, 1995: 14).

5. Legal or illegal effects of various interest groups (political, religious, ideological, etc.) will undermine education control and monopolize education in various power centers. (Gershberg, González, and Meade, 2012; Türkoğlu, 2004: 5).

6. It will cause many problems in education, the pressure of political forces will break the motivation of the people and will negatively affect the possible motivation, encouragement and motivation to be made to education. (Odabaş, Tekdere, and Aktepe, 2016: 20; Dolgachev, 2017: 32).

7. Since the high level of participation gives the chance to refuse innovation, change and development, an absolute benefit will not be obtained in this regard without localization. (Usluel, 1995; Hurst, 1985; Türkoğlu, 2004).

8. It will make it difficult to follow a single policy across the country by preventing standards set by local governments from easily exceeding national targets and providing a minimal sample of service across the country. (Usluel, 1995: 13-15) (Papadopoulou and Yirci, 2013) (Atasayar, 2005; Geçit, 2008; Taşar, 2009; Korkmaz, 2010).

9. It will be difficult to provide the necessary experts and staff at the local level, and the lack of administrative infrastructure and human resources will prevent the realization of the expected benefits from localization. (Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan, 2014; Özgen, 2011; Atasayar, 2005; Topaloğlu, 2012; Geçit, 2008).

10. Local politicians' desire to transfer financial resources to visual structures that will bring short-term gains and improve their popularity instead of using them for education will prevent

11. the on-site use of resources, prevent the public from providing adequate financial support to education, effective and efficient use of resources and the creation of sustainable financial policies, and it will also cause problems in using them effectively and require financial assistance from the central government. (Barrera-Osorio, 2003: 45; Dolgachev, 2017: 31; Winardi, 2017: 80; Özgen, 2011: 52).

12. Financial resources left to local governments will make the on-site solution difficult by local factors, problems will be covered up or cared for, and important issues will not be considered locally and educational services will not be carried out at the level of the country. This will affect the contribution of education to the national economy negatively (Görmiş, 2014: 42; Jeong, Lee, and Cho, 2017: 12).

13. It can transform into a centralization at the local level and reduce the financial and human support of the public to education services. (Atasayar, 2005; Geçit, 2008; Korkmaz, 2010).

14. In societies where there is not enough experience in practices such as participatory management, the transfer of powers and responsibilities related to decentralization to local institutions will cause them to fail to increase their responsibilities and will not provide the expected benefits (Özgen, 2011; Geçit, 2008).

15. It will further deepen the current inequality between students in the rich and poor regions and eliminate equal opportunities in education by providing more opportunities in favor of students in rich regions. (Görmiş, 2014; Keskin, 2008: 623; Winardi, 2017: 80; Rauf, et al., 2017: 174; Li, 2017: 2).

16. It will dominate the idea that it will increase local and regional imbalances and differences, and that especially poor people and regions will be damaged, and will lead to more corruption, favoritism and injustice. This will cause inequalities between regions. (Winardi, 2017: 79; Li, 2017; Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan, 2014; Şen and Bandyopadhyay, 2010; Görmiş, 2014; Keskin, 2008: 623).

17. Due to the economic capacity differences between local government units, the training will result in the amount and quality of the service being delivered to a certain standard, and the quality of service cannot be spread across the country. (Torres-Arizmendi, 2007: 211; Barrera-Osorio, 2003: 23; Taşar, 2009: 113).

18. The idea that it can damage unitary state and

society structures and destroy national unity by encouraging ethnic, sectarian and micro-nationalist organizations by decreasing ownership of education over time will cause it to be constantly expressed in the form of political concerns. (Papadopoulou and Yirci, 2013; Usluel, 1995; Türkoğlu, 2004).

19. Decentralization will trigger the voicing of concepts such as the language of education and language education that will damage the unity of education, the formation of regional and ethnic desires, the weakening of education in the national language, and the formation of changes in national education, it will disrupt the application flexibility and create incompatibilities, which may lead to harsh compensations rather than benefits. (Şen and Bandyopadhyay, 2010; Odabaş, Tekdere, and Aktepe, 2016: 21).

Discussion

Decentralization of the education management system and other issues of decentralization in education are written together: The administrative, financial and effects of education management are written together in all scientific studies. For example (Shah, 2010), while dealing with the management dimension only Yildiz (2016), he talks about the differences of education decentralization among countries. Again Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan (2014) and Mwinjuma, Hamzah, and Basri (2015) examine decentralization at school level, while Falleti (2001) deals with the issue of relation with political decentralization and federalism. Yildiz (2016: 27) mentions in which categories countries are successful in decentralization in education management. For example, it mentions that teacher unions have reduced power in Colombia, have more decision-making and control over the curriculum in Spain, loss of power in the local area weakens in Argentina, and school administrators have reduced influence on local policies in Israel.

Considering international studies, concepts such as negativity affecting democratization, national integrity, political interest, power centers, inequality of opportunity, difficulty in following a single policy, financial support, and lack of qualified manpower which are among the most frequent negatives related to localization in educational administration come to the fore. Oates (1999); Winkler and Gershberg (2000); Bardhan and Mookherjee (2006); Pollitt (2005); Oates (2005); Li (2017); Papadopoulou and Yirci (2013); Venkataraman and Keno (2015: 165). However, in none of the international studies, decentralization in education management has been seen as a national unity negativity. Only Hurst (1985) refers localization in educational administration in Turkey, political, social and nations, social unity and potential to religious conflicts. Hurst has made this work exclusively for Turkey. No negativity in terms of national integrity can be seen in other scientific studies. Even, Ebel and Yilmaz (2001: 2) state that African states see decentralization as a tool that provides national unity. All national studies have

addressed all of the negatives above. In particular, the effects of national integrity and pressure groups have been particularly emphasized. The majority of national and international scientific studies address the positive aspects of localization more intensely. Common concepts that stand out in these studies are listed as participation in decision, efficiency and efficiency in management, development of democracy, contribution to democratic life, education quality, education finance and education costs, local administrator's management capacity and qualified personnel, efficiency in management, on-site use of resources. These concepts are the ones with the highest frequency. In fact, they are all concepts that affect each other systematically.

The increase in participation of the decision, will provide democracy and democratic life, efficiency and productivity in management, the quality of education managers and staff, the qualified personnel to be effective and efficient, the correct use of education financing and reduction of education costs, ensuring equality and justice, increasing access to justice and equality education, and increase of these all will also provide the quality of education, the increase in the quality of education and positive reflections of education to the economy and democracy. Then the opening of the road that provides the OECD averages will be provided.

While national integrity, which is seen as negatively related to decentralization in educational management in national studies, the inability to establish permanent policies, pressure groups, the negativities caused by decision participation, the lack of proper use of educational financing, and the management capacities of local administrators, were not intensely processed Panagoret, Panagoret, and Coporan (2014); Özgen (2011); Atasayar (2005); Topaloğlu (2012); Geçit (2008) this topic was covered in only two of the international studies. It can be said that this is related to the political, cultural and ethnic structure of our country.

Shah (2010) states that making all decisions from one center or by one person gives an advantage while others give a disadvantage. Here, the effect of interest groups on decision makers will ensure that the outcome is unilateral. While one group benefits from educational opportunities, it will cause negligence of other groups. This will increase the quality of education, financing, and the negative effects of education on the country's economy. Özgen (2011) and Atasayar (2005) state that high participation in decision making processes will enable local governments to strengthen and provide more qualified services.

The positive and negative aspects mentioned in national and international studies are not categorized without writing on any thematic area. However, Bilgin (2014: 11-13) stated that coding and categorization are essential in qualitative studies. Based on this scientific data, both categorization and code method were used in the study.

Many of the negative aspects mentioned in national and international studies should be implemented in Turkish Republic development plans and in national education councils and when implemented, it is referred to as advice decision that will positively affect the training management system. As an example, to this (Table 5), the article on the development of Management Capacity, which is the most used and ranked 3rd in frequency rankings, will be updated in the 9th Development Plan based on service principle in the central organization of the Ministry of National Education, institutional capacity will be strengthened, and responsibilities will be transferred provincial organizations and educational institutions.

In the reports written on decentralization in education management, positive aspects regarding the decentralization of the education management system are noted. On the downside, it makes positive recommendations for many of the items shown in table 4. However, these recommendations have not been implemented so far.

It is envisaged to have the characteristics of a local government institution that integrates the management system and management unity principle and planning discipline, realizes administrative effectiveness and efficiency, strengthens local democracy, supervised by the local community, effective participation, transparent, strong in terms of resources and especially own resources, able to take decisions about their local community through their own bodies and implements them through their own units, receives support from the central government and provides assistance under objective conditions.

The positive and negative aspects of decentralization have not been compared in scientific studies related to decentralization in the education management system. To make a comparison; When the codes in the scientific studies written in the field of decentralization in the education management system are compared, it is seen that the positive aspects correspond to 451 negative aspects and 186 frequencies. Positive aspects can be said to be more dominant than negative aspects.

While interest in scientific research in Turkey comes to the forefront, this situation is not mentioned in international sources. While international sources emphasize that cultural interaction affects the quality of education, this issue has not been covered in national sources. This shows that decentralization in education focuses on different problems from country to country.

While the countries of central and south America such as Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, etc. and Asian countries such as Pakistan and Russia, and European countries such as Romania and Poland are on the way to decentralization in education management, DeBoer (2012: 512-513) states that the USA (United States of America) is in a direction towards centralization. Despite America's precedent for local control over school, national policymakers have started to shift education management towards the center, finding two important ways in educational governance (judicial system and conditional financing). A trend towards centralization continues in the USA. There is also a contradiction of decentralization in educational administration. It is an exceptional situation. It is thought-provoking that the USA, which is an important world country, has been prone to decentralization for years and has a tendency to shift to centralization. The power of political structures in the country may also be due to the desire to gather in itself.

When the studies conducted are evaluated in general, it can be seen that there are many positive results regarding decentralization in the education management system. Most of the negativities stem from political interests. In societies in which different ethnic groups live, there are negative views on local elements stemming from the dominant feelings of nationalism of the national government or more intense ethnic groups. However, the results of many studies show that there will be many benefits in terms of the administrative, financial and the impact of decentralization in education management. With the support of the World Bank, studies on decentralization in education are carried out in many countries and many countries benefit from this. With this study, the positive and negative aspects in the scientific studies related to the decentralization of the education management system are compiled and divided into themes, allowing them to be examined from a holistic perspective. Education management dimension is handled alone.

Conclusion and Suggestions
Conclusion

Frequency weight favors positive views in terms of both positive and negative results regarding the decentralization of the management system in education. Negative views arise from the internal anxieties of a small segment.

It is seen that most of the concepts mentioned in the positive and negative aspects of the decentralization of the education management system are the same and even all of the negative concepts are included in the concepts that pass in the positive direction. As it can be understood from the frequency distributions, it is seen that the frequency of a positive concept is higher than a negative concept. For example, the frequency of those who say that bureaucracy decreases are 15 while the frequency of those who say it increases is three (Table 3-4).

In particular, the positive and negative aspects in the thesis in Turkey have been in the nature of duplicates. Positive and negative aspects were gathered under one item and sentences that were difficult to understand were created. Positive and negative aspects are not categorized and opinions regarding management, practice and theoretical structure are intertwined. With this study, only the educational management dimension was written by being separated.

It is shown as distrust to local administrators as one of the obstacles to decentralization in the education management system. These untrustworthy local rulers can become reliable when they are appointed as a new member of the central government in various ways (political power, education, superior achievement, etc.) or politically elected. As a result, local administrators can somehow become a central administrator, or one of the central governments can be a local administrator. Either there will be confidence in both segments, or neither will trust. After all, everyone will serve somehow. It is unrealistic to make this judgment without assigning people a task. When local administrators fail in service, they will be punished and expelled by the local people in some way. Just as the executives working in the central administration can be removed from office when necessary.

"Although science is universal, it is local to perceive, define and select the problem for research" (Karasar, 2014: 58). The decisions taken by a localized education management system are scientific and universal. It is the most correct decision for the conditions it is in.

Suggestions

Based on the findings of this qualitative research, quantitative studies should be conducted

to obtain more generalizable results. Because of decentralization of education management system is important to assess the positive and negative opinions of Turkey is perceived by stakeholders in education in general. Objective findings regarding the current situation should be reached by taking the opinions of different groups (parents, students, teachers and administrators).

The results can be measured by pilot implementation in a region related to decentralization in the education management system. Generalization can be made by evaluating how it contributes to education and country development. Or new strategies can be developed.

References

[1] 9.Kalkınma Planı. (2017). *Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı.* http://www.sbb.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Dokuzuncu-Kalk%C4%B1nma-Plan%C4%B1-2007-2013%E2%80%8B.pdf 20.12.2017).

[2] Adubra, K. E. (2003). Education decentralization in Togo: The roles of regional education directors. . *The Pennsylvania State University*, s. A Thesis in Educational Administration,132.

[3] Anayasa. (1982). *T.C. Anayasası.* 03 03, 2018 tarihinde http://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/Metin1.Aspx?MevzuatKod=1.5.2709veMevzuatIliski=0vesourceXmlSearch=veTur=1veTertip=5veNo=2709 adresinden alındı

[4] Arslan, Y. (2013). Yerel Yönetimler ve Eğitim Hizmetleri İlişkisi. *İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü Mahalli İdareler ve Yerinden Yönetim*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

[5] Atasayar, H. H. (2005). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Taşra Örgütü Yöneticilerinin Yerelleşme Konusundaki Görüşleri. *Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Bilim Dalı*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

[6] Bakioğlu, A. (2014). *Karşılaitırmalı Eğitim Yönetimi PISA'da Başarılı Ülkelerin Eğitim Sistemleri.* Ankara: Nobel.

[7] Bardhan, P., ve Mookherjee, D. (2006). Decentralization: corruption and government accountability. *Int. Handb. Econ. Corruption* , 6, 161–188.

[8] Barrera-Osorio, F. (2003). Decentralization and education: An empirical investigation. . *University of Maryland*, s. Doctoral dissertation,132.

[9] Bilgiç, V. K. (2009). *Değişik yönleriyle yerelleşme.* Ankara: Seçkin.

[10] Bilgin, N. (2014). *Sosyal Bilimlerde İçerik Analizi.* Anakara: Siyasal Kitabevi.

[11] Bucak, E. B. (2000). *Eğitimde Yerelleşme.* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

[12] Bulut, T. (2013). *Kent Konseyleri.* Bursa: Ekin Basın Yayın Dağıtım.

[13] Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., ve Demirel, F. (2014). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

[14] Coşkun, B. (2005). Türkiye'de kamu yönetiminde yeniden yapılanma tarihsel geçmiş ve genel bir değerlendirme. *Türk İdare Dergisi*, *448*, 13-47.

[15] Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Researchdesign: Qualitative, quantitative, andmixedmethodsapproaches(4nd ed.).* United States: PearsonEducation.

[16] Çalık, M., ve Sözbilir, M. (2014). İçerik analizinin parametreleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 39*(173), 430-453.

[17] DeBoer, J. (2012). Centralization and decentralization in American education policy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 87(4), 510-513.

[18] Denzin, N., ve Lincoln, Y. (2005). *Handbook of qualitativeresearch (3rd ed.).* ThousandOaks, CA: SAGE.

[19] Dolgachev, N. (2017). Education Decentralization Reform in Bulgaria and the Involvement of the World Bank. *University of Maryland, Baltimore County*, s. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 327.

[20] Ebel, R., & Yilmaz, S. (2001, April). Fiscal decentralization: Is it happening? How do we know? *In Conference in Honor of Richard Bird, Conference at Georgia State University, Atlanta, April* (pp. 4-6).

[21] Falcão, M. S. (2015). The Decentralization of Education at Paranaguá County Brazil (1985–2011). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 3975-3982.

[22] Falleti, T. G. (2001). Federalism and Decentralization of Education in Argentina. Unintended Consequences of Decentralization of Expenditures in a Federal Country.

[23] Florestal, K., ve Cooper, R. (1997). *Directions in Development Decentralization of Education:.* 03 03, 2018 tarihinde WORLDBANK: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-

1099079877269/547664-
1099080000281/Decent_ed_legal_issues_
EN97.pdf adresinden alındı

[24] Forster, N. (1994). The analysis of company documentation. Qualitative methods in organizational research: a practical guide. *London: Sage*, 147-66.

[25] Geçit, Y. (2008). Eğitimde Yerinden Yönetim Yaklaşımı. *Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Anabilim Dalı*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

[26] Gershberg, A. I. (2005). *Towards an education decentralization strategy for Turkey: Guideposts from international experience.* Washington: World Bank.

[27] Gershberg, A. I., González, P. A., ve Meade, B. (2012). Understanding and improving accountability in education: A conceptual framework and guideposts from three decentralization reform experiences in Latin America. *World Development*, 40(5), 1024-1041.

[28] Görmez, K. (2005). *Küreselleşme ve Yerelleşme.* Ankara: Odak Yayın ve Dağıtım.

[29] Görmüş, H. (2014). Küreselleşme İle Birlikte Değişen Yerel Yönetim Anlayışı ve Eğitime Yansımaları: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Örneği. *İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Anabilim Dalı Mahalli İdareler Ve Yerinden Yönetim Bilim Dalı*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

[30] Göymen, K. (2014). *Katılımcı Yerel Yönetim.* İstanbul: Kolkedon.

[31] Gulbenkian Komisyonu. (2014). *Gulbenkian Komisyonu Sosyal Bilimleri Açın Sosyal Bilimlerin Yeniden Yapılanmas Üzerine Rapor.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

[32] Hanson, M. E. (1997). *Educational Decentralization: Issues and Challenges.* 03 03, 2008 tarihinde https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44832286_Educational_Decentralization_Issues_and_Challenges adresinden alındı

[33] Healey, F., Hanna, R., ve Attalla, H. (2016). Decentralization and Decentralized Education Finance in Egypt (2007–2013). *RTI Press Publication*, OP-0025-1601. doi:https://doi.org/10.3768/rtipress.2016.op.0025.1601

[34] Hurst, P. (1985). Decentralization: Panacea or red herring. J. LOUGLO, ve M. McLEAN içinde, *The control of education* (s. 79-85). London: University of London Institute of Education.

[35] İlimoğlu, İ. (2014). Eğitimin Yerelleşmesi Aracılığıyla Yerel Birimlerin Türk Eğitim Sistemine Etkileri. *Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

[36] Jeong, D. W., Lee, H. J., ve Cho, S. K. (2017). Education decentralization, school resources, and student outcomes in Korea. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 53, 12-27.

[37] Kalkınma Bakanlığı. (2017, 121 29). *http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Pages/KalkinmaPlanlari.aspx*. Kalkınma Bakanlığı. adresinden alındı

[38] Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi.* Ankara: Nobel Yayın.

[39] Karataş, İ. H. (2012). Türk Eğitim Sisteminde Toplumsal Katılımı Sağlamak İçin Bir Model Önerisi: Yerel Eğitim Şûrâları. *Amasya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 151-166.

[40] Keskin, N. E. (2008). Dünya Bankası ve Eğitimde Yerelleşme Kamu Okullarında İşletmecilik. *Küreselleşme ve Demokratikleşme Uluslararası Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı* (s. 617-624). Antalya: Akdeniz Üniversitesi __Bf Yayını.

[41] Korkmaz, N. (2010). Ortaöğretim Kurumları Müdürlerinin Eğitimin Yerinden Yönetimine İlişkin Görüşleri. *Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Bilim Dalı*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

[42] Kurt, T. (2006). Eğitim Yönetiminde Yerelleşme Eğilimi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 61-72.

[43] Li, T. (2017). Financial decentralization and geographical stratification of access to higher education in China: the case of

Shanghai. *Chinese Sociological Review*, 49(3), 212-238.

[44] Maikish, A. (2010). Universal primary education and decentralization in Ghana. *New York University*, s. Proquest Umi Dissertation, 200.

[45] MEB. (2018). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Şura Kararları*. 12 29, 2018 tarihinde Talim Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı : https://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/www/gecmisten-gunumuze-mill-egitim-sralari/icerik/328 adresinden alındı

[46] Miles, M. B., ve Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. *sage*.

[47] Mwinjuma, J. S., Hamzah, A., ve Basri, R. (2015). A review of characteristics and

experiences of decentralization of education. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 3 (1), 34-41.

[48] Oates, W. (1999). An essay on fiscal federalism. *J. Econ. Lit.*, 37 (3),1120-1149.

[49] Oates, W. (2005). Toward a second-generation theory of fiscal federalism. *Int. Tax Public Finance* , 12 (4), 349–373.

[50] Odabaş, H., Tekdere, M., ve Aktepe, E. (2016). Eğitim Hizmetlerinin Yerelleşmesinin Muhtemel Etkileri: Türkiye'de Uygulanabilirliği. *Econworld 2016@Barcelona.* Barcelona.

[51] Ortiz, E. (2006). The impact of education decentralization on education output: a cross country study. *Georgia State University. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, s. 163.

[52] Ökmen, M., Çağatay, U., ve A.Görmez. (2013). *Küreselleşme Yerelleşme Dikotomisinde Yerel ve Bölgesel Kalkinma.* Ankara: Orion Kitabevi.

[53] Ömür, Y. E. (2017). Eğitimde Neoliberal Yerelleşme ve Eleştirisi Kurulları. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 1*, 10-25. http://dergipark.gov.tr/trkefd/issue/27304/287417 adresinden alındı

[54] Öz, Y. (2013). Eğitim Paydaşlarının Türk Eğitim Sisteminin Yerelleşme Süreci Hakkında Görüşlerine İlişkin Bir Araştırma. *Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Eğitim Yönetimi, Teftişi, Planlaması ve Ekonomisi Bilim Dalı*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

[55] Özgen, V. (2011). Eğitim Hizmetlerinde Yerelleşme ve Hizmet Kalitesi. *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler*

Enstitüsü Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

[56] Panagoret, D. M., Panagoret, A. A., ve Coporan, C. (2014). The Impact of the Educational Management on the Educational Process Quality in the Context of School Education Decentralization. *Valahian Journal of Economic Studies*, 5(2).

[57] Papadopoulou, V., ve Yirci, R. (2013). Rethinking decentralization in education in terms of administrative problems. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 2(1),1.

[58] Popescu, A. C. (2013). Headteachers and the decentralisation of public education in post-communist Romania. *University of Manchester*, s. ProQuest Dissertations and

Theses,368.

[59] Rauf, A., Khan, A. A., Ali, S., Qureshi, G. Y., Ahmad, D., ve Anwar, N. (2017). Fiscal decentralization and delivery of public services: evidence from education sector in Pakistan. *Studies in Business and Economics*, 12(1), 174-184.

[60] Salinas, P. (2014). The effect of decentralization on educational outcomes: real autonomy matters. *Documents de Treball de l'IEB*, 2014/25.

[61] Shah, J. I. (2010). Centralisation versus Decentralisation in Education. *Dialogue (Pakistan)*, (1819-6462), 5(3). http://www.qurtuba.edu.pk/thedialogue/The%20Dialogue/5_3/Dialogue_July_September2010_284-288.pdf

[62] Şen, D., and Bandyopadhyay, A. (2010). Educational decentralization as part of public administration reform in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 269-276.

[63] Şişman, M., ve Turan, S. (2003). Eğitimde Yerelleşme ve Demokratikleşme Çabaları Teorik Bir Çözümleme. *Kuram Ve Uygulamalarda Egitim Yönetimi*(34), 300-315.

[64] Taşar, H. H. (2009). Merkeziyetçi Yönetim Yapısının Kamu Okulları Üzerinde Bıraktı-I Olumsuz Etkiler. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*(2), 109-119.

[65] Tekdere, M. (2013). Eğitim Hizmetlerinin Yerelleşmesinin Ekonomik, Sosyal Ve Siyasal Boyutları: Türkiye'de Uygulanabilirliği. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Maliye Anabilim Dalı*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

[66] Todaie (1966). *Merkezi Hükümet Teşkilatı Kuruluş ve Görevleri, Merkezi Hükümet Teşkilatı Araştırma Projesi Raporu,* Ankara: TODAİE Yayını.

[67] Todaie (1991). *Kamu Yönetimi Araştırma Projesi (KAYA),*Ankara: TODAİE Yayını.

[68] Todaie (1992). Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü. TODAİE Yayını..

[69] Topaloğlu, H. (2012). Türkiye'deki Eğitim Sendikaları Genel Merkez Yöneticilerinin Eğitimin Yerelleşmesi İle İlgili. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Yönetimi Teftişi Planlaması ve Ekonomisi Bilim Dalı*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

[70] Torres-Arizmendi, A. (2007). The effects of decentralization of education in Mexico in the quality of education. *The University of*

[71] *New Mexico*, s. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses,227.

[72] Türkoğlu, R. (2004). Eğitimde Yerelleşme Sorununa Kamu Yönetimi Temel Kanunu Tasarısı ve Yerel Yönetim Yasa Tasarısının Getirdiği Çözümler Konusunda Yerel Yöneticilerin Görüşleri. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*(550). https://www.pegem.net. adresinden alındı

[73] Tüsiad. (1990). *Türkiye'de Eğitim Sorunlar ve Yapısal Uyum Önerileri.* 01 02, 2018 tarihinde http://tusiad.org/tr/yayinlar/raporlar/item /download/7716_c117d698632bdccf9877 4153df923714 adresinden alındı

[74] Usluel, Y. K. (1995). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Merkez Örgütü Yöneticilerinin Yerelleşme Konusundaki Görüşleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü*. Doktora Tezi.

[75] Uygun, F. (2007). *Federal Devlet.* İstanbul: On İki Levha Yayıncılık.

[76] VanSant, J. (1996). Governance as Stewardship: Decentralization and Sustainable Human Development. *In A Review of the Experience of Research Triangle Institute prepared for the United Nations Development Program Asia Ministerial Conference. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle, NC*.

[77] Venkataraman, M., ve Keno, E. (2015). Decentralization and primary education service delivery: an assessment of two woredas in the Oromo nationality zone. *Amhara National Regional State, Ethiopia. African and Asian Studies*, 14(3), 165-188.

[78] Winardi, W. (2017). Decentralization of Education in Indonesia—A Study on Education Development Gaps in the Provincial Areas. *International Education Studies*, 10. 79. 10.5539. doi:10.5539 /ies.v10n7p79

[79] Winkler, D. R., and Gershberg, A. I. (2000). Education decentralization in Latin America: The effects on the quality of schooling. *The World Bank: Washington DC*.

[80] Yıldırım, A., ve Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri.* Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

[81] Yildiz, S. O. (2016). Questioning the scholarly discussion around decentralization in Turkish education system. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 8(4), 27-32.

[82] Zajda, J. (2006). *Decentralisation and Privatisation in Education: The Role of The State.* 03 03, 2018 tarihinde https://limchheng.files.wordpress.com/20 08/11/decentralisation-and-privatisation-in-education1.pdf adresinden alındı