

Decentralization as an Educational Planning Strategy in Turkish Education System

Betül Balkar^{1,*} & Mahinur Gözde Kasurka¹

¹Department of Educational Sciences, Gaziantep University, 27310 Gaziantep, Turkey

*Correspondence: Department of Educational Sciences, Gaziantep University, 27310 Gaziantep, Turkey. Tel: 90-505-542-7043. E-mail: b.balkar@gmail.com

This study was delivered as an oral presentation at 44th International Society for Educational Planning (ISEP) Conference held in Kyrenia, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus on 15-18 October, 2014.

Received: May 17, 2015 Accepted: June 4, 2015 Published: June 30, 2015

doi:10.5296/ije.v7i2.7621 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ije.v7i2.7621>

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the policies of decentralization which guide the planning of Turkish education system and which are involved in Development Plans of Turkey. The sample of study is composed of ten development plans for 5 years which have been published between the year of 1963 and 2014. Development plans were reached upon the website of Ministry of Development. Data of the study were collected via document review and were analyzed by using content analysis. As a result of the analysis of education policies in development plans, it cannot be said that there is a decentralization policy which is adopted in planning the Turkish Education System. In development plans, there are only objectives and strategies that point out possible decentralization policies. Decentralization policies in development plans are determined to be under the category of deconcentration and delegation in terms of extent of execution. Based on the results of the study, it is suggested that developing and executing decentralization policies should take more place in the plans for Turkish Education System in order to be able to meet educational needs which result from regional inequalities. The extent of decentralization should be decided by taking into consideration the need that decentralization would respond rather than the delegated and deconcentrated units.

Keywords: Decentralization, Development plans, Turkish education system

1. Introduction

Decentralization can be considered as a policy and has aims for political, economic and administrative areas. Decentralization enables transferring of authority, resources and responsibility of decision-making to local levels (Camelia, Vladimir-Aurelian & Răzvan Cătălin, 2014). Distributing power or authority to local levels within the decentralization can be “decision-making”, “spending”, “planning”, “management”, “determining service provision level and quality”, and “use of resources” (Dubois & Fattore, 2009, p.709). Decentralization presents an understanding of local needs and problems. On one hand it enables different stakeholders’ having voice in education, on the other hand it helps understand to practices and decisions of central governments (Oktay, 2013). Local education needs can be addressed more and resource utilization can become more efficient through decentralization. This is because taking local needs into consideration can provide right matching between demands and resources (Cuellar-Marchelli, 2003).

Democratization, market orientation, improving quality of education have brought about shifting toward decentralization (van Amelsvoort & Scheerens, 1997). Especially neo-liberal policies require the shifting toward decentralization. Neo-liberal policies transform countries by using different ways. Re-structuring of education sector is one of the ways used by neo-liberal policies for this purpose. Re-structuring of education sector has changed governance of the education sector in line with the paradigms of neo-liberal policies (Robertson, 2007). Neo-liberalism seeks to dominate educational policy decisions and to give schools more autonomy. Neo-liberal education reform creates a tension between centralization and decentralization (Horsley, 2014). Decentralization and deregulation are located in the focus of the neo-liberal educational reforms. Redistribution of power by means of decentralization and deregulation gives opportunities to markets in education (Wang & Ho-Mok, 2014). Although education is generally considered as a public good, private benefits of education require a shift toward an understanding of private good (Rizvi, Engel, Nandyala, Rutkowski & Sparks, 2005). Since decentralization gives more autonomy to schools and teachers, it is considered that decentralization leads to private education and creates a market in education (Duru-Bellat, 2014).

There are many reasons for education stakeholders to support this change that progresses to decentralization. Among these reasons, there are local authorities’ being willing to get responsibility about education, decentralization’s reducing the center’s burden, parents’ thinking that they would be able to solve the problems in schools if they have control over the school, the business world’s thinking that decentralization would let private sector’s money to be used in schools, school principals’ thinking that their control over the school would enhance and political interest groups’ thinking that they would affect the educational programs (Gibton & Goldring, 2001). There are also evidences of researches that show teachers, too, support decentralization implementation which strengthens the school autonomy (Ekşi & Kaya, 2011; Laudams, 2013).

In general, decentralization is classified under four different types named political, administrative, fiscal and market decentralization. While political decentralization deals with

giving the power to local governments for decision making processes, in administrative decentralization the planning and management responsibilities are given to local units. Fiscal decentralization is concerned with giving the control of financial resources to lower levels of government and market decentralization is a kind of transfer of resource to lower levels and even to private sector (Hinsz, Patel, Meyers & Dammert, 2006). Decentralization is also considered at three levels in terms of its extent in implementation. Resource autonomy and delivery of services are closely related to the extent of decentralization (Dubois & Fattore, 2009). These three levels are stated under the categories of deconcentration, delegation and devolution. Deconcentration means the authority is conveyed from center to local administrations in order to apply the rules, but they do not have the permission to create rules (Welsh & McGinn, 1999). In deconcentration the responsibility is transferred to the local units, but the authority is not totally. It is a very limited level of decentralization. In delegation the authority is lent to lower levels of government but it is easy to take it back. In devolution the authority is vested in a lower level of government, so that it can act on its own, without asking for permission (Hanson, 1997).

There are many benefits of decentralization to education. Positive impact on student test scores and student performance (Falch & Fischer, 2012; Galiani, Gertler & Schargrodsky, 2008; Yirci & Kocabaş, 2013), gaining support for change initiatives at local level and solving local educational problems (Therkildsen, 2000) are only some of these benefits. Di Gropello (1999) states that decentralization creates more flexibility in management process and it leads to much more faster decision making process. In this respect decentralization makes the process more responsive as the decision makers are able to experience the real conditions of their own district. Having said that, bureaucracy is going to be diminished and the decisions are going to be taken more effectively than centralized systems (Hanson, 1997). There are also some disadvantages of decentralization that are mentioned together with its advantages. Galiani, Gertler and Schargrodsky (2008) states that practices of decentralization are not reach the poor communities and help the good ones to get better. He (2011) found that decentralization causes inconsistency and incoherence between the theoretical underpinnings of the programs and the practices in schools and classrooms. Decentralization may cause the inequalities in education system to be more dominant (Cuellar-Marchelli, 2003). As decentralization would have these kinds of positive and negative reflections to education, administrative ability of the authorities, whose power is enhanced, should be improved through a well-planned program (de Guzman, 2007). Because of this reason before giving decision to execute decentralization, it is really important to make the required system analysis and preparations.

To decide decentralization is a necessary policy purpose, analyzing its effects in the institutional-base in whole country (Lessmann & Markwardt, 2010). In order to be able to decentralize a system truly, the analysis of the existing system should be done first of all. The main goals of the decentralization should be determined. A common vision of reform should be formed among the units of education (Hanson, 1997). Decentralization should not be considered as a program, should be considered as a process. The way of using power and resources by the center at decision-making determines how effective decentralization process

is (Faguet & Sanchez, 2008). It would be possible with a good planning process that the required analysis and preparations' getting ready for decentralization's being executed effectively. Decentralization is an implementation that helps and leads to planning studies in education system as well. It contributes to success of educational plans by providing flexible ways in solving problems (Oktay, 2013). In countries which used decentralized education management, they change the long range plans into provincial plans. In doing this the main goal is to ensure that both the long range plan of government and provincial (local administrations) plans correspond to each other (Bahr, 2007).

In Turkish Education System, the central organization's extending too much has been criticized and local governments' taking part in actions related with education is accepted as a solution to this problem (Turan, Yücel, Karataş & Demirhan, 2010). In Turkish Development Plans, the unequal level of education in different regions (e.g. The First Development Plan, 1963-1967) and developmental disparities among rural-urban places (e.g. The Ninth Development Plan, 2007-2013) are considered as a problem and decreasing the disparity among regions is stated among objectives of education (e.g. The Eighth Development Plan, 2001-2005 and Tenth Development Plan, 2014-2018). In this regard, it is stated that the problems' being defined and solved in the point where they occur, the community's taking active part in problem solving, redefining tasks of boards involved in educational regions, delegating to local government and giving authority to schools are required (Şişman & Turan, 2003). It is suggested that the structure and principles of decentralization should be formed and the definition of duties and authorities should be executed by taking into consideration of schools' local conditions and current facilities in Turkey (Özmen & Hozatlı, 2008; Şahin, 2003).

The extent of central organization and being not able to find a solution to local educational problems have made decentralization a current issue in political arena besides in community of education. First of all in Ministry of Education, Education Regions and Education Boards Instruction (1999), the education regions and education boards are mentioned in which each and every formal and non-formal educational institutions of Ministry of Education are going to be involved. In this instruction, mentioning educational regions can be considered as a kind of structuring that would lead up to decentralization. In political arena, Justice and Development Party (JDP) program (2001) made a mention of the principle of local self-government in accordance with the European Charter of Local Self-Government and following that, the 58th government program (2002) included some reforms for education. While the Ministry of National Education (MONE) would have a role of coordinating; local governments, civil society, and the private sector would have expanded roles in educational policy making concordantly. The Urgent Action Plan of 58th and 59th governments (2002) envisaged that provincial level and local branches of MONE would provide the educational services. Subjects related to the personnel and resources would be under these bodies' authority. But curriculum and supervision issues would be under center's authority (as cited in Şen & Bandyopadhyay, 2010). Public Management Basic Draft Law which was published in 2003 proposed removing the provincial organization of Ministry of National Education and delegating the authority to local governments, but later this proposal was

abandoned with the Law about Basic Principles and Restructuring of Public Administration that was published in 2004.

Since decentralization in different sectors including education serves for local and national development, decentralization is one of the important topics of national development plans. Romeo (2012) draws attention to link between decentralization and local development and states that developmental goals and national policy for development are necessary to implement decentralization successfully with the purpose of development. The contribution of decentralization to development and the necessity of determining goals and policy to carry out decentralization lead decentralization's being included in development plans. Similarly, Woiwode (2009) points out the importance of decentralization and development planning. Decentralization is used for planning of development and serves to achieve economic growth and social equity (Rondinelli, 1983).

Decentralization is considered as a way to maintain economic development and many developing countries carry out decentralized planning for development (Rondinelli & Nellis, 1986) and support decentralization to handle administrative situations as well (Shin, 2001). It helps to manage economic and social development and increases participation of local units in these development areas as a development strategy. At this point, the primary aim of conducting decentralization is to provide the participation of all actors in development plans (Terfassa, 1994).

Community development at local level has become an important issue with the beginning of planned development period in Turkey and local administrations have been involved in development plans in detail (Turkish Ministry of Development Specialization Commission, 2014). Local administration units are among practitioners of planned development. It is seen that there are important determinations about local administrations in Turkish Development Plans (Kızılboğa Özasan & Alıcı, 2014). Determinations regarding decentralization in Turkish Development Plans are directed to different sectors including education.

In order to examine decentralization policies about education in Turkish Education System, Turkish Development Plans should be analyzed. Turkish Development Plans keep national development in perspective and include many sectoral planning from industry to education. Decentralization is considered within the scope of educational issues besides administrative issues and is discussed as part of the goals and policies which are directed to develop through education in Turkish Development Plans.

In Turkish Education System decentralization isn't executed exactly, but the fact that there are requests and initiatives towards executing decentralization induce to take into consideration decentralization policies in planning the education system even if it is limited. Therefore, there are limited targets and strategies that point out decentralization implementations in development plans. In this respect, examining the objectives that would be related with decentralization implementations in development plans can be useful in order to find out how decentralization policies lead to planning studies.

2. The Purpose of Study and Problem Statement

In this research, it is intended to examine the policies of decentralization which guide the planning of Turkish education system and which are involved in development plans of Turkey. Following questions are investigated with this aim:

1. What is the decentralization type of the decentralization policies that guide educational planning in Turkish development plans?
2. What is the extent of decentralization policies that are developed to guide educational planning in Turkish development plans?

3. The Significance of the Study

Decentralization is evaluated as a planning and development strategy, since it contributes to economic and social development in various developmental areas. It especially provides that education systems respond to the needs of educational stakeholders in a short time and more effective way. It is therefore an important issue which should be taken into consideration for planning the education systems. But first of all, extent of decentralization and the areas which are subjected to decentralization should be determined.

In this study, it is thought that examining how decentralization is considered in policies developed for Turkish Education System can contribute to actualizing of the planning process which takes the needs of educational stakeholders into account and produces outputs quickly. Performed and intended practices regarding educational decentralization can be understood within a developmental process with a holistic manner in case of examining the decentralization in education within the scope of development plans. Results of the study are also important to provide data for comparing the policies and strategies of the countries giving place to decentralization in planning of education system.

4. Method

Case study pattern is used in the study in which qualitative methods and techniques are used. Case study can be conducted to describe a process or explain a phenomenon (Kohn, 1997). Documents are among the main forms of data sources in case study researches since they reflect human activity (Olson, 2010). In this study, development process of decentralization understanding in Turkish Education System is considered as a process and development plans including established decentralization policies by governments are considered as documents.

4.1 Population and Sample

The population of study is composed of ten development plans for 5 years which have been published between the year of 1963 and 2014 (which contains the years between 1963 and 2018) by State Planning Organization in Turkey. Development plans were reached upon the website of Ministry of Development. No kind of sampling method was used for the research

and ten five years development plans were totally included in the study.

4.2 Collection and Analyzing of Data

Data of the study were collected via document review and were analyzed by using content analysis. In document review, the parts of development plans about education and especially the parts which include educational policies and educational aims were analyzed and subjected to content analysis. Data analysis was implemented at three levels as themes, sub-themes and codes. The themes and sub-themes that were used in interpreting data were determined in the direction of research problems and related literature before the beginning of analysis process. Data were decided to be coded under the sub-themes of “political decentralization”, “administrative decentralization”, “fiscal decentralization” and “market decentralization” depending on “decentralization types” theme and sub-themes of “deconcentration”, “delegation” and “devolution” depending upon “the extent of decentralization” theme.

Codes were determined as a consequence of analysis of the parts about education in ten five years development plans. Defined codes include administrative subjects which are included in policy statements and decentralized units. Under the coding process of the sub-themes which depend on types of decentralization and extent of decentralization themes, the same codes were coded. Due to the fact that codes were described as including the subject of decentralization and delegated units, thematic coding process was implemented by focusing type of decentralization and extent of decentralization to which these subjects correspond.

Although the analysis of data was started with four sub-themes depending on decentralization types theme and three sub-themes depending on extent of decentralization theme in line with literature, it is determined that codes which have become evident upon the investigation of development plans are not included in entire sub-themes. Because of this reason, in the study coding process was performed depending on sub-themes of “administrative decentralization”, “fiscal decentralization” and “market decentralization” which belong to theme of “decentralization types” and depending on sub-themes of “deconcentration” and “delegation” which belong to theme of extent of decentralization”

4.3 The Validity and Reliability of the Study

In order to provide internal validity/credibility, expert review was conducted on consistency between raw data gathered from development plans and codification and also for the results. At the same time, attention was paid for the themes’ being consistent among themselves. In order to provide external validity/transferability, data gathering and analysis processes were explained in detail and the parts of development plans that include codes which were determined in codification process were quoted directly.

Within the scope of the studies on internal and external reliability/ dependability and confirmability, reviews of two experts were asked to examine the parts of development plans regarding education, coding related to these parts and conclusions. Experts conducted consistency analysis regarding data gathering and analysis processes and confirmation analysis by comparing raw data and conclusions regarding judgments and interpretations

(Patton, 2002). In the study, data were coded by two different researchers and the correlation between two raters was calculated as .96. At the same time within the scope of reliability studies, not to make any kind of difference in codes' meanings in time, coding process was conducted by writing notes upon concerning the way codes were defined (Creswell, 2009).

5. Findings

5.1 Findings on the Types of Decentralization of Decentralization Policies Guiding Educational Planning in Development Plans

In consequence of the analysis of development plans, it is revealed that decentralization policies guiding educational planning are generated depending upon “administrative decentralization”, “fiscal decentralization” and “market decentralization” which are among the types of decentralization. Codes on subject of decentralization and units that are delegated and deconcentrated are included in the statements about administrative decentralization policies in development plans and quotations of these statements including these codes in development plans are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Codes depending on administrative decentralization sub-theme and quotations of statements including these codes in development plans

Development Plan	Quotations From Development Plans	Codes
The Fourth Development Plan (1979-1983)	<i>Division of labor among central and local organizations is going to be reorganized in order to provide active participation of local units of Ministry of Education in applied courses' being arranged in school-wide in this stage (primary school/ secondary school) and providing delegation to local organizations is going to be carried out in short time.</i>	• Delegation to local organizations in applied courses' being arranged in school-wide
The Fifth Development Plan (1985-1989)	<i>In the fifth development plan period municipality, governorship and provincial special administration are going to help to provide land for school rapidly in suitable points of city at first to Ministry of Education, Sports and Youth. Working cooperatively with Ministry, they are going to contribute more widely in education investments.</i>	• Delegation to municipality, governorship and provincial special administration in providing land for school and contribution to education investments
The Seventh and Eighth Development Plan (1996-2000)	<i>The central organization of Ministry of Education is aimed to achieve a kind of structure that creating policy at the macro level, executing the tasks of research and development, programming, ensuring coordination and making inspection tasks</i>	• Delegation to provincial

(2001-2005) *effectively, reducing bureaucracy, giving more authority and responsibility to provincial organizations and facilitating the families' taking part in decision-making process.* organizations in administrative subjects

With the aim of going towards to a kind of structure that depends on service basis and delegating authority and responsibility to provincial organizations of Ministry, arrangements are going to be done in Ministry of Education Organization Act law numbered 3797.

<p>The Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013)</p>	<p><i>In the central organization of Ministry of Education, there is going to be a kind of restructuring that is based on service basis, institutional capacity is going to be strengthened; delegation to provincial organizations and educational institutions is going to be provided.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delegation to provincial organizations and educational institutions in administrative subjects
<p>The Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018)</p>	<p><i>Alternative financing models are going to be developed in education; private sector's establishing education institutions and private sector's and professional organizations' taking part in professional education process in administrative and fiscal aspects are going to be encouraged.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private sector's and professional organizations' taking part in professional education process administratively

As it is seen in Table 1, administrative decentralization policies have started to take place in Turkey's development plans with the Fourth Development Plan (1979- 1983). Except for the Sixth Development Plan, administrative decentralization policies have been included in each development plan that following Fourth Development Plan in limited way. Administrative decentralization policies have started by delegation of powers to local organizations (to provincial organizations of Ministry of Education); it has continued by delegation to municipality, governorship and provincial special administration and within the scope of these policies, lastly, it is made possible for private sector and professional organizations to take part in administrative processes. When development plans are analyzed generally, it is understood that administrative decentralization is treated mainly as delegation to provincial organization. Municipality, governorship, provincial special administrations and professional organizations are partly included in planning and administration processes only with respect to subjects related to education investments and education processes.

Codes on subject of decentralization and units that are delegated and deconcentrated are included in the statements about fiscal decentralization policies in development plans and quotations of these statements including these codes in development plans are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Codes depending on fiscal decentralization sub-theme and quotations of statements including these codes in development plans

Development Plan	Quotations from Development Plans	Codes
The Seventh Development Plan (1996-2000)	<i>Saving the university from centralist and bureaucratic structure, increasing the authority of boards of university and faculty and providing freedom of movement regarding funding and spending and maximizing the relationship between university and industry are aimed. By changing the 130th item in constitution, it is aimed to be able to establish university besides foundations.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giving freedom of movement to faculties in funding and spending
The Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018)	<i>School administrations' authority and responsibility in budgeting processes are going to be enhanced.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancing the schools' budgeting authority

As it is seen in Table 2, fiscal decentralization policies are included barely in development plans and the kind of statements that can be regarded within the scope of fiscal decentralization have been seen in the Seventh Development Plan (1996-2000) for the first time. In policies that can be considered as fiscal decentralization policies are seen to give limited authority only to faculties and schools. It doesn't come into question to delegate or deconcentrate to local administrations or to any kind of local unit in fiscal aspect. While freedom of movement is given to faculties in funding and spending, only the budgeting authority is enhanced for the schools by means of these policies. Because of this reason it is understood that fiscal decentralization policies don't have many execution areas in Turkish Education System.

Codes on subject of decentralization and units that are delegated and deconcentrated are included in the statements about market decentralization policies in development plans and quotations of these statements including these codes in development plans are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Codes depending on market decentralization sub-theme and quotations of statements including these codes in development plans

Development Plan	Quotations from Development Plans	Codes
The Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013)	<i>Private sources in education are going to be directed to enable the equality of opportunity. In all education levels, private sector's share is going to be increased; public funding is going to be directed to the parts that need it most. It is going to be possible establish private universities providing that there is going to be an effective quality assessment and audit system.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase the share of private sector in all education levels • To enable private universities' being established
The Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018)	<i>Alternative financial models are going to be developed in education; private sector's establishing educational institution, private sector's and professional organizations' taking active part in professional education process is going to be encouraged.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting private sector's establishing educational institution • Private sector's and professional organizations' taking part in professional education process financially

As it is seen in Table 3, policies that depend upon market decentralization has started to taking part in development plans with the Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013) and in the most recently published Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018) these policies have been included. Therefore market decentralization can be discussed as a brand new decentralization type in Turkish Education System. Both in Ninth and Tenth Development Plans, market decentralization is defined as private sector's being able to establish educational institution. In Tenth Development Plan, professional organizations' taking part in education sector in fiscal aspect is supported as well. When these two development plans, in which market decentralization policies take very limited part, are examined generally; it can be said that market decentralization doesn't have execution area in Turkish education system with its entire meaning.

5.2 Findings on the Extent of Decentralization Policies Developed for Educational Planning in Development Plans

As a result of the analysis of development plans, decentralization policies that could be used with the intention of educational planning have become evident to be considered under the sub-themes of "deconcentration" and "delegation" in point of extent of application.

Codes on subject of decentralization and units that are delegated and deconcentrated are

included in the decentralization policies in development plans and these codes' corresponding sub-themes in terms of extent of decentralization are shown in Table 4. Since these codes and quotations including these codes in development plans are shown in Table 1, 2 and 3, quotations aren't given in Table 4.

Table 4. Codes depending on deconcentration and delegation sub-themes

Development Plan	Codes	Sub-themes
The Fourth Development Plan (1979-1983)	-Delegation to local organizations in organizing applied courses in school-wide	Delegation
The Fifth Development Plan (1985-1989)	-Deconcentration to municipality, governorship and provincial special administrations in supplying school land area and in making contribution to education investment	Deconcentration
The Seventh Development Plan (1996-2000)	-Giving freedom of movement to faculties in funding and spending	Delegation
The Seventh Development Plan (1996-2000)	-Deconcentration to provincial organizations in administrative subjects	Deconcentration
The Eighth Development Plan (2001-2005)	-Delegation to provincial organizations in administrative subjects	Delegation
The Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013)	-Delegation to provincial organizations and educational institutions in administrative subjects	Delegation
The Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013)	-Increasing private sector's share in entire education levels -Enabling to establish private universities	Deconcentration
The Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018)	-Enhancing the schools' authority in budgeting	Deconcentration
The Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018)	-Supporting private sector's establishing educational institutions -Private sector's and professional organizations' taking part in professional education process in financial aspect	Deconcentration

When Table 4 is analyzed, it is seen that the policies made depending upon the types of administrative, fiscal and market decentralization are applied as deconcentration and delegation within the scope of extent of application. It is drawn attention that deconcentration is mostly preferred within decentralization policies. While delegation is preferred in expanding the authority of provincial units of Ministry of Education, especially within the scope of administrative decentralization, deconcentration is preferred in executing of administrative, fiscal and market decentralization.

It is seen that the extent of decentralization policies in development plans are not in a certain development process with regards to chronological order of development plans. In other words, it is not possible to say exactly that there is a systematic expanding in the extent of implementation of decentralization in time.

6. Discussion, Results and Recommendations

As a result of the analysis of education policies in development plans, it cannot be said that there is a decentralization policy which is adopted in planning the Turkish Education System. In development plans, there are only objectives and strategies that point out possible decentralization policies. Accordingly, in this research, the objectives and strategies that can lead up to decentralization within the scope of educational planning in Turkey are analyzed, too. Studies that have been conducted about decentralization in Turkey reveal different results on if decentralization is supported by educators or not. Turan, Yücel, Karataş and Demirhan (2010) determined that Turkish educational administrators do not want areas', districts' and municipalities' to be so active in decentralization and they do not accept these units as authority in giving decision. Ölmez and Tonbul (2011) in their study with administrators determined that the situation in Turkey is not suitable for the implementation of transferring the educational administration to local governments which takes place among the objectives of Education Regions and Education Boards Instruction that was issued in 1999. They also found that targeted principles couldn't carry out and interaction between internal and external stakeholders of school is not sufficient. Yalçınkaya (2004) in his study with administrator candidates found that candidates have positive opinions on school-based management and they perceive school-based management as an alternative to centralist model. It can be useful to take into consideration that Turkey has regional differences in socio-economic and socio-cultural aspects while interpreting these studies' different results. In Turkish Development Plans, it is also aimed at decreasing the regional developmental differences (e.g. The Eighth Five Years Development Plan, 2001-2005 and The Tenth Five Years Development Plan, 2014-2018) and in analysis of current situation it is mentioned that there is inequality among regions in benefiting from educational opportunities, distribution of teacher is unbalanced and educational levels are not equal in different regions (e.g. The First, 1963-1967; The Second, 1968-1972 and The Third Five Years Development Plans, 1973-1977). If there are regional differences in a country in terms of wealth distribution, level of education, it is hard to create decentralized system (Oktay, 2013; Tracy, 1997). Therefore, conception of planning that takes decentralization policies to its center being not included so

much in Turkish Development Plans can be thought as a result arising from regional differences and economic and socio-cultural groundwork preparations' being not ready.

The analysis of development plans shows that policies that point out decentralization in Turkish Education System have been mostly developed depending upon administrative decentralization even if it is limited. It is seen that even in policies that can be related with administrative decentralization, delegation and deconcentration have been put into practice generally directed to provincial units of Ministry of Education. Decentralization can't be put into practice completely when local governments and non-governmental organizations meet the demands of government with their authorization (Dubois & Fattore, 2009). But principles of decentralization can be stated as responsibility, autonomy, resource management at the local level, local curriculum adapted to local needs, participation and partnership (Camelia, Vladimir-Aurelian & Răzvan Cătălin, 2014). Therefore, even administrative decentralization policies take place in development plans limitedly, it cannot be said that these policies reflect the administrative decentralization philosophy exactly.

Besides administrative decentralization, there are also other policy statements that can be related with fiscal and market decentralization in a limited way in development plans. Policies about fiscal decentralization have directed the planning studies in increasing schools' and faculties' authority. These policies have given freedom of movement to faculties in funding and spending, in other words, they have given the power to revenue collection to faculties. Increasing universities' financial authority is considered within the scope of decentralization executions. Liu Rong (2009) states that trends of decentralisation require giving financial and operational autonomy to the lower levels and therefore redefining of relationship between university and government has become a necessity. Fiscal decentralization should prevent income inequality and includes "spending decentralization, revenue decentralization, and autonomy power" (Song, 2013, p.294). In this respect, it can be said that fiscal decentralization policies for universities in development plans enable spending and revenue decentralization. In development plans, the schools do not have the authority to revenue collection within the scope of fiscal decentralization policies, only the schools' authority in budgeting is increased. In implementation of decentralization, local schools have their own budget and they decide about how they would distribute the resources on their own. Central institutions play the role of supporter, recommender and observer (Laudams, 2013). In this respect, in many countries a financial system which lets the budget's being controlled much more at school level is constituted (Van Amelsvoort & Scheerens, 1997). From this respect, it is not possible to mention that in development plans, there is a policy that lets a transition to school-based management in Turkish Education System.

School-based management which lets autonomy to school (Gorostiaga Derqui, 2001) is related with increasing the administrative quality (Alstete, 1997). Therefore fiscal decentralization for schools can lead up to administrative decentralization executions at the same time. But although it is stated that fiscal decentralization increases administrative accountability by making much more clear the process of policy formulation (Joanis, 2014), it is also mentioned that it strengthens the central planning (Gorostiaga Derqui, 2001) and expenditure decentralization which is considered in the scope of fiscal decentralization causes

more government expenditure (Jia, Guo & Zhang , 2014). Accordingly, the subject of fiscal decentralization's getting formed in line with the school-based management is a critical subject both in fiscal and administrative aspects. Therefore it is required implementing both administrative and fiscal decentralization completely in education system in order for school based-management's being included in development plans. When taken into consideration that in Turkish Education System administrative and fiscal decentralizations are not executed exactly, it is understood that it is not right to have an expectation that school-based management policies which strengthens school autonomy would lead to planning studies.

In development plans there are policies, which can be related with market decentralization, that would enable private sector's increasing share in education sector, establishing private educational institutions and professional organizations' taking part in professional education process fiscally. These policies that are included in development plans accord with the philosophy of supporting private sector schools within the scope of market decentralization. In development plans there aren't any policies or objectives related with political decentralization. Political decentralization can be thought as stronger evidence showing that a system lets decentralization. This is because political decentralization transfers power of giving decision to local governments in educational issues (Hinsz, Patel, Meyers & Dammert, 2006). When taken into consideration other decentralization types' execution areas and their extensities, it is understood clearly that political decentralization is not used as a policy in educational planning process. Without finding an area of execution exactly for the other decentralization types proposing delegation in planning, administration and distributing financial resources, expecting political decentralization to take part in Turkish Education System offers a way of thinking which is not rational.

Decentralization policies in development plans are determined to be under the category of deconcentration and delegation in terms of extent of execution. In the plans there isn't any policy related with devolution. Decentralization executions are used with the aim of empowering local units and/or private sectors (Lo, 2010). In development plans it is seen that which level this empowerment is going to be performed changes according to which sector is going to be empowered and what the subject of empowering is. Transferring administrative responsibility begins with the process of deconcentration. In this phase, educational institutions and local level should be strengthened to get technical expertise and decision making capabilities (Tracy, 1997). While administrative decentralization is linked to deconcentration, expenditure decentralization, included in fiscal decentralization, gives responsibility of providing services to local government or other authorities. This situation points out the type of authority given to lower levels can affect the extent of decentralization policies (Rounds Parry, 1997). Beyond doubt for the extent of decentralization's enabling to devolution, all types of decentralization, including political decentralization, are required to have opportunity to get executed completely. As in Turkish Education System, in a system in which there aren't any decentralization executions or there are limited decentralization executions in reality, it is not possible to carry out implementations that would enable to devolution.

In order to be able to execute decentralization in devolution level, certainly it should be

provided that delegated units would have the required ability. Local units should have the potential to fulfill the devolved responsibilities (Rounds Parry, 1997). It can be said that the understanding of planning is true in carrying out the decentralization first of all in deconcentration and delegation levels in Turkish Development Plans when it is looked from the viewpoint that delegated units should have the required organizational ability. Besides there are also other important requirements like giving the essential training to delegated units to enhance their organizational ability, managing a supervision in this respect and enabling the required resources. Chan and Wang (2009) states that financial responsibility and necessary financial resources should be given to local units at the same time in order to prevent possible tension caused by decentralization. Taking these precautions at the same time has an important role in the success of decentralization execution generally. The success of decentralization depends on availability of resources, clarity of guiding policies, capacity of stakeholders (Chikoko, 2009), flow of information between the units and existence of monitoring (Lessmann & Markwardt, 2010; Meade & Gershberg, 2008), following to planning studies in designing policies and improving local capacity (Meade & Gershberg, 2008). Therefore it can be said that the executions and strategies that would lead to improving the delegated units' ability would serve to both the success of decentralization and increasing the extent of decentralization. In Turkish Development Plans, it can be seen that there aren't these kinds of strategies and executions in planning decentralization. This finding shows that decentralization couldn't find itself a place in Turkish Education System and a systematic long period of planning concept is required to carry out decentralization in devolution level.

Based on the results of the study, it is suggested that developing and executing decentralization policies should take more place in the plans for Turkish Education System in order to be able to meet educational needs which result from regional inequalities. In order to strengthen administrative decentralization, different local units like municipality, governorship and schools should be authorized. It is suggested that fiscal decentralization should be executed by using more delegation and deconcentration from local governments to educational institutions in order to be able to finance of education by taking into consideration the local and institutional needs. The extent of decentralization should be decided by taking into consideration the need that decentralization would respond rather than the delegated and deconcentrated units, in other words it should be decided by considering the subject of decentralization. It is suggested that there should be a kind of planning concept related with supervision and education processes that would build delegated units' capacities in development plans, in order to be able to increase the extent of delegation and develop successful policies about decentralization.

References

- Alstete, J.W. (1997). The correlates of administrative decentralization. *Journal of Education for Business*, 73(1), 21-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08832329709601610>
- Bahr, K. (2007). Training course on decentralized education planning in the context of public sector reform. *Training Course On "Decentralized Education Planning in the Context of Public Sector Management Reform" - Course Materials*. Bangkok: UNESCO

- Bangkok, 2007 [Slides]. Retrieved from <http://www2.unescobkk.org/elib/UNESCO-MI-Course-Material/Session-10/PPP%2010.1.%20Concept%20and%20Method%20of%20Decentralised%20Education%20Planning.pdf>
- Camelia, S., Vladimir-Aurelian, E., & Răzvan Cătălin, D. (2014). The impact of decentralization on the Romanian school. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 124, 69–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.461>
- Chan, R.K.H., & Wang, Y. (2009). Controlled decentralization: Minban education reform in China. *Journal of Comparative Social Welfare*, 25(1), 27-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17486830802513983>
- Chikoko, V. (2009). Educational decentralisation in Zimbabwe and Malawi: A study of decisional location and process. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29(3), 201–211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2008.05.003>
- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). USA: Sage.
- Cuellar-Marchelli, H. (2003). Decentralization and privatization of education in El Salvador: Assessing the experience. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 23(2), 145–166. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593\(02\)00011-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(02)00011-1)
- De Guzman, A.B. (2007). Chronicling decentralization initiatives in the Philippine basic education sector. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(6), 613–624. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2006.06.014>
- Di Gropello, E. (1999). Educational decentralization models in Latin America. *Cepal Review*, 68, 155-173.
- Dubois, H.F.W., & Fattore, G. (2009). Definitions and typologies in public administration research: The case of decentralization. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32(8), 704-727. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01900690902908760>
- Duru-Bellat, M. (2014). Neo-liberal educational reforms and social inequality. Some insights from France. In D. Turner & H. Yolcu (Eds), *Neo-liberal educational reforms: A critical analysis* (pp.32-49). New York: Routledge.
- Ekşi, H., Kaya, M. (2011). Okul merkezli yönetim sistemine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri (Teacher opinions towards school based management system). *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi (Marmara University Atatürk Education Faculty Journal of Educational Sciences)*, 33, 45-60.
- Faguet, J-P., & Sanchez, F. (2008). Decentralization's effects on educational outcomes in Bolivia and Colombia. *World Development*, 36(7), 1294–1316. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2007.06.021>
- Falch, T., & Fischer, J.A.V. (2012). Public sector decentralization and school performance: International evidence. *Economics Letters*, 114(3), 276–279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2011.10.019>

- Galiani, S., Gertler, P., & Schargrodsky, E. (2008). School decentralization: Helping the good get better, but leaving the poor behind. *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(10-11), 2106–2120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2008.05.004>
- Gibton, D., & Goldring, E. (2001). The Role of legislation in educational decentralization: The case of Israel and Britain. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76(3-4), 81-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2001.9681992>
- Gorostiaga Derqui, J.M. (2001). Educational decentralization policies in Argentina and Brazil: Exploring the new trends. *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(6), 561-583. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680930110087825>
- Hanson, E.M. (1997). *Educational decentralization: Issues and challenges, No.9*. Retrieved from <http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/PREAL%209-English.pdf>
- He, A.E. (2011). Educational decentralization: A review of popular discourse on Chinese–English bilingual education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 31(1), 91-105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2011.544245>
- Hinsz, S., Patel, M., Meyers, C., & Dammert, A. (2006). *Effects of decentralization on primary education: Phase I: A survey of East Asia and the Pacific Islands*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/socialpolicy/files/Effects_of_Decentralization_on_Primary_Education.pdf
- Horsley, S. (2014). *A comparative analysis of neoliberal education reform and music education in England and Ontario, Canada*. University of Western Ontario - Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. Paper 1873.
- Jia, J., Guo, Q., & Zhang, J. (2014). Fiscal decentralization and local expenditure policy in China. *China Economic Review*, 28, 107–122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2014.01.002>
- Joanis, M. (2014). Shared accountability and partial decentralization in local public good provision. *Journal of Development Economics*, 107, 28–37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2013.11.002>
- Kızılboğa Özasan, R., & Alıcı, O.V. (2014). Kalkınma planlarında yerel yönetimler ve yapılan reformlar çerçevesinde mukayesesi (Local governments in the development plans and comparison in the scope of reforms). *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences)*, 26(11), 315-342.
- Kohn, L.T. (1997). *Methods in case study analysis*. Technical Publication No. 2. The Center for Studying Health System Change.
- Laudams, V. (2013). Decentralization of education in LEA and the participation of pedagogues in its implementation. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 82, 621 – 627. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.320>
- Law about Basic Principles and Restructuring of Public Administration [Kamu Yönetiminin Temel İlkeleri ve Yeniden Yapılandırılması Hakkında Kanun] (2004). Retrieved from <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/kanunlar/k5227.html>

- Lessmann, C., & Markwardt, G. (2010). One size fits all? Decentralization, corruption, and the monitoring of bureaucrats. *World Development*, 38(4), 631–646. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2009.11.003>
- Liu Rong, N. (2009). Decentralisation and marketisation of adult and continuing education: A Chinese case study. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29(3), 212–218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2008.02.007>
- Lo, W.Y.W. (2010). Decentralization of higher education and its implications for educational autonomy in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 30(2), 127-139. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02188791003721572>
- Meade, B., & Gershberg, A.I. (2008). Making education reform work for the poor: Accountability and decentralization in Latin America. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(3), 299-322. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680930801923823>
- Ministry of Education Education Regions and Education Boards Instruction [Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Eğitim Bölgeleri ve Eğitim Kurulları Yönergesi] (1999). Retrieved from <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/49.html>
- Oktay, A. (2013). Decentralization in-and of- education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106, 777-782. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.089>
- Olson, M. (2010). Document analysis. In A. Mills, G. Durepos & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research* (pp. 319-321). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Ölmez, Ö., & Tonbul, Y. (2011). Eğitim yönetiminin yerelleşmesi sürecinde bir uygulama: Eğitim bölgeleri danışma kurulları (An application in the process of educational administration's localization: Educational regions advisory committee). *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (University of Mehmet Akif Ersoy Journal of Education Faculty)*, 21, 153-179.
- Özmen, F., & Hozatlı, M. (2008). İlköğretim müfettişlerinin okul temelli yönetimin uygulanabilirliğine ilişkin görüşleri (The views of primary school supervisors about the applicability of school-based management). *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (Firat University Journal of Social Science)*, 18(1), 159-174.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). USA: Sage.
- Public Management Basic Draft Law [Kamu Yönetimi Temel Kanunu Tasarısı] (2003). *Kamu Yönetimi Temel Kanunu Tasarısı ile İçişleri, Plan ve Bütçe ve Anayasa Komisyonları Raporları (1/731) [Public Management Basic Draft Law and Reports of Internal Affairs, Planning and Budget and Constitutional Commission (1/731)]*. Retrieved from <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/sirasayi/donem22/yil01/ss349m.htm>
- Rizvi, F., Engel, L., Nandyala, A., Rutkowski, D., & Sparks, J. (2005). *Globalization and recent shifts in educational policy in the Asia Pacific: An overview of some critical issues*. APEID, UNESCO Bangkok Occasional Paper Series, Paper No. 4.
- Robertson, S.L. (2007). 'Remaking the world': Neo-liberalism and the transformation of education and teachers' labour. In L. Weis & M. Compton (eds), *The global assault on teachers, teaching and their unions* (pp.11-30). New York: Palgrave.

- Romeo, L.G. (2012). Decentralizing for development: The developmental potential of local autonomy and the limits of politicsdriven decentralization reforms. *Swedish International Center for Local Democracy, Working Paper*, No: 11. Retrieved from http://www.delog.org/cms/upload/pdf-lgd/ICLD-Workingpaper_11_tryck-low.pdf
- Rondinelli, D.A. (1983). Implementing decentralization programmes in Asia: A comparative analysis. *Public Administration and Development*, 3, 181-207.
- Rondinelli, D.A., & Nellis, J.R. (1986). Assessing decentralization policies in developing countries: The case for cautious optimism. *Development Policy Review*, 4(1), 3-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7679.1986.tb00494.x>
- Rounds Parry, T. (1997). Achieving balance in decentralization: A case study of education decentralization in Chile. *World Development*, 25(2), 211-225. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(96\)00094-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(96)00094-0)
- Shin, R. (2001). Strategies for economic development under decentralization: A transformation of the political economy. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 24(10), 1083-1102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1081/PAD-100105103>
- Song, Y. (2013). Rising Chinese regional income inequality: The role of fiscal decentralization. *China Economic Review*, 27, 294-309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2013.02.001>
- State Planning Organization [Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı] (1963-1967). *The first five years development plan (1963-1967)*. Retrieved from <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/9/plan1.pdf>
- State Planning Organization [Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı] (1968-1972). *The second five years development plan (1968-1972)*. Retrieved from <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/8/plan2.pdf>
- State Planning Organization [Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı] (1973-1977). *The third five years development plan (1973-1977)*. Retrieved from <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/7/plan3.pdf>
- State Planning Organization [Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı] (1979-1983). *The fourth five years development plan (1979-1983)*. Retrived from <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/6/plan4.pdf>
- State Planning Organization [Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı] (1985-1989). *The fifth five years development plan (1985-1989)*. Retrieved from <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/5/plan5.pdf>
- State Planning Organization [Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı] (1996-2000). *The seventh five years development plan (1996-2000)*. Retrieved from <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/3/plan7.pdf>
- State Planning Organization [Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı] (2001-2005). *The eighth five years development plan (2001-2005)*. Retrieved from <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Kalknma%20Planlar/Attachments/2/plan8.pdf>

- State Planning Organization [Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı] (2007-2013). *The ninth development plan (2007-2013)*. Retrieved from <http://pbk.tbmm.gov.tr/dokumanlar/kalkinma-plani-9-genel-kurul.pdf>
- State Planning Organization [Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı] (2014-2018). *The tenth five years development plan (2014-2018)*. Retrieved from <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Lists/Yaynlar/Attachments/518/Onuncu%20Kalk%C4%B1nma%20Plan%C4%B1.pdf>
- Şahin, S. (2003). Okul merkezli yönetim uygulamaları (School-based management applications). *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi (Educational Administration in Theory & Practice)*, 36, 582-605.
- Şen, D., & Bandyopadhyay, A. (2010). Educational decentralization as part of public administration reform in Turkey. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 269–276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.009>
- Şişman, M., & Turan, S. (2003). Eğitimde yerelleşme ve demokratikleşme çabaları: Teorik bir çözümleme (Decentralization and democratization in education: A conceptual analysis). *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi (Educational Administration in Theory & Practice)*, 34, 300-315.
- Terfassa, B. (1994). The role of fiscal decentralization in promoting participatory development in Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Economics Association (EEA) Report*, 141-166. Retrieved from <http://www.africaportal.org/dspace/articles/role-fiscal-decentralization-promoting-participatory-development-ethiopia>
- Therkildsen, O. (2000). Contextual issues in decentralization of primary education in Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20(5), 407–421. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593\(99\)00085-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(99)00085-1)
- Tracy, M. (1997). To transfer power or to transfer responsibility: Educational decentralization in Venezuela. *Int. J. Educational Development*, 17(2), 145-162. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593\(96\)00034-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(96)00034-X)
- Turan, S., Yücel, C., Karataş, E., & Demirhan, G. (2010). Okul müdürlerinin yerinden yönetim hakkındaki görüşleri (Opinions of school principals about local management). *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (University of Uşak Journal of Social Sciences)*, 3(1), 1-18.
- Turkish Ministry of Development Specialization Commission [Türk Kalkınma Bakanlığı Özel İhtisas Komisyonu] (2014). Onuncu Kalkınma Planı 2014-2018, Yerel yönetimler (The Tenth Development Plan 2014-2018, Local governments). *Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu (Report of Specialization Commission)*, Ankara. Retrieved from http://www.cka.org.tr/dosyalar/Ozel%20Ihtisas%20Komisyonu%20Raporlar%C4%B1/Yerel%20Y%C3%B6netimler_%C3%B6k.pdf
- van Amelsvoort, H.W.C.G., & Scheerens, J. (1997). Policy issues surrounding processes of centralization and decentralization in European education systems. *Educational*

Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice, 3(4), 340-363. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1380361970030404>

- Wang, L., & Ho-Mok, K. (2014). The impacts of neo-liberalism on higher education in China: Issues and challenges. In D. Turner & H. Yolcu (Eds), *Neo-liberal educational reforms: A critical analysis* (pp.139-163). New York: Routledge.
- Welsh, T., & McGinn, N.F. (1999). Decentralization of education: Why, when, what and how? *Fundamentals of Educational Planning- 64, UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*. Retrieved from http://www.see-educoop.net/education_in/pdf/decentr_educ_why_when_what_how_o_th_enl_t07.pdf
- Woiwode, C. (2009). Decentralization and local development planning in the Periphery: The institutional framework in the North and East of Sri Lanka. *Sri Lanka Journal of Real Estate*, 3, 76-104.
- Yalçinkaya, M. (2004). Okul merkezli yönetim (School based management). *Ege Eğitim Dergisi (Journal of Ege Education)*, 5(2), 21-34.
- Yirci, R., & Kocabaş, İ. (2013). Eğitimde özelleştirme tartışmaları: Kavramsal bir analiz (Discussions on Privatization in Education: A conceptual analysis). *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 8(8), 1523-1539. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.5173>

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).