



The Problems that Secondary School Administrators' and Teachers' Face Regarding Strategic Administration

Sukru ADA¹

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 26 May 2017

Received in revised form: 03 Oct. 2018

Accepted: 8 Nov. 2018

DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2018.78.8

Keywords

school administrators, strategy, strategic planning, teachers, secondary education

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the Study: This study aims to determine attitudes of teachers and school administrators towards strategic planning based on their perception and whether their views on strategic planning differs in relation to factors such as gender, educational level, years of experience and position. **Method:** The sample for the study consists of 383 teachers and school administrators working in secondary schools in Palandöken, Aziziye and Yakutiye municipalities of the city of Erzurum, during the academic year of 2015-2016. Data were collected via Strategic Administration Problem Scale developed by Çetin (2012). For the data analysis of the data, in addition to descriptive statistics, T-test, Anova, and Tukey

HSD multi comparison tests were used. **Findings:** Findings of the study showed that, administrators' views on strategic planning do not differ based on years of experience. Insufficient data, it was not possible to compare gender and education level variables. On the other hand, teachers' views on strategic planning showed significant differences based on years of experience variable. Similar to administrators' data, there was not sufficient data for gender and education level variable for teachers as well.

Discussion and Suggestions: School administrators' views on strategic planning are found to be positive; they are aware of their responsibilities and they acknowledge active role of administrators in strategic administration. In addition, participants were to be found in agreement regarding the institutional problems administrators and teachers face in strategic administration, which are; teachers' lack of knowledge in strategic administration, lack of communication between stakeholders, and lack of support for the practices of strategic planning.

© 2018 Ani Publishing Ltd. All rights reserved

¹ Uludağ University, TURKEY, e-mail: sukruada@uludag.edu.tr, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3329-9494>

Introduction

Rapidly changing and dynamic face of the organizations, as well as increasing and changing expectations require organizations to act in a strategical manner. This rapid and effective change, which is clouding the future, enforces social organizations such as educational institutions to define, adopt and apply their strategic behaviors in order to become visionary. Schools encounter change intensively due to intense social and cultural interaction.

Globalization lead changes in peoples' perceptions as well. Tendency towards new ideas increase. Changing competition conditions make current administration strategies inefficient for future organizations. Public and educational administrations are in effort to adapt to new situations required by this wind of change.

Public administration has gone through changes which put tools of transparency, accountability, performance evaluation, and inspection into practice. These developments render importance to innovation of strategies and preparation of strategic plans for the future (Arabacı, 2007; Davies, 2006; Demir & Yılmaz, 2010; Güçlü, 2003). Strategic planning is quite valuable for organizations in order to protect themselves from risks, to benefit from opportunities and to sustain.

Strategy means to direct, to transmit, to carry and to drive (Dinçer, 2007; Ereş, 2004; Küçüksüleymanoğlu, 2008; Freeman, 2008). In other words, concept of strategy is about showing direction. Planning is written or unwritten documents and information which state the targets (i.e. staff, budget, materials, goods, service) of public, private or non-governmental organizations in short, medium or long-term periods.

Strategic planning can be described as a contributing, transparent, flexible planning approach which determines rational strategic purposes and targets in accordance with organizations' vision, and reports the process of reviewing, watching, and correcting sustainable success by developing measurable indicators in line with an action plan (Arslan, 2009; Wolf & Floyd, 2013). First step for a plan is determining the purpose. After the purpose is clear, it is possible to envision that there are different paths available to reach that purpose.

Schools, where educational activities took place, fulfill many functions while providing teaching and educational activities. Strategic planning is the forefront of these activities. Since schools are facing multi-dimensional environmental changes, strategic planning become more important (Zincirli, 2012; Brews & Hunt, 1999). Administrators and teachers who are trained in the field of strategic planning, who have the required knowledge, accumulation and experience have crucial effect on success of the strategic planning activities.

Quality of strategic plans and the level of their applicability may be linked to the level of schools' academic success. However, OECD's "Education at a glance 2017" annual report shows that our schools do not match with the desirable level of activity and success (Education at a Glance OECD Indicators, 2017). This situation creates questions about the level of fulfilment for strategic planning activities in the schools.

School administration and staff's view on the strategic planning process, level on training, awareness and participation level are important factors which can decrease the problems to a minimum level. This study which focuses on determining problems faced by school administrators and teachers on strategic planning will contribute to literature on strategic planning.

Strategic administration is a methodology which can be used for defining the future targets of organization and identifying the required process to fulfill these targets by the whole organization (Çoban & Karakaya, 2010, p. 343; Şener, 2009; Radin, 2000). Drucker (1999) stated that the main purpose of strategic administration is to care about mission of a work from start to end by asking questions of "what is our job, what it should be?" in the direction of predetermined targets, and to get the results of decisions in the future (Drucker, 1999; Akt; Güçlü, 2003). Strategic planning and strategic administration may provide positive contribution to educational organization if these organizations show flexibility towards changes and also have qualities to respond to needs.

Strategic planning status yearned in medium or long-term period. It also shows vision for medium or long-term future. Strategic planning is a discipline which leads the road and indicates what the organization is (Narinoğlu, 2009; Mintzberg, 1994, p. 107; John, 2004), points out that strategic planning is not strategic thinking but a process of analyzing and synthesizing. Within this respect, strategic planning is a must which is required for organizations to survive.

According to Kaufman and Jacobs (1987, p. 25) qualities of strategic planning, which separate it from traditional planning, are being action, result and application oriented, variation in participation during planning, and adapting a competitive attitude. Moreover, strategic planning aims to review environment and determine opportunities and threats.

Administrators with a traditional view of administration are not able to see environmental opportunities and taking precautions against threats when they are focused on efficiency in their system, producing predictable products and doing activities. According to Gürer (2006) popular administration literature explains the importance of strategic planning by pointing out how it focuses on the concepts of mission, vision and direction defining for all organizations. Another factor increasing the importance of strategic planning is the increase of ambiguity surrounding the organizations (Çalık, 2003). Strategic planning process is shaped by the answers of questions such as "Where are we as an organization? Where do we want to go? How can we reach the place we wish to go? How can we follow up and evaluate our success" (Bryson & Alston, 1996; DPT, 2006; Kocatepe, 2010, p.17). This sort of questionings are important steps of organizational development. Organizations' life span and ability to compete might be related to rational answers given to these questions.

Strategic planning provides opportunities to analyze the success constantly by developing indicators of performance. According to Bryson (2004) there are four main benefits of strategic planning. First, it improves strategic thinking and behaviors.

Second, it enhances decision making processes. Strategic planning helps administrators to coordinate the decisions, taken during development stage and after, according to levels and function. Third, strategic planning eases adaptation to changing conditions. Organizations showing effort for strategic planning are encouraged to reveal and handle the main organizational issues. Lastly, strategic planning promotes the organizational sensitivity. Stakeholders and critical decision makers play their roles better, fulfill their responsibilities, team work and specialty between members of the organization become stronger. Strategic planning also prevents staff working at lower division to lose track of organizations' targets by providing opportunities for coordination between lower and upper divisions of the organizations (Aydın & Aksoy, 2007; Kocatepe, 2010; Balkar & Ekici 2015; Bell, 2002).

Strategic planning tells about the road between the organization's current status/place and the status being planned for the long-term period. Lingam and Raghuwaiya (2014, p. 21-20) state that in order to accept a strategic plan, it should motivate the organization to move, construct a vision based on common values, provide a process in which all members of the organization share the responsibility and contribute, accept the accountability, be sensitive to its environment, be based on value of quality, be open to question its current condition, and be part of the effective administration.

Technological and environmental changes create a force for educational system to change. Schools contribute to the change of the public and the environment they are in (Çelik, 1994, p.28; Balkar & Ekici, 2015). Making strategic planning is inevitable in order to keep schools' functionality sustainable (Arslan, 2009). Educational planning is a decision-making process which helps the accomplishment of schools' educational and organizational objectives (Başaran & Çınkır, 2012; Forshaw, 1998). It is safe to state that there is a close relationship between schools' effective functioning and their effort for strategic planning.

There are certain steps or models to follow when making strategic plans. The first step of making strategic plans is to increase stakeholders' participation and interest to the highest level. During this step a workshop is required to create a base for effective participation of the stakeholders. Participation to strategic planning eases the communication and decision-making process, helps accepting different benefits and values and informs reasonable decision making by providing rational analysis; therefore, enhances the performance of the institution (Bryson, 2011, p. 219; John, 2004). Participation on decision making may increase the institutional performance.

Second step is to make a SWOT analysis that helps schools to find their own identity by inside and outside evaluation. Stakeholders engage in brainstorming on their performance, resources, and basis of their existence through SWOT analysis (Stahl & Grigsby, 1992; Clarke, 2007). Therefore, more than one brain would participate to the work in the organization.

The next step is to develop vision and mission of the organization which requires a common approach in supporting maximum participation and sense of belonging. School administration has a role in making organization's vision and mission

statements to be reachable and applicable by all stakeholders. Organization's vision and mission statements should be announced by everyone. It is essential to identify the organization's needs and making a list of priorities when developing the vision and the mission statements (Molale, 2007; Dökmeci, 2010). An action plan is necessary to turn strategic plans into an open working tool. Well prepared action plans help schools to reach their targets in the most effective way and stakeholders to guide the application process of targets (Allison, 2005; Şener, 2009; Shapiro, 2010). School administrators' following these steps of strategic planning is considered as effective school work as well.

The last step of strategic planning is defining an application strategy as a framework for follow up and evaluation. Strategic planning should be supported by a systematic program which aims to collect data in order to make decision and revise the education program (Glanz, 2006). Follow up and evaluation programs provide information to revise the strategic plan and therefore application capacity of the strategic plan is expanded by comparing targets and reached results (Middlewood & Lumby, 2007). These studies may plan important roles in determining future targets. In recent years, every school in Turkey has been making their own strategic plan and putting it in action.

There are research studies on strategic planning, their content, application and evaluation processes. In their study titled "Primary and secondary school administrators' views on strategic planning applications" Yelken, Kılıç & Üredi (2010) found that school administrators have adequate knowledge on the concept and purpose of strategic planning. However, they also found that administrators face problems in practice due to educational and economical deficiencies such as in-service training and lack of financial support.

Memduhoğlu and Uçar (2012) conducted a study titled "Administrators' and teachers' perception of strategic planning and evaluation of current strategic planning practices in schools" and found out that administrators and teachers have a positive understanding of strategic planning, however, they think that current practices of strategic planning are not carried out in line with the purposes of strategic planning. Moreover, it was found that there is a weak link between administrators' and teachers' perceptions (beliefs) of the concept of strategic planning and their thoughts on actual practice of strategic planning in schools.

In their study on school administrators' problems on planning and using strategic plans, Arslan and Küçüker (2016) conclude that participants have correct and adequate understanding, believe in the necessity of strategic planning however they show lack of self-efficacy on doing strategic planning themselves. Results of Yenipınar and Akgün's (2017) study titled "Application of Strategic Planning in Elementary School" indicate that according to school administrators there is a high level of use of strategic plans in schools.

The research literature show that stakeholders' perception holds an important place in effective school and school development process. However, quantity of research in this area is also limited in determining problems stakeholders face and

providing solutions to those problems. Therefore, current research study aims to reveal the perception of administrators and teachers of secondary schools on strategic planning is thought to be contribute to the literature and researchers working on this topic and also to follow up the developments. Following questions were asked to reach this aim; what is the perception of secondary school administrators on strategic planning? Is there a difference between secondary school administrators' perception of strategic planning based on years of experience? Is there a difference between secondary school teachers' perception of strategic planning based on years of experience? Is there a difference between secondary school administrators' and teachers' perception of strategic planning?

Method

Research Design

This study is designed as a descriptive study with survey design. The aim is to discover administrators' and teachers' perceptions on strategic planning and problems they face in educational institutions. According to Karasar (2006), descriptive studies are the ones which describes "what are" events, objects, entities, institutions, groups and various areas. In descriptive or survey studies, generally the main purpose is to identify "the current status". Therefore, these studies are conducted in natural settings. Survey research aims to collect data to determine characteristics of a group (Büyüköztürk et al., 2013).

Universe and Sample/Research Group

The universe of the study consists of secondary school administrators and teachers work in all secondary schools in Erzurum city center during 2015-2016 academic year. There are 83 secondary schools in Erzurum city (in municipalities of Palandöken, Aziziye and Yakutiye). There are 2001 teachers and 171 administrators working in these schools. The sample for the research was selected within this universe with simple noncompliance sampling method. There is an equal chance of being selected for all individuals in simple noncompliance sampling method. Selection of one individual does not affect the selection of others [Erdfelder, 1996, (ed. Aypay et.al., 2015); Yazıcıoğlu, & Erdoğan, 2004]. Field study for the survey was conducted in 20 secondary schools in Erzurum city center. In total, there are 2172 secondary school administrators and teachers working in these schools. Sample size was calculated as 322 teachers and 118 administrators with %95 trust level and %5 error level. Therefore, 330 teachers and 120 administrators were accepted as the sample size for the survey study to ensure the reliability [Erdfelder, 1996, (ed: Aypay et.al., 2015)]. 295 surveys from teachers and 88 surveys from administrators returned to researchers and SPSS analyses was carried on 383 survey which were valid.

Data Collection Instrument

“Strategic Administration Problem Scale” developed by Çetin (2012), was used for this study. Structural and conceptual validity of the scale was measured by Çetin (2012).

Strategic Administration Problem Scale (SAPS) has five sub dimensions; internal problems in strategic administration, external problems in strategic administration, problems derived from educational staff, problems derived from administrative staff, level of belief in strategic administration. The scale is a 5 point Likert type scale. Each item on the scale has one of the following 5 responses; “never obstructs”, “obstructs very little”, “somehow obstructs” “obstructs” and “obstruct very much”. Cronbach’s alpha was measured 0.948 by Çetin (2012) for reliability analyses.

Data Analysis

As a result of the research, the collected data and information was analyzed in accordance with the aims via SPSS 22 program. For the data analysis of the data, in addition to descriptive statistics, T-test, Anova, and Tukey HSD multi comparison tests were used.

Table 1

Extreme Value Analysis

Proportions	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov P
Internal Problems in Strategic Administration	0.13	0.25	0.00
External Problems in Strategic Administration	0.13	0.25	0.01
Problems Derived From Educational Staff	0.13	0.25	0.00
Problems Derived From Administrative Staff	0.13	0.25	0.00
Level of Belief in Strategic Administration	0.13	0.25	0.00
Scale of the Problems in Strategic Management	0.13	0.25	0.01

To determine if the collected data’s distribution is normal or not, the coefficient of skewness and kurtosis related to the data set was examined. It was determined that both the coefficient of skewness and the coefficient of kurtosis is changing about ± 1 . It is argued that if the skewness and kurtosis coefficients are between +2 and -2 the data doesn’t deviate from normal distribution (Cameron, 2004). As the data were normally distributed parametric tests were used in analyses.

Research sample had 293 participants of which 156 were women (%53,5) and 137 were man. Based on education level variable; 10 participants have two-year undergraduate degrees (7 man and 3 women), 250 (%85,4) participants have an

undergraduate degree (113 (%38,3) man and 137 (%47,1) women). There were total 33 participants who hold a graduate degree (17(%5,8) man and 16 (%5,4) women).

Based on years of experience variable, number of teachers with 15 years of experience and less is 139 (%47,5) of which 69 (%23,4) are man and 70 (%24,1) are women. There are a total number of 60 (%20,7) teachers with 16 to 20 years of experience of which 24(%8,1), are man and 36 (%12,5) is women. Lastly, there are 94 (%31,9) teachers who have 21 years of experience or more. Among these teachers 44 (%14,9) are man and 50 (%16,9) are women. For administrators, there are only 2 women (%2,3) and 83 men (%97,7) among the total number of 85. In terms of education level, 1 (1.2%) male participant holds an associate degree, 74 male (%87,1) and 2 female (2.4%) participants hold an undergraduate degree and 8 (9.4%) participants, all male, hold graduate degrees. Years of experience was another variable. Among the participants, there were 19 male (22,7 %) and 1 female (1,1%) administrators who have 15 years of experience or less. Number of administrators who has 16 to 20 years of experience was 32 of which 31(%37,5) one of them male and 1 (%37,5) of them was female. There were 33 administrators, all male, who has 21 and more (% 37,5) years of experience. There was not any female administrators among the second group.

Results

Table 2 shows secondary school administrators' views on problems they face in strategic administration process.

Table 2

Secondary School Administrators' Views on Problems Regarding Strategic Administration

Items	N	\bar{X}	S
Lack of internalization by administrators	85	3,33	,94
Administrators' lack of knowledge on strategic administration	85	3,60	,88
Lack of support by the administrators for strategic administration practices	85	3,76	,84
Administrators who put themselves before others	85	3,66	1,04
Frequent change in SDAT team members	85	3,46	1,15
Ineffective work of SDAT team members	85	3,45	1,17
No extra payment for SDAT team members	85	3,42	1,19
Staff's lack of belief and determination in the application process	85	3,55	1,21
Negative attitudes of some teachers in application process of strategic plan	85	3,72	1,04
Frequent change of teachers in the school	85	2,22	1,08
Parents' lack of knowledge about strategic planning	85	1,69	,79
Institution's economic shortage	85	4,04	1,09
Teachers' lack of knowledge about strategic planning	85	4,27	,75
Heavy work load in schools	85	2,81	,95
Absence of educational psychology and guidance specialist in school	85	2,31	,99
Environmental conditions and school's lack of possibilities	85	3,91	,88
Lack of support by internal and external stakeholders	85	4,07	,61
Belief that plans will stay on paper	85	4,00	,66
Reluctance of teachers and administrators in taking responsibility	85	3,69	,93
Not putting team's work outputs into practice	85	3,68	,93

Table 2 Continue

Items	N	\bar{X}	S
Overage of the projects in the city which cause project exhaustion	85	2,15	1,10
Lack of supplements (computer etc.)	85	3,88	,68
Not breaking command chain and not valuing talented individuals	85	4,04	,72
Habits of institutional legislation	85	3,91	,85
Lack of agreement between strategic plans and institutional legislations	85	3,93	,74
Lack of care in answering evaluation surveys	85	3,79	,90
Incompatibility between staff and stakeholders	85	3,74	,88
Lack of qualified and experienced staff at institution	85	3,13	,96
Overage of substitute teachers (who doesn't hold a permanent position)	85	2,60	1,03
Dictating method of approach in strategic administration practices showed by upper level administrator	85	3,65	,77
Lack of appreciation towards successful staff showed by administrators	85	3,95	,67
Loading certain individuals with work of strategic planning and practicing	85	3,96	,75
Lack of healthy communication between school administrators and teachers	85	4,00	,66
Domination of traditional administration approach	85	3,99	,68

Table 2 presents secondary school administrators' views on problems they face in strategic administration process. According to Table 1, the highest points were gathered in two items respectively; "Teachers' lack of knowledge about strategic planning" (\bar{X} =4,27, S=0,75) and "Lack of support by internal and external stakeholders" (\bar{X} =4,07, S=0,61). On the other hand, the lowest point was gathered in following item; "Parents' lack of knowledge about strategic planning" (\bar{X} =1,69, S=0,79). These findings indicate that schools are not adequately informed about strategic planning.

Table 3

Sub dimension Mean Values of Administrators' Views on Problems Regarding Strategic Administration

Sub Dimensions	N	Min	Max	\bar{X}	S
Internal Problems In Strategic Administration	85	25	42	32,75	4,15
External Problems In Strategic Administration	85	18	30	23,46	2,57
Problems Derived From Educational Staff	85	6	32	22,20	4,58
Problems Derived From Administrative Staff	85	10	34	25,99	3,78
Level Of Belief In Strategic Administration	85	10	20	14,93	2,45

Table 3 shows mean values of administrators' views on problems regarding strategic administration. Data on table 2 indicates that administrators think that they have internal problems in strategic administration on strategic planning ($\bar{X}=32.75$, $S=4.15$). Analysis of the data also shows that administrators external problems in strategic administration ($\bar{X}=23.46$, $S=2.57$).

Administrators' problems derived from educational staff of strategic planning application process is found to be at a medium level ($\bar{X}= 22,20$, $S=4,58$ In addition, administrators' problems derived from administrative staff ($\bar{X}=25,99$, $S=3,78$). Analysis of data level of belief in strategic administration show that the mean score is $\bar{X}=14.93$, and the standard variation is $S=2.45$.

Previous research on strategic administration shows that school administrators have adequate knowledge on strategic planning, they also have positive attitudes and they believe in the necessity of strategic planning (Çetin, 2012; Ayrancı, 2013; Ekici, 2015; Yıldırım, 2015; Kocatepe, 2010; Balcı, Çanakçı & Tan, 2012; Yelken, Kılıç & Üredi, 2010; Zincirli ,2012; Arslan & Küçüker, 2016; Memduhoğlu & Uçar, 2012). Results of the current study are compatible with the literature on strategic planning.

In order to understand whether participants' years of experience in their profession have an effect on their perception, one-way ANOVA test was carried out. The result shows that there is no significant difference between years of experience and perception on strategic planning. Hence, all of the administrators participated in this study are in agreement on existence of problems about strategic planning. Gender (2 woman-86 man) and educational level (78 undergraduates, 8 graduate, 1 associate degree) variables were not able to be analyzed due to the imbalanced number of participants.

Tablo 4

ANOVA results of Secondary School Administrators' Problems in Strategic Management in terms of Seniority Variable

Sub Dimensions	Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
Internal Problems in Strategic Administration	Between groups	2	33.17	16,59	0,96	0,40
	Within groups	82	1414.64	17,25		
	Total	84	1447.81			
External Problems in Strategic Administration	Between groups	2	18.94	9,47	1,45	0,24
	Within groups	82	536.17	6,54		
	Total	84	555.11			
Problems Derived from Educational Staff	Between groups	2	61.55	30,78	1,48	0,23
	Within groups	82	1704.05	20,78		
	Total	84	1765.60			
Problems Derived from Administrative Staff	Between groups	2	0.04	0.02		0.001
	Within groups	82	1202.95	14.67		
	Total	84	1202.99			
Degree of Belief in Strategic Administration	Between groups	2	1.78	0,89	0.15	0.87
	Within groups	82	503.80	6,146		
	Total	84	505.58			

Results of ANOVA regarding seniority variable were non-significant [Secondary School Administrators' Problems in Strategic Management $F(2,82) = 1.428, p > .05$, Internal Problems in Strategic Administration $F(2,82) = 0.96, p > .05$, External Problems in Strategic Administration $F(2,82) = 1.45, p > .05$, Problems Derived from Educational Staff $F(2,82) = 1.48, p > .05$, Problems Derived from Administrative Staff $F(2,82) = 0.001, p > .05$, Degree of Belief in Strategic Administration $F(2,82) = 0.15, p > .05$]. One of the post hoc testes is the LSD test. A LSD Post Hoc Tests further indicated that there was no significant relationship between the variables.

It was determined that there is no difference in the scale and dimension of "Problems in Strategic Management" in accordance with seniority variable. All administrators have the same idea about existence of the problems in strategic management.

Table 5

Secondary School Teachers' Views on Problems Regarding Strategic Administration

Items	N	\bar{X}	S
Lack of internalization by administrators	293	4,06	,78
Administrators' lack of knowledge on strategic administration	293	4,29	,61
Lack of support by the administrators for strategic administration practices	293	4,15	,80
Administrators who put themselves before others	293	4,02	,85
Frequent change in SDAT team members	293	4,01	,82
Ineffective work of SDAT team members	293	4,03	,76
No extra payment for SDAT team members	293	4,00	,86
Staff's lack of belief and determination in the application process	293	4,15	,69
Negative attitudes of some teachers in application process of strategic plan	293	4,19	,79
Frequent change of teachers in the school	293	2,47	1,36
Parents' lack of knowledge about strategic planning	293	2,14	1,28
Institution's economic shortage	293	4,21	,90
Teachers' lack of knowledge about strategic planning	293	4,40	,71
Heavy work load in schools	293	2,71	1,22
Absence of educational psychology and guidance specialist in school	293	2,60	1,28
Environmental conditions and school's lack of possibilities	293	4,09	,77
Lack of support by internal and external stakeholders	293	4,16	,75
Belief that plans will stay on paper	293	4,24	,72
Reluctance of teachers and administrators in taking responsibility	293	4,28	,81
Not putting team's work outputs into practice	293	3,78	,97
Overage of the projects in the city which cause project exhaustion	293	3,04	1,29
Lack of supplements (computer etc.)	293	4,12	,88
Not breaking command chain and not valuing talented individuals	293	4,09	,78
Habits of institutional legislation	293	4,29	,70
Lack of agreement between strategic plans and institutional legislations	293	4,18	,68
Lack of care in answering evaluation surveys	293	4,06	,83
Incompatibility between staff and stakeholders	293	4,02	,85
Lack of qualified and experienced staff at institution	293	3,25	1,16
Overage of substitute teachers (who doesn't hold a permanent position)	293	2,77	1,36
Upper level administrators' use of dictating method of approach in strategic administration practices process	293	3,97	,88
Lack of appreciation towards successful staff showed by administrators	293	4,13	,72
Loading certain individuals with work of strategic planning and practicing	293	4,18	,58
Lack of healthy communication between school administrators and teachers	293	4,23	,61
Domination of traditional administration approach	293	4,17	,72

Table 5 presents secondary school teachers' views on problems regarding strategic administration. Looking at the distribution, lowest mean and standard variation values belong to the following items; "Parents' lack of knowledge about strategic planning" ($\bar{X}=2,14$, $S=1.28$) and "Frequent change of teachers in the school" ($\bar{X}=2,47$, $S=1.36$). Data also show that the highest mean and standard variation values are seen for the following items; "Teachers' lack of knowledge about strategic planning" ($\bar{X}=4,40$, $S=0.71$) and "Administrators' lack of knowledge on strategic administration" ($\bar{X}=4,29$, $S=0.61$).

Based on statistical analysis, mean value for teachers' habits of institutional legislation on strategic planning ($\bar{X}=4.29$, $S=0.7$) indicates that teachers have medium level of knowledge on strategic planning. Teachers' perceptions regarding upper level administrator's use of dictating method of approach in strategic administration practices ($\bar{X}=3.97$, $S=0.88$) are on the medium level.

Previous studies conclude that teachers do not see themselves well informed about strategic planning (Akdoğan, 2012; Arslan & Küçükler, 2016; Ayrancı, 2013; Balcı, Çanakçı & Tan 2012; Çetin, 2012; Dökmeci, 2010; Ekici, 2015; Kocatepe, 2010; Martinelli, 1999; Memduhoğlu, 2012; Yelken, Kılıç & Üredi 2010; Yıldırım, 2015; Zincirli, 2012). Present study also reached similar results.

The results suggest that there is no statistically significant difference between the SAPS scores of male teachers and the SAPS scores of female teachers.

Tablo 6

Test Comparison Table Regarding Teachers' Perception on Strategic Planning Changes in Terms of Their Years of Experience According to the ANOVA Results

Factor	Seniority	n	M	SD	df	F	Sig	Significant Difference (LSD)
Internal Problems in Strategic Administration	1.0-15 years	140	35,93	3,74	2; 292	11.618	0.000	1-3
	2.16-20 years	61	34,72	3,96				
	3.21 years and over	94	33,56	3,47				
External Problems in Strategic Administration	1.0-15 years	140	26,41	3,81	2; 292	18.216	0.000	1-2 1-3
	2.16-20 years	61	24,52	3,31				
	3.21 years and over	94	23,75	2,87				

Table 6 Continue

Factor	Seniority	n	M	SD	df	F	Sig	Significant Difference (LSD)
Problems Derived from Educational	1.0-15 years	140	26,51	3,69	2; 292	17.160	0.000	1-2 1-3
	2.16-20 years	61	24,31	3,35				
	3.21 years and over	94	24,03	3,23				
Problems Derived from Administrative Staff	1.0-15 years	140	29,30	2,88	2; 292	3.895	0.021	1-2 1-3
	2.16-20 years	61	28,36	2,60				
	3.21 years and over	94	28,42	2,76				
Degree of Belief in Strategic Administration	1.0-15 years	140	16,59	1,69	2; 292	0.304	0.738	-
	2.16-20 years	61	16,39	2,07				
	3.21 years and over	94	16,46	1,73				
Issues encountered in Strategic Administration	1.0-15 years	140	134,76	12,74	2; 292	16.745	0.000	1-2 1-3
	2.16-20 years	61	128,31	11,08				
	3.21 years and over	94	126,24	10,12				

According to the results of the ANOVA test on whether teachers' perception on strategic planning changes depending on their years of experience, there is a significant difference in terms of "Internal Problems in Strategic Administration" dimension. Similarly, "External Problems in Strategic Administration" dimension also shows significant difference based on years of experience variable. Results suggest that there is a significant difference between scores of teachers with more than 15 years of experience, scores of teachers with teaching experience of 16 to 20 years and scores of teachers with more than 21 years of experience in the sub dimension of "Out of Institution Problems in Strategic Administration" of SAPS. On this sub dimension, while there is a significant difference between the scores of teachers with 16 years of experience and the scores of teachers with 15 or less years of experience, there is no statistically significant difference between scores of teachers with 21 and more years of experience. While there was a significant difference between those who have 21 years and over working experience, 15 years and those who had lower experience, there was no significant difference between the teachers who had 16-20 years of experience. Results of the data analysis show that there is a significant difference between the scores of teachers with 15 or less years of experience and scores of the rest of the teachers (16 years of experience and 16 to 20 years of experience) on sub dimension of "Problems Derived from Administrative Staff".

There was a significant difference between teachers who had 15 years and lower experience, teachers who had 16 years and over experience. There was a significant difference between the teachers who had 16-20 years of experience and the teachers who had different experiences.

On sub dimension of "Level of Belief in Strategic Administration", results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between any of the teachers based on years of experience variable. However, results show that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores from SAPS based on years of experience variable.

Results of the study "Administrators' Views on Strategic Planning Practices of Ministry of National Education", conducted by Bulut (2014), also present no significant difference in terms of years of experience variable similar to the current study. Moreover, Yıldırım's (2015) study, titled "Elementary and Secondary School Administrators' and Teachers' Perception of Strategic Plan", show no significant difference for the variable of years of experience. Level of education was not hold against any statistical analysis as a variable due to lack of adequate number of participants in every sub category (252 undergraduate, 33 graduate and 10 associate degree).

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

For successful strategic planning practices, administrators' and teachers' attitudes, knowledge and skills related to strategic planning is an essential part that cannot be dismissed. Results of the current study which aims to reveal perceptions of secondary school administrators and teachers about strategic planning, show that stakeholders of strategic planning are not working with a shared understanding of strategic planning and they do not show full participation to the process.

Results of this study indicate that school administrators think positively about strategic planning, they are aware of their responsibility, and they also think that the most effective role in strategic planning belongs to the school administration. However, it was also determined that administrators do not have any training on strategic planning and their perception that they do not have adequate knowledge, may obstruct their belief in strategic planning and may weaken their determination during the practice. Results of the current study support previous research studies conducted by Çalık (2003); Işık and Aypay (2004); Türk and Ünsal (2009); Cook, (1990); Dökmeci (2010); Ayrancı (2013).

Similarly, teachers who participated in this study hold positive ideas about strategic planning and they think that school administrators and school development administration team have more effective roles in application process of the strategic planning. This result indicates that school administration is not able to encourage collaboration or full participation of teachers regarding their perception about administration's directing, assigning and controlling the strategic planning process. In addition, the strong perception of teachers about the effective role of school

administration in strategic planning and application point out that participation of parents and students in strategic planning processes are inadequate.

Akbaba and Yıldızbaş (2016) state that parents and students show less participation in their study titled 'Views of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers on Strategic Planning Applications in Schools'. On the contrary, stakeholders' participation in strategic planning processes is an effective way to encourage people in the institution to interact in order to create a strategic understanding and enhance the institutions' strategic capability (Davies, 2006).

The public outcry about the deterioration in quality of public education necessitated the mandate for schools to develop strategic plans for school improvement (Chukwumah, 2015) in the study titled "Developing quality strategic plan in secondary schools for successful school improvement". This subject was supported by some researchers (Ajobiwe, 2008; Iyamu, 2005 & Titilayo, 2002) who noted gross dissatisfaction about the lack of quality education delivery and output in Nigerian education institutions. Therefore, planning and the ability to think strategically by planners, managers and employees alike, feed into the strategic plan document. The document is expected to provide well-justified answers to the strategic questions by stakeholders and should be used as a basis for communication (Chukwumah, 2015).

Teachers participated in the study, also state that they do not have sufficient knowledge and skills about strategic planning similar to administrators. Administrators' and teachers' lack of understanding about strategic planning in Turkey, causes problems, which obstruct strategic planning practices to gain successful results (Babaođlan, 2015).

Results of the study show that there is no significant difference between administrators' view on problems related to strategic planning and their years of experience. This result indicates that administrators are in agreement about the existence of the problems and they face similar problems and obstacles in strategic planning. Results from the views of teachers in the study also show that there is a significant difference between teachers' views on internal and external problems, problems derived from staff and administrators' and teachers' years of experience. This result may be related to their level of participation on strategic planning practices, knowledge and skills.

Zincirli (2012) concluded in his study titled "Evaluation of Strategic Planning Feasibility in Elementary Schools Based on Views of Administrators and Teachers and Reports" that increase in administrators' and teachers' years of experience results in positive attitudes towards strategic planning. Ekici (2015) also reached similar results about the correlation between years of experience and positive attitudes towards strategic planning. Results of the current study contradicts with previous research results. In his study Çetin (2012) found that teachers' years of experience has a statistically significant effect on their knowledge on strategic planning. In the same study statistical analysis showed that teachers with teaching experience of 30 years and more and teachers with teaching experience of 21 to 30 years have less knowledge than teachers with less experience. Therefore, Çetin (2012) concluded that increase in

years of experience causes negative attitudes towards strategic planning among teachers.

In the current study, internal problems administrators and teachers face in strategic administration are teachers' lack of knowledge on strategic administration, habits of institutional legislation, schools' economic struggles, lack of communication between stakeholders, lack of support for strategic administration practices and lack of support for staff during strategic planning. This result points out that process of making and implementing strategic planning is not functioning at desired level. It is considered more of a legal obligation far from strategic administration. Arslan and Küçükler (2016) revealed similar results which indicates that strategic planning cannot be used effectively in strategic administration because of similar problems in their study titled "Problems School Administrators Face in Planning Activities and Strategic Planning"

Recommendations

The importance of strategic planning should be emphasized and kept in the agenda as a priority by Ministry of National Education. In this context, along with Research and Development Divisions and strategic planning teams in City Education Council, specialists, who would be responsible for the strategic planning of schools, may determine the current situation in schools. In leadership of school administrators and teachers who are trained in strategic planning, conferences, seminars, and in-service educations programs may be organized to increase the knowledge of belief in strategic planning. Strategic planning teams and administrative boards may be found to carry the strategic plan in an effective way. Benefits such as extra payment or improvements in employee rights may be provided to encourage participation in strategic planning activities. Similar studies on problem in strategic administration may be conducted in other cities.

References

- Ajobiewe, J.A. (2008). Motivating the nigerian secondary school personnel for quality secondary education. Paper presented at the 51st Annual National Congress of ANCOPSS in Ekiti.
- Allison, M.K. (2005). *Strategic planning for nonprofit organizations. a practical guide and workbook* (2nd Edition). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Arabacı, İ. B. (2007). Stratejik planlamada amaç, misyon, vizyon ve örgütsel slogan gerçekleştirme düzeyini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma [A research on determining the accomplishment level of aim, mission, vision and organizational slogan in strategic planning (sample of Malatya)]. *A.Ü. Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(3), 85-98.
- Arslan, M. (2009). Yükseköğretimde stratejik planlama süreci [Strategic planning process in higher education]. *Millî Eğitim Dergisi*, 182.

- Arslan, G., & Küçükler, E. (2016). Okul müdürlerinin planlama etkinlikleri ve stratejik planlamada karşılaşılan sorunlar [Planning activities of school principals and problems encountered in strategic planning]. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 24(2), 839-856.
- Aydın, M. & Aksoy, S. (2007). Kamu kesiminde stratejik planlama ve çalışanlara yansımaları: Hacettepe Üniversitesi örneği [Strategic planning in the public sector and its reflections upon employees: The case of Hacettepe University]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, (1), 293-322.
- Ayrancı, G. (2013). *Okul yöneticilerinin stratejik planlama ve uygulama süreçlerine ilişkin görüşlerinin incelenmesi (Kadıköy ilçesi örneği)* [The examination of school administrators' opinions regarding to the processes of strategic planning and implementation procedure (Kadıköy district sample)] (Unpublished master thesis). Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Aypay, A. (2015). *Araştırma yöntemleri desen ve analiz*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Babaoğlu, E. (2015). Strategic planning in education in Turkey. *The Journal of the International Society for Educational Planning*, 2(22), 35-39.
- Balcı, A., Çanakçı, H. & Tan, Ç. (2012). Elazığ İli, ilköğretim okullarında hazırlanan stratejik planlar ile ilgili okul yöneticisi ve öğretmen Görüşleri [The views of school administrators and teachers related to the strategic plans prepared at primary schools in Elazığ city]. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 39(11), 385-394.
- Balkar, B and Ekici, R.(2015). İlkokullardaki stratejik planlama uygulamaları ve örgütsel iletişim arasındaki ilişkinin öğretmen görüşleri doğrultusunda İncelenmesi. [The examination of connection between strategic planning applications in elementary schools and organizational communication in the direction of teachers' views]. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 10(11), 215-23.
- Başaran, İ.E., & Çınkır, Ş. (2012). *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi*. Ankara: Ekinoks Yayıncılık.
- Bell, L., (2002). Strategic planning and school management: Full of sound and fury, signifying nothing? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 407-424.
- Brews, P. J., & Hunt, M. R., (1999). Learning to plan and planning to learn: Resolving the planning school/learning school debate. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20, 889-913.
- Bryson, J. M. (2004). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Bryson, J. M., & Alston, F. K. (1996). *Creating and implementing your strategic plan: A workbook for public and nonprofit organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Bryson, J. (2011). *Strategic planning for public and non-profit organizations* (Rev. Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bulut, H. (2014). *Yöneticilerin milli eğitim bakanlığı stratejik planlama uygulamalarına yönelik değerlendirmeleri (Tekirdağ İli Örneği) [Ministry of education of managers for evaluation of strategic planning applications (An example of Tekirdağ province)]* (Unpublished master thesis). Okan Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi
- Clarke, A. (2007). *A handbook for school management and leadership*. Cape Town: Kate McCallum.
- Cook, W., J. (1990). Strategic planning in amerika's scholl: an explotory study. A Paper Presented at The Annual Meeting of the AERA. San Francisco, CA: April, 20-24.
- Çalık, T. (2003). Eğitimde stratejik planlama ve okulların stratejik plan açısından nitel değerlendirilmesi [Strategical planning in education and the qualitative evaluation of the schools as regards to strategical planning]. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 11(2), 251-258.
- Çelik, V. (1994). Etkili bir okul için stratejik yönetim [Strategic management for an effective school]. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 13, 28-34.
- Çetin, H. (2012). *Eğitim kurumlarında stratejik planlama bilinç düzeyi ve stratejik yönetimde karşılaşılan sorunlar: Denizli ilinde bir araştırma [The level of strategic planning conciousnus and strategic management problems in the educational institutions; a research in the provience of Denizli]* (Unpublished master thesis). Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Isparta.
- Chukwumah, F.O. (2015). Developing quality strategic plan in secondary schools for successful school improvement. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(21), 137.
- Çoban, B., & Karakaya, Y.E. (2010). Geleceği planlamada stratejik yönetim ve swot analizi: Kavramsal yaklaşımlar. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 5, 342-352.
- Davies, B. (2006). *Leading the strategically focused school: Success and sustainability*. London EC1Y 1SP: Sage Publications Limited.
- Davies, B. (2006) Processes not plans are the key to strategic development. *Management in Education*, 20(11), 11-15.
- Demir, C., & Yılmaz, M.K., (2010). Stratejik planlama süreci ve örgütler açısından önemi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1), 69-88.
- Dinçer, Ö. (2007). *Stratejik yönetim ve işletme politikası* (8. Baskı), İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

- Dökmeci, Y. (2010). *İlköğretim okullarında stratejik planlama (Uşak ili örneği) [Strategic planning in primary schools (Uşak province case)]* (Unpublished master thesis). Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- DPT. (2006). Kamu idareleri için stratejik planlama kılavuzu, 2. Sunum, Başbakanlık, Haziran 2006.
- Ereş, F. (2004). Eğitim yönetiminde stratejik planlama. *Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15, 21-29.
- Erdfelder, E, Faul, F., & Buchner, A. (1996). GPOWER: A general power analysis program. *Behavior Research Methods Instruments & Computers*, 28, 1-11.
- Freeman J. (2008). Management tip: co-op boards demonstrate leadership through strategic planning process. *Rural Cooperatives*, 24-25.
- Glanz, J. (2006). *What every principal should know about strategic leadership*. Corwin: Sage Publication.
- Güçlü, N. (2003). Stratejik yönetim [Strategic management]. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(2), 61-85.
- Gürer, H. (2006). Stratejik planlamanın temelleri ve Türk kamu yönetiminde uygulanmasına yönelik öneriler [The Principles of Strategic Planning and Proposals for the Implementation in Turkish Public Administration]. *Sayıştay Dergisi*, (63), 91-105.
- John M, B. (2004). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations*. USA: Jossey-Bass.
- Iyamu, E.O. (2005). Parents' and Teachers' Perception of selection as a Factor of quality in the Curriculum Process in Nigeria. *International Educational Journal*, 6(1), 96-103.
- Karasar, N. (2006). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (16. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kaufman, J.L., & Jacobs, H.M. (1987). A public planning perspective on strategic planning. *APA Journal*, 23-33.
- Kocatepe, Ş. (2010). *Eğitimde stratejik planlama ve toplam kalite uygulamalarının okul yöneticileri tarafından algılaması [The perceptions of strategic planning in education and total quality management applications by school managers]* (Unpublished master thesis). Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Küçüksüleymanoğlu, R. (2008). Stratejik planlama süreci. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 16(2), 403-412.
- Işık, H., & Apay, A. (2004). Eğitimde stratejik plan geliştirme sürecinde karşılaşılan sorunlar: çanakkale ilinde yapılan bir çalışma [Problems faced in the process of strategic planning in education: A study conducted in Çanakkale]. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24(3), 349-363.

- Lingam, G., Lingam, N., & Raghunwaiya, K. (2014). Effectiveness of school strategic planning: the case of fujian schools. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 8(7), 2119-2125.
- Martinelli, F. (1999). *Strategic planning in nonprofit and public sector organizations*. Milwaukee: Learning Institute for Nonprofit Organizations.
- Memduhođlu, H. B. & Uçar, İ. H. (2012). Yönetici ve öğretmenlerin stratejik planlama algısı ve okullarda mevcut stratejik planlama uygulamalarının değerlendirilmesi [The perception of administrators and teachers about strategical planning and evaluation of current strategical planning practices at schools]. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(23), 234-256.
- Middlewood, S., & Lumby, M. (2007). *Strategic management in schools and colleges*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Mintzberg, H. (1994). The fall and rise of strategic planning. *Harvard Business Review*, 107-114.
- Molale, I. S. (2007). *How policy travels? An insight into the politics of implementation* (1st ed.). Mafikeng: Mosipidi Management.
- Narinođlu, A. (2009). *Yerel yönetimlerde stratejik yönetim ve planlama*. İstanbul: Mart Matbaacılık.
- OECD. (2017). *Education at a Glance 2017: OECD Indicators*, Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved October 9, 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2017-en>
- Radin, B. A. (2000). The government performance and results act and the tradition of federal management reform: square pegs in round holes. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(1), 111-135.
- Shapiro, J. (2010). *Toolkit on overview of strategic planning*. Washington: Olive Publication. Retrieved July 10, 2017 from <http://www.civicus.org>.
- Stahl, M., & Grigsby, C. (1992). *Strategic management formulation and implementation*. Boston: Kent Publishing Company.
- Şahin, S., & Aslan, N. (2008). İlköğretim okul yöneticilerinin stratejik planlamaya ilişkin görüşleri üzerine nitel bir çalışma (Gaziantep ili örneđi) [A qualitative study on the opinions of secondary school principals regarding strategic planning]. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(1), 172-189.
- Şener, T. (2009). *Eđitimde stratejik planlama* [strategic planning in education] (Unpublished master thesis). Kadir Has Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Titilayo, H. (2002). *Secondary education in Nigeria: A boat on a stormy sea*. Keynote Address delivered to the 45th Annual National Congress of All Nigeria Conference of Principals of Secondary Schools, Abeokuta: ANCOSS.

- Türk, E., & Ünsal, N. (2009). Milli eğitim bakanlığı üst düzey yöneticilerinin stratejik planlama konusundaki görüşleri [The views of top-level administrators of the ministry of national education on strategic planning] *Milli Eğitim, Eğitim ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 181, 222-239.
- Wolf, C., & Floyd, S.W., (2013). Strategic planning research: toward a theory driven agenda. *Journal of Management*, 20(10), 1-35.
- Yazıcıoğlu, Y., & Erdoğan, S. (2004). *Spss uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Yelken, T. Y., Kılıç F., & Üredi, L. (2010). Stratejik planlama uygulamalarına ilişkin ilk ve orta öğretim okul müdürlerinin görüşleri [Strategic planning implementation manager on the view of primary and secondary schools]. *Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1(1), 3850.
- Yenipınar, Ş., & Akgün, N. (2017). Stratejik yönetimin ilköğretim kurumlarında uygulanması [Implementation of the strategic management in primary schools]. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17 (2), 1039-1060.
- Zincirli, M. (2012). *İlköğretim okullarında stratejik planlamanın uygulanabilirliğinin yönetici- öğretmen görüşleri ve izleme raporlarına göre değerlendirilmesi [The evaluation of practicability of strategic planning in primary schools according to administrators-teachers views and monitoring reports]* (Unpublished master thesis). Fırat Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Elazığ.

Ortaöğretimde Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerin Stratejik Yönetimde Karşılaştıkları Sorunlar

Atf:

- Ada, S. (2018). The problems that secondary school administrators' and teachers' face regarding strategic administration. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 78, 159-182, DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2018.78.8

Özet

Problem Durumu: Türkiye’de ilk ve orta dereceli okullarda yasal bir zorunluluk olarak yapılan stratejik planlama ve uygulama çalışmaları okulun amaçlarını gerçekleştirmede, etkili okul gelişiminde stratejik yönetimin önemli bir aracıdır. Stratejik yönetim ve stratejik planlamaya ilişkin yönetici ve öğretmenlerin algısı, tutumları, yaşadıkları güçlükler ile ilgili yapılan araştırmalar, stratejik yönetim sürecinin daha etkili uygulanmasında büyük öneme sahiptir. Yüksek başarıyı ve eğitimde kaliteyi hedef alan stratejik planların yönetim sürecinde karşılaşılan güçlüklerin kaynağını tespit etmek ve çözüm yolları geliştirmek mevcut stratejik planların süreç içerisinde iyileştirilmesinde paydaşlara kolaylık sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Ortaokullarda çalışan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin stratejik planlamaya ilişkin algılarını belirlemek amacıyla yapılan bu çalışmada şu sorulara cevap aranmaktadır.

1. Ortaokul yöneticilerinin stratejik planlama düşüncesine ilişkin algıları nasıldır?
2. Stratejik plan algısı ortaokul yöneticilerinin kıdemlerine göre farklılaşmakta mıdır?
3. Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin stratejik planlama ilişkin algıları nasıldır?
4. Stratejik plan algısı ortaokul öğretmenlerinin kıdemlerine göre farklılaşmakta mıdır?
5. Ortaokul yönetici ve öğretmenlerinin stratejik planlama algıları, yönetici ve öğretmenlere göre farklılaşmakta mıdır?

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden tarama deseninde yürütülen araştırmanın çalışma grubunu, Erzurum il merkezinde görev yapan ve seçkisiz örneklem yöntemi ile belirlenmiş 88 yönetici ve 295 öğretmen öğretmende oluşturmaktadır. Veri Analizi: Araştırma sonucunda elde edilen veri ve bilgiler, amaçlar doğrultusunda SPSS22.0 programı yardımıyla analiz edilmiştir. Araştırma verilerinin çözümlenmesinde Yüzde, Aritmetik Ortalama, Standart Sapma, Çarpıklık (Skewness) ve Basıklık (Kurtosis), T-testi, Tek Yönlü Varyans Analizi (ANOVA), Tukey HSD çoklu karşılaştırma testi kullanılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Araştırmaya katılan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin stratejik yönetime yönelik algılarına ilişkin dağılımlar incelendiğinde stratejik uygulama sürecinde rol paylaşımında en etkin rolün okul yönetimine ait olduğu yönünde ortak bir algının olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Yöneticilerin stratejik planlama algılarına ilişkin dağılımlarda en düşük puanlar planlama konusunda yeterli eğitim almadıkları yönünde olmasına rağmen yöneticiler, stratejik planlama hakkındaki bilgi düzeyleri boyutundaki algı ortalamaları açısından kendilerinin yeterli bilgi düzeyine sahip olduklarını belirtmektedirler. Yöneticilerin stratejik planlama hakkındaki olumsuz tutum düzeyleri ile ilgili görüşleri incelendiğinde yöneticiler stratejik planlama hakkında olumsuz düşüncelerinin olmadığı, stratejik planlama uygulama süreci rol paylaşımı hakkındaki tutum düzeylerine ilişkin görüşleri orta düzeyde olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Yöneticilerin stratejik planlamaya olan inançları hakkındaki tutum düzeyleri ile ilgili görüşleri incelendiğinde yöneticiler stratejik planlamaya olan inançlarının olumlu yönde olduklarını belirtmektedirler.

Öğretmenlerin stratejik planlama algılarına ilişkin dağılımlar incelendiğinde; en düşük puan ortalamaları stratejik planlama konusunda yeterli eğitim almadıkları ve konuya ilişkin yeterli bilgiye sahip olmadıkları yönündedir. Öğretmenlerin stratejik planlama hakkındaki olumsuz tutum düzeyleri ile ilgili görüşleri incelendiğinde, stratejik planlama hakkında olumsuz düşüncelerinin olmadığı, stratejik planlama uygulama süreci rol paylaşımı hakkındaki tutum düzeyleri ilişkin görüşlerinin orta düzeyde olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Öğretmenlerin stratejik planlamaya olan inançları hakkındaki tutum düzeyleri ile ilgili görüşleri incelendiğinde stratejik planlamaya olan inançlarının olumlu yönde olduğu belirlenmiştir. Stratejik yönetimde karşılaşılan

sorunlara ilişkin yöneticilerin algı düzeyi kıdemlerine göre farklılık göstermezken öğretmenlerin stratejik planlamaya yönelik algıları tüm kıdem yılları arasında anlamlı bir farklılık görülmüştür.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Öneriler: Ortaokullarda görev yapan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin stratejik planlamaya ilişkin algılarını belirlemek amacıyla yapılan araştırmanın bulguları stratejik planlama konusunda paydaşların ortak anlayış içinde ve tam katılımlı hareket etmediklerini göstermektedir. Yapılan araştırmada okul yöneticileri ve öğretmenler stratejik planlamaya yönelik olumlu bir algıya sahip olup stratejik planlama çalışmalarında en etkin rolün okul yönetimine ait olduğunu düşünmektedirler. Araştırmaya katılan yönetici ve öğretmenler, stratejik planlama ve uygulama çalışmalarına ilişkin yeterli bilgi ve beceriye sahip olmadıkları yönünde kendilerini değerlendirmektedirler. Stratejik yönetimde karşılaşılan sorunlara ilişkin yöneticilerin algı düzeyi kıdemlerine göre farklılık göstermezken öğretmenlerin stratejik planlamaya yönelik algıları kıdemlerine göre anlamlı bir farklılık göstermektedir.

Araştırmada ortaya çıkan bu sonuçlar ışığında il milli eğitim müdürlüklerinde oluşturulmuş bulunan ARGE ya da stratejik planlama ekibinin dışında her an okulların stratejik planlama etkinlikleriyle ilgilenecek uzman personelin okullarda durum tespitinde bulunulabilir. Okul yöneticilerinden başlanarak okullardaki stratejik planlama ve okullarda bu konuda daha bilgili olanların öğretmenlere çeşitli konferans, seminer, hizmet içi eğitim yoluyla stratejik planlama bilgisi ve inancı artırılabilir. Okullarda amaçlara uygun bir şekilde stratejik planlama ekipleri ve stratejik planlama üst kurulları kurulmalı ve etkin bir şekilde çalıştırılmalı. Eğitim Örgütlerinde stratejik planlama uygulamalarına katılıp özverili bir şekilde çalışan personeller ek ödeme ya da özlük haklarında iyileştirme gibi araçlarla ödüllendirilebilir. Okullarda velilerinde stratejik planlama uygulamalarına katılmaları sağlanıp deneyim ve görüşlerinden yararlanılabilir. Katılımcı veya işbirliğine dayalı stratejik düşünmeyi teşvik eden katılımcı liderlik stratejileri bağlamında stratejik planlama yaklaşımları geliştirilebilir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Strateji, stratejik yönetim, stratejik planlama, okul yöneticisi, öğretmen, ortaöğretim.