

## WHO DRIVES EDUCATIONAL CHANGE: SCHOOL OR SOCIETY?

**Sinem Vatanartiran**

*(Corresponding Author)*

Bahçeşehir University

Faculty of Educational Sciences

Istanbul, Turkey

Email: [sinem.vatanartiran@es.bahcesehir.edu.tr](mailto:sinem.vatanartiran@es.bahcesehir.edu.tr),

**Deniz Örucü**

Başkent University

Faculty of Education

Department of Educational Sciences

Ankara, Turkey

### ABSTRACT

**T**he purpose of this paper is to discuss and yield further insight into the consequential conflicting relationship between the societal and educational change as well as the required leadership to lead this necessary educational change. Upon the recent dramatic changes in the society, this paper tries to discuss the functions of education and necessary educational leadership for change. The administrative, educational and social processes should be reconsidered to tackle genuine transformation.

**Design/methodology/approach** A conceptual exploration of the essential concepts and literature regarding the purpose is employed to lead the discussion about the conflicting relationship between the purpose of education, society, educational leadership and the intended change.

**Findings** The consequential relationship between the society and education systems seems to be problematic. The expected outcome of education is supposed to transform the society for better, however, the existing administrative systems and the relevant standardization movements around the globe clash with the so-called transformational power of education, whereby the existing macro system creates no room for transformational leadership practices on the side of the educational administrators to lead change both in the school contexts and in the society.

**Practical implications** There is a need to let principals and other administrators transform their individual schools both to transmit necessary skills to survive successfully in the society, and also to educate them in such a way to lead the change in the future. To respond to societal and educational change appropriately, rethinking and redesigning the school systems is necessary.

**Keywords:** purpose of education, societal change, educational change, transformational leadership, centralization, decentralization

## Introduction

21st century is the "Knowledge Economy" which requires "Knowledge Society" as Drucker (1969) anticipated long ago in his seminal work, *Age of Discontinuity*. Three main characteristics of the knowledge society that we currently live in are a borderless world, upward mobility and the potential for quick failure as well as quick success (Drucker, 2001). Friedman (2005) argued that Drucker's "next society" has arrived and the following events and innovations have rapidly and dramatically redistributed economic advantage around the globe, which in a way flattened the world:

1. Fall of Berlin Wall
2. Netscape – first mainstream web browser goes public
3. Workflow software – standardized applications, PayPal, eBay, et al.
4. Open-sourcing – Adobe Acrobat Readers, Linux
5. Outsourcing – Y2K, spin-off functions to India
6. Offshoring – China in the World Trade Organization, capital flows to find cheap labor
7. Supply-chaining - Wal-Mart retailer to manufacturers
8. Insourcing – UPS services linked to shipping
9. In-forming – “Google-like” intelligent searches and data mining
10. “The Steroids” – wireless mobile digital communication

Obviously, this flattened world that has brought about many upheavals and change has surrounded governments and organizations that has led to a deep societal shift. Inevitably, education systems and educational leadership are affected by the larger system in regard to its functions. As Simsek (2013) put forward, the demands of rapid social, political and economic changes in the post-industrial knowledge economy require reforms on educational systems around the world. From a Deweyan stance, the desired change process should be the notion that society is constantly changing, and that education reflects, generates, and guides the social change (Dewey, 1907). On the other hand, Durkheim's rejection of the idea that "education could be the force to transform society and resolve social ills" stands as the contradictory standpoint. Durkheim asserted that education “can be reformed only if society itself is reformed” and argues that education “is only the image and reflection of society. It imitates and reproduces the latter it does not create it” (Durkheim, 1897/1951: 372-373).

This is the paradox this paper will be built upon. To clarify more, the purpose of this paper is to further elaborate on a thesis by Simsek in his keynote address at the 20<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of European Network for Improving Research and Development in Educational Leadership and Management (ENIRDELM) in the Fall of 2012 (Simsek, 2013). In his speech, he asserted that the idea of “transformational leadership” has a wide acceptance among the education scholars. In scholarly journals around the world, he asserts, educators are after securing concrete research evidence that leadership (that is, transformational leadership) has a capacity to change schools from inside out. He extensively delved into how this expectation turns around to be a fantasy when the nature of education is investigated with its organic relationship with economy, culture, and politics in a society. His final statement is short enough: Schools are dependent variables in their relation with the society; whereby expecting transformational leadership practices to transform schools, and in turn schools to transform the society is a delusion. Departing from Simsek’s main arguments, we intend to discuss and yield further insight into the consequential relationship between the societal and educational change as well as the required leadership to lead this necessary educational change. The main dilemma to be probed into is whether education leads the changes in the society to make it a better one or the societal changes so far have pushed education to transform its systems and leadership to keep up with the new order, needs, and expectations in the society.

## The Purpose of Education

Public education is “a moral endeavor, serving both the individual and the common” (Goodlad, 2000, p. 86). As expressed by Goldberg and Morrison (2003, p. 61), the most obvious purpose for schooling is to prepare young people for a lifetime of learning, productive work, and responsible citizenship. This function of schooling is vital to nations’ economy, democracy, and a vital individual right for all. Various writers explicated functions of schooling (Goodlad, 2000, Sadker & Sadker, 2000, Ballantine, 2001). Goodlad (1984) defines four broad goals of schooling as academic; vocational - readiness for the world of work and economic responsibilities; social and civic - skills and behavior for participating in a complex democratic society; and personal, based on his examination of a wide range of documents over 300 years of history.

Sadker and Sadker (2000) summarize these purposes under two general headings: transmitting society’s knowledge and values (passing the cultural baton) and reconstructing society (schools as tools for change). The first purpose is expressed by society’s vital interest as to what schools do and how they do it. It is an agreed situation that schools reflect and promote society’s values by selecting what to teach. This selection obviously creates a cultural message. Each country chooses the curriculum to match and advance its own view of history, its own values, its self-interests, and its own culture (Sadker & Sadker, 2000, p. 140). This is frequently labeled as political or ideological function of schools. As society transmits its culture, it also transmits a view of the world. The second purpose of schooling is about reconstructing the whole society. Society needs reconstruction because the world is contaminated with problems like poverty, hunger, injustice, terrorism, pollution, overpopulation, racism, sexism, ethical challenges, and threats of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. According to Sadker & Sadker (2000, p. 141), reconstructionism views schools as instruments of change, a way that society can address and correct these economic and social ills. This is in line with Harris’s (2009) suggestion that “for many politicians and policy makers, schools are the worst problem and the best solution. They are the best solution because of their potential to secure social change and reform (p. 63).

Ballantine’s (2001) functions of schools are very much alike with the previously discussed purposes. He lists four functions for schools as socialization, transmission of culture, social control and personal development, and selecting, training and placement of individuals in society (p. 27). To sum up all of these ideas in the broadest sense, it could be said that schools have political, social, economic, and intellectual purposes (Sadovnik, Cookson, & Semel, 2006, p. 24; Bennett & LeCompte, 1990, pp. 5-21).

Ultimately, the purposes of education are directed at conceptions of what constitutes the “good life” and a “good person” – questions that have been at the center of philosophical inquiry from Plato to Aristotle, Marx, Freud, and Dewey (Sadovnik, Cookson, & Semel, 2006, p. 24). These purposes sometimes contradict with each other, as well. For example, how can schools teach higher-order thinking skills, such as critical thinking and evaluation, but also simultaneously engender patriotism and conformity to society’s rules? Another striking example would be the Fall of the Berlin Wall, as mentioned as a flattener by Friedman. The Fall of the Wall was not because of the societal changes drove by education; on the contrary, education was functioning its traditional purpose of passing the cultural baton, as phrased by Sadker and Sadker. Cremin (1977, p. 37) pointed out that “schooling, like education in general- never liberates without at the same time limiting. It never empowers without at the same time constraining. It never frees without at the same time socializing”. The question here, then, as suggested by Cremin, is not “whether one or the other is occurring in isolation but what the balance is, and to what end, and in light of what alternatives”. At this point, it is important to ask who controls these limits. As will be further discussed, nations create educational systems to control these limitations and liberations at various levels by centralizing or decentralizing their systems at different levels.

Goldberg and Morrison (2003, p. 57) rightfully states that “for many reasons – economic, social, demographic, and technological – American nation has been engaged for more than 20 years in an intense and historic debate concerning the state of public education, the purposes of public schools, and strategies and policies that may help to change our schools for the better”. They believe that there is a general agreement that many schools are failing to adequately prepare all students for life in a modern democratic society. In this respect, they suggest asking the following questions, which are also supportive of the dilemma discussed in this paper:

- What kind of educational results really matter – what is the purpose of institutions of public education from the perspectives of the stakeholders the school serves?
- What kinds of accountability processes and strategies for change are most likely to help schools fulfill their purpose in the eyes of their stakeholders?
- What kinds of reform and leadership are required to develop and sustain these processes in schools? (Goldberg and Morrison, 2003, p. 60)

To answer these challenging questions, the relationship between society and education systems and the counter impact they emphasize on each other in terms of the change process might be well comprehended through Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) conceptual understanding of sociological paradigms in organizational analysis. There exist two dimensions stated for the analysis of social theory: nature of science and nature of society. Assumptions about the nature of society can be thought of in terms of two dimensions: regulation and radical change. The sociology of regulation is concerned with the need for regulation in human affairs; the basic questions it asks focus on the need to understand why society is maintained as an entity. On the other hand, sociology of radical change attempts to find explanations for radical change, deep-seated conflict, modes of domination and structural contradiction that the theorists see as the characteristics of modern society.

Based on this background, the political perspectives on education have mostly been expressed with three different approaches: conservative, liberal and radical. The conservative view looks at social evolution as a process that enables the strongest individuals and/or groups to survive, and looks at human and social evolution as adaptation to changes in the social environment in order to survive, and human progress is dependent on individual initiative and drive (Sadovnik, Cookson, & Semel, 2006, p. 26). The conservative perspective also expects schools to provide necessary education so that the most talented and hard-working individuals are equipped with tools necessary to maximize economic and social productivity. In this respect, they see the school’s function as one of transmitting the cultural traditions through what is taught (the curriculum). The idea goes back to the very notion of Darwin’s “Survival of the Fittest” and it is essential that any education system, which is ideally supposed to transform the society positively, be able to manage the change processes to survive and to continue to cater for the needs of the society it serves. Educational reforms are implemented around the globe as a number of emerging social, economic and technological factors force organizations to renew themselves. The liberal perspective, on the other hand, stresses the school’s role in providing the necessary education to ensure that *all* students have an *equal* opportunity to succeed in society. Liberals stress the importance of educated citizenry in a democratic society. Lastly, the radical perspective argues that the school’s role is to reproduce the unequal economic conditions of the capitalist economy and to socialize individuals to accept the legitimacy of the society (Sadovnik, et al., 2006).

As could be seen as the common ground of all these perspectives, schools are expected to generate value for their communities, and for the society at large, in the form of *human capital* and *social capital* (Goldberg and Morrison, 2003, p. 62). The human capital means the growing skills and knowledge of the members of the community and social capital means the strengthening of collaborative relationships and trust among the school and outside individuals and organizations. However, Bourdieu's (1974) theory of cultural reproduction poses a contradictory situation. Bourdieu stated that cultural capital consists of familiarity with the dominant culture in a society, and especially the ability to understand and use 'educated' language and the possession of cultural capital varies with social class, yet the education system assumes the possession of cultural capital. He claims that social inequalities are legitimated by the educational credentials held by those in dominant positions. This means that the education system has a key role in maintaining the status quo (as cited in Sullivan, 2002).

From this stance, the change process in education could be construed through either regulation or radical change, or both. Educational systems are highly "regularized" ones that attempt to "modify" social, cultural and ideological aspects of society. A contradictory situation appears at this point that leads to question whether schools are the settings to preserve the status quo, social order, consensus, social integration, solidarity, and actuality as characterized by structural functionalists or they are the places to impose radical change on the society to survive. Levin's (1974; cited in Simsek, 2013) "principle of correspondence" might be a reference in tackling this conflict. He asserted that schools reproduce the existing society rather than change it, which brings up questioning the efficiency of educational reforms. According to him, educational reform initiatives can continue as long as they do not threaten the "dominant ideology". Greenfield's elaboration on the alternative bases of understanding social reality might also serve as a standpoint in elucidating this conflicting process. From a naturalist point of view, social reality is ordered and governed by a uniform set of values and made possible only by those values. On the other hand, with human intervention, social reality appears as conflicted and it is governed by the values of people with access to power (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993). As education is a social phenomenon, the social reality related with the society and educational change could also be questioned in this respect. The dilemma which arises at this point is supportive of the contradiction discussed above, whereby the meaning of education, educational change and society concepts would differ considering Greenfield's distinction in the interpretation of social reality. The complex nature of the present society and the relevant educational change and reform efforts seem to pertain to the latter one which values human intervention in the construction of social reality.

Furthermore, Bourdieu's theory of "educational reproduction" is congruent with, or might be regarded as the corollary of Levin's principle of correspondence in scrutinizing the relationship of society and educational change. If the education system maintains the status quo and the dominant ideology within the frame of sociology of regulation and different forms of interpretation of social reality, then is it possible to expect the education systems or schools to transform the society? Hargreaves (1994) recapitulates on this as follows:

On the one hand is an increasingly postindustrial, postmodern world, characterized by accelerating change, intense compression of time and space, cultural diversity, technological complexity, national insecurity and scientific uncertainty. Against this stands a modernistic, monolithic school system that continues to pursue deeply anachronistic purposes within opaque and inflexible structures (p. 3).

In this respect, an overview of cross-cultural evidence and implementations are important to be discussed, as globalization is a phenomenon affecting the whole world. For instance, evidence from the US shows that for the last 40 years, manufacturing jobs have become automated or moved overseas. Whereas in 1967, more than half (54%) of the country's economic output was in the production of material goods and delivery of material services (such as transportation, construction, and retailing), by 1997, nearly two-thirds (63%) was in the production of information products (such as computers, books, televisions, and software) and the provision of information services (such as telecommunications, financial services, and education). Information services alone grew from about one-third to more than half of the economy during that 30-year period (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 4). Carnevale and Desrochers's report (cited in Wagner & Kegan, 2006, p. 5) written for Educational Testing Services summarizes the key competencies needed by workers in today's new economy as follows: Basic skills (reading, writing, and mathematics), foundation skills (knowing how to learn), communication skills (listening and oral communication), adaptability (creative thinking and problem solving), group effectiveness (interpersonal skills, negotiation, and teamwork), influence (organizational effectiveness and leadership), personal management (self-esteem and motivation/goal setting), attitude (positive cognitive style) and applied skills (occupational and professional competencies).

If the purpose of education is to prepare citizens to become successful members of society, educators have to educate all students with these new skills. This is a new challenge for educators, because "we have not had to educate all students to this skill level before", as expressed by Wagner & Kegan (2006, p. 6); the problem educators face now extends even beyond the "all students, new skills" challenge.

### **Controlling the Power**

Darling-Hammond (2010) argues that the school system designed between 1900 and 1920 was for other sets of skills. That system was based on the factory model then made popular by Henry Ford's assembly line. The notion was that one could organize all of the facts needed into a set body of knowledge and divide it up neatly into the 12 years of schooling, doling out the information through graded textbooks, and testing it regularly. By the 1950s, "modern" methods allowed the accrual of knowledge to be evaluated with multiple-choice tests that could be scored exclusively by machine, without involvement of teachers or the complications of asking students to produce and defend their own ideas (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 4). She claims that some nations are more able to transform their school systems to meet these new demands. Such a system that claims to teach all students the same skills would definitely require the control of decision-making at a higher level in the bureaucratic hierarchy. Most educational systems break down the decision making into two types: centralized and decentralized (Ingersoll, 1994, p. 150).

In every system, there are centers of power where decision-making takes place. Some gives the power in one central place and some distribute it among parts of a system (e.g. superintendent, principal, and teacher). Who should make decisions for whom, and at what level (Barr and Dreeben, 1983)? The binary opposition which lies here is that the demands of the 21st century knowledge society are not fully fulfilled with the current educational system and leadership practices. Elmore (1993) supports this conflict by stating that public school bureaucracy, school reformers widely agree, has become too large, too inefficient, and too unresponsive (p. 34). As a consequence of the growth of centralized school bureaucracies, schools have become mired in rules and cut off from their clients – students, parents, and community members. Ambitious, if not radical, reforms are required to rectify this situation. As a highly centralized governance model, Turkey can be given as an example. In U.S. education system, however, there are several reform

movements like site-based decision-making, charter schools, and grants from the federal and state government to individual schools, which all try to encourage a more decentralized, school-by-school approach. However, despite these new models, Murphy and Datnow (2003) claim that the relationship between districts and schools has not changed much. Very few principals know the amount of their school's annual budget, much less control or manage it. There is still a pervasive passivity in most schools, a belief that the real power is in the district office, and that eventually the district will tell the school what to do, or perhaps shut the school down, or decide to turn it from a neighborhood elementary to a K-8 magnet school (p. 27).

In spite of the fact that the Anglo-Saxon model of decentralized system of the US highly differs from that of Turkey's Napoleonic centralized governance model, the picture still remains similar. In their nominal writing, Simsek and Yildirim (2004) described the state of Turkish context as follows:

"The French education model has been the most influential model in Turkey since the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. The Turkish system currently (in 2004: authors' note) is 'more French than the French system' because the French model has experienced significant changes during the past twenty years (p.155)."

Turkish education system is centralized, which is built upon the fact that almost all decision-making is centralized in the Ministry of Education, the only exceptions involving teaching methods and pupil assessment, where provincial-level education offices, and schools themselves, have some flexibility (Davutyan, Demir and Polat, 2009). Furthermore, higher education institutions (universities, vocational training institutes etc.) can operate under the authority of the Council of Higher Education (HEC) in a number of issues such as recruitment and student enrollments, which is a further signifier of the centralized system. In the Turkish context, the relevant literature asserts that both centralized and decentralized systems preserve advantages and disadvantages. Therefore, the tendency is towards maintaining a good balance of both forms to be implemented regarding the specific conditions and needs of the country (Turkoglu, 2004). Similarly, centralization and decentralization have both been defended on the grounds of their presumed contribution to efficiency, planning, their relation to increased democracy, and an ideal relationship between the functions of the state and the market from the opinions of local elites points in the European context (DeVries, 2000). Obviously, centralization and decentralization processes in anywhere have an impact on education systems at all levels, which lead one to raise questions. Yet, in centralized education systems, educational change and reform efforts are likely to result in slow transformation on the society.

Moos (2009) asserts that in line with some centralization initiatives there are tendencies in educational policies towards demanding that educational systems as well as educational practice and leadership be based on rigorous evidence. Hence, decentralization proponents in the field of education argue that the technology of teaching is complex and dynamic and that decision-making about what goes on in the classroom should therefore be located with the classroom teacher, or at least somewhere within the school. Proponents also assert that teachers understand, better than central authorities, the requirements of the classroom teaching and learning process. Proponents also presume that the autonomy and discretion of lower-level units, meaning schools and the actors within them, are constrained by higher authorities. If these constraints were lifted, it is argued, and schools (particularly teachers) were empowered to use with more discretion the information that they possess, then they would do things differently and better (Hannaway, 1993, p. 137). This discussion, in fact, sheds light perfectly in the current state and reform endeavors in

Turkish education system. Due to the centralized bureaucracy, schools do not have enough space even to control their own budgets, do modifications in their curriculum or teacher recruitment. Every single process is determined by the Ministry; therefore, the reform initiatives are slow.

Moreover, restructuring reforms and adaptation to change in higher education in the process of EU candidation pose some issues to be considered (Grossman, Onkol & Sands, 2007). Bologna Process in Europe can be one example of the conflict. As explicated by Kwiek (2004), The Bologna Process of creating the European Higher Education Area and the simultaneous emergence of the European Research Area can be viewed as two sides of the same coin: that of the redefinition of the roles, missions, tasks, and obligations of the institution of the university in Europe's rapidly changing and increasingly market-driven and knowledge-based societies and economies. The question here is to what extent the Bologna Process as part of the education-for-all-efforts will be effective in terms of handling societal transformation. By standardizing the curriculum and course credits in universities around Europe, it, in fact, leads to isomorphism, which lacks originality and uniqueness that is likely to produce more innovation and transformation. In this respect, if everything is standardized, it is not realistic to expect the education system to transform the society and reconstruct it. If the education system maintains the status quo and the dominant ideology within the frame of sociology of regulation and different forms of interpretation of social reality, then is it possible to expect the education systems or schools to transform the society?

### **Leadership to Lead Change**

Drucker's Age of Discontinuity is now the reality, therefore, the so-called educational reforms and their desired outcome on the society are considered to be related with the premise that the most appropriate leadership style/s should be employed by educational administrators at school, district and government levels. In this respect, to accomplish the reforms central to school restructuring, scholars of education espoused a model of transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership focuses on problem finding, problem solving, and collaboration with stakeholders with the goal of improving organizational performance (Hallinger, 1992). As further explicated by Simsek (2013), transformational leaders focus on building and strengthening new organizational norms and attitudes. They mainly engage in the creation and the establishment of new common "meaning systems." This type of leadership makes major changes in the mission, structure and human resources management of the organization. They suggest fundamental changes in the organization's political and cultural systems. Mintzberg (2004), as Fullan (2007), also exclusively agrees with and quotes him, describes the "desired form of leadership" as follows:

Leadership is not about making clever decisions. . . . It is about energizing other people to make good decisions and do better things. In other words it is about helping people release the positive energy that exists naturally within people. Effective leadership inspires more than it empowers; it connects more than it controls; it demonstrates more than it decides. It does all this by *engaging* —itself above all, and consequently others (p. 143).

What the educational reformers actually yearn for are transformational leaders. According to Avolio (2008), transformational leaders are those types of leaders who are highly trusted, inspiring, intellectually

stimulating, and oriented toward developing followers to their full potential. As transformational leaders, principals are expected to craft a vision, establish school goals, provide intellectual stimulation, offer individualized support, model best practices and important organizational values, demonstrate high-performance expectations, create productive school culture, and develop structures to foster participation in school decisions (Goldberg and Morrison, 2003, p. 160). The principal is in the middle of the relationship between teachers and external ideas and people (Fullan, 2007, p. 155).

In today's complex fragmented society, to what extent does the relatively recent phenomenon, transformational leadership, might operate effectively while the society enforces and influences educational systems to change according to society's demands? Do centralized educational systems created for the sake of educating all citizens with necessary skills bolster up principals to transform their individual schools? On top of that, do centralized educational systems let principals to transform their individual schools not only to transmit the necessary skills to survive successfully in the society, but also to educate them in such a way to lead the change?

This is a conflicting issue in itself. As the discussion so far demonstrates educational leaders, ranging from a single school principal to a district manager, are expected to be transformational leaders to fulfill the society's needs and realize the reforms necessary for today's complex social, political and economic conditions in the age of discontinuity, whereas the existing education system does not seem to allow them to act in this way. The Turkish context, for example, demonstrates an irony as well as other countries discussed. School principals are in a situation that they are not able to move without the central rules and legislations imposed officially by the Ministry of Education, which is similar to the claim that Murphy and Datnow (2003) made about the situation in the US.

## **Conclusion**

We have departed from Simsek's thesis of thinking about change, especially significant change, by leadership practices (such as transformational leadership) in schools and a corresponding change in society has some good ground in the literature. However, is there a hope to turn this dark picture around? How?

The dilemma between schools' role in maintaining the status quo and its potential to bring about change is at the heart of differing conceptions of education and schooling. As discussed in this paper, those who support the society stress school's role in helping to maintain it; those who believe the society is in need of improvement or change stress its role in either improving or transforming it (Sadovnik, Cookson, & Semel, 2006, p. 25). If we look at the picture with today's changing world and the new skills needed, however, education systems generally were not designed to equip students for today's world – let alone tomorrow's world. If we want to respond to these changes appropriately, "we need to rethink and redesign" (Wagner & Kegan, 2006, p. 1).

Departing from Drucker's (2001) proposition of "21st century as a knowledge society", which claims that knowledge is its key resource and knowledge workers are the dominant group in its workforce, the regularized and standardized education systems may not be able to impose radical change in the society, from which the knowledge economy is supposed to emerge. The created centralized systems based on standardization to educate all citizens with necessary skills do not bolster up principals to transform their individual schools. Systems should be created to leave space for leaders to be able to lead change, because as Murphy and Datnow (2003, p. 26) state radically that "if school reform does not happen at the individual school level, it does not happen, because students go to schools, not to districts or state departments of

education". This proposition draws the role of individual schools for change initiatives and the need for a different model of educational systems required by today's changing world.

As Fullan (2007) states that while research on school improvement is now into its fourth decade, systematic research on what the principal actually does and its relationship to stability and change is quite recent. He finds this as an irony that as the change expectations heighten, the *principalship* itself has become overloaded in a way that makes it impossible to fulfill the promise of widespread, sustained reform (Fullan, 2007, p. 156). This is partially supported by the results of a research on Vermont administrators, 22% of whom were employed in the fall of 1984 and had left the school system in one year. The interviews with these principals showed that their dissatisfaction included policy and administration, lack of achievement, sacrifices in personal life, lack of growth opportunities, lack of recognition and too little responsibility, relations with subordinates; and lack of support from superiors (Duke, cited in Fullan, 2007, p. 158). The message is clear: principals need autonomy and support.

As stated by Harris (2009), 21st century schooling necessitates a shift away from vertical, policy driven change to lateral, capacity building change. Obviously there is a need to be able to create different systems to let principals transform their individual schools both to transmit necessary skills to survive successfully in the society, and also to educate them in such a way to lead the change in the future. It is essential to have more room for discussions on educational systems, success stories of different models and dig into what makes them successful. As support to this idea, Diane Ravitch suggested, "we do not need a school system, but a system of schools" (cited in Murphy & Datnow, 2003, p. 28). We then, need to be able to make individual schools the center of the reform enterprise by moving the control away from the center to the schools, which "need freedom to innovate and to collaborate" (Harris, 2009, p. 66). As Diana Lam, the reform-minded superintendent of the Providence, Rhode Island schools says, "a central office should, first and foremost, have an orientation toward service. And if that orientation doesn't exist, then really, why is there a central office?" (cited in Murphy and Datnow, 2003, p. 28).

We need to be able to create systems that would encourage schools to develop their own vision and culture, manage their own resources creatively and innovatively, develop state-of-the-art educational programs and content that would even go beyond what is needed today but also what should be needed tomorrow. In a way, schools should become the sources for creating what tomorrow should be like. The "factory model" has been tried but obviously, as this paper demonstrates, it does not allow space for the "genuine transformation". At this point, one considers if there is a real tension in the form of leadership implemented in schools and education systems. If transformational leadership cannot be exercised in the relatively inflexible systems around the world, then there is a heightened need to either transform the whole public administration and power relationships or exercise a synthesis of different leadership styles.

## References

1. Avolio, B.J. (2005), *Leadership development in balance: Made/Born*. New Jersey, Erlbaum & Associates.
2. Ballantine, J. H. (2001), *The sociology of education: a systematic analysis* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.), New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.
3. Barr, R. and Dreeben, R. (1983), *How schools work*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
4. Bennett, K. P., & LeCompte. M. D. (1990), *The way schools work*, New York, Longman
5. Bourdieu, P. (1974). "The school as a conservative force: scholastic and cultural inequalities", in Eggleston, L (Ed.), *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education*, London, Methuen & Co Ltd., pp. 32-46.
6. Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979), *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*, New Hampshire, Heinemann
7. Cremin, L. A. (1977), *Traditions of American education*, New York, Basic Books.
8. Darling-Hammond, L. (2010), *The flat world and education: how America's commitment to equity will determine our future*, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University.
9. Davutyan, N., Demir, M., & Polat, S. (2009), "Assessing the efficiency of Turkish secondary education: Heterogeneity, centralization, and scale diseconomies." *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, Vol.44 No. 1, pp. 35-44.
10. DeVries, M.S. (2000), "The rise and fall of decentralization: A comparative analysis of arguments and practices in European countries. *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 38, pp. 193–224
11. Dewey, J. (1907), " *The School and Society*", Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
12. Drucker, P. F. (2001), "The next society", *The Economist* (November 1, 2001), <http://www.economist.com/node/770819>.
13. Drucker, P. F. (1969), "The age of discontinuity: guidelines to our changing society", New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers.
14. Durkheim, E. (1897/1951), "Suicide, A study in sociology", New York: Free Press.
15. Elmore, R. F. (1993), "School decentralization: who gains? who loses?" in J. Hannaway & M. Carnoy (Eds.), *Decentralization and school improvement: can we fulfill the promise?*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, pp. 33-54.
16. Friedman, T. L. (2005), *The flat world: A brief history of the 21st century*, U.S.A., Farrar, Strauss and Giroux
17. Fullan, M. (2007), *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.), New York, Teachers College Press.
18. Greenfield, T. B. (1973), "Organizations as social inventions: rethinking assumptions about change", *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol.9 No. 5, pp. 551-574.
19. Greenfield, T. B. & Ribbins, P.(1993). "Educational administration as a humane science: conversations between Thomas Greenfield and Peter Ribbins", In T. B. Greenfield & P. Ribbins (Eds.). *Greenfield On Educational Administration: Towards A Humane Science*, London: Routledge.
20. Goodlad, J. I. (1984), *A place called school*, New York, McGraw Hill Book Company
21. Goodlad, J. I. (2000), "Education and democracy: advancing the agenda", *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 82 No.1, pp. 86-89.
22. Goldberg, B. & Morrison, D. M. (2003), "Co-Nect: purpose, accountability, and school leadership", in J. Murphy & A. Datnow (Eds.), *Leadership lessons: Comprehensive school reforms*, Thousand Oaks, Corwin Press, pp. 57-82.

23. Grossman,G, Onkol,P.E and Sands, M. (2007), "Curriculum reform in Turkish teacher education: Attitudes of teacher educators towards change in an EU candidate nation", *International Journal of Educational Development*, No. 27, pp.138-150
24. Gutmann, A. (1999), *Democratic education: with a new preface and epilogue*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
25. Hallinger, P. (1992). "The evolving role of American principals: from managerial to instructional to transformational leaders", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol.30 No.3, pp.35-48.
26. Hannaway, J. (1993), "Decentralization in two school districts: challenging the standard paradigm", in J. Hannaway & M. Carnoy (Eds.), *Decentralization and school improvement: can we fulfill the promise?*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, pp.135-161.
27. Hargreaves, A. (1994), "Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age, London, Cassell.
28. Harris, A. (2009), "Big change question: does politics help or hinder education change?" *Journal of Educational Change*, Vol.10, pp. 63-67.
29. Ingersoll, R. M. (1994), "Organizational control in secondary schools", *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 64, No. 2, pp. 150-72.
30. Kwiek, M. (2004). "The emergent European educational policies under scrutiny: the Bologna process from a central European perspective", *European Educational Research Journal*, Vol.3 No.4, pp. 759-776.
31. Levin, H.M. (1974), *Educational reform and social change*, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 38 No.3, pp. 68-89.
32. Mintzberg, H. (2004). "Managers not MBAs", San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
33. Moos, L. (2009), "Governance and leadership 'of' and 'in' schools: school leadership between governance and student outcomes in knowledge societies", in M.S.Khine&I.M. Saleh (Eds.), *Transformative Leadership and Educational Excellence*, Rotterdam, Sense, pp. 11-32.
34. Murphy, J. & Datnow, A. (2003), "The development of comprehensive school reform", in J. Murphy & A. Datnow (Eds.), *Leadership lessons: comprehensive school reforms*. Thousand Oaks, Corwin Press, pp. 3-18.
35. Sadker, M. P. & Sadker, D. M. (2000), *Teachers, schools, and society* (5th Ed.), USA, McGraw-Hill Companies.
36. Sadovnik, A. R., Cookson, P. W., & S. F. Semel. (2006), *Exploring education: an introduction to the foundations of education* (3rd ed.), Boston, Pearson Education.
37. Simsek, H. (2013), "Transformational leadership in educational context: education scholars' fantasy" *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, in print.
38. Simsek, H. & Yildirim, A. (2004), "Turkey: Innovation and tradition", in I. C. Rotberg (Ed.), *Balancing Change and Tradition in Global Education Reform*, Lanham, Maryland, Scarecrow Education, pp. 153-187.
39. Sullivan, A. (2002), "Bourdieu and education: how useful is Bourdieu's theory for researchers?", *Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 38 No.2, pp. 144-166.
40. Turkoglu, R. (2004), "Eğitimde yerleşme sorununa kamu yönetimi temel kanunu tasarısı ve yerel yönetim yasa tasarısının getirdiği çözümler konusunda yerel yöneticilerin görüşleri", *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 5 No. 8
41. Wagner, T. & Kegan, R. (2006), *Change leadership: a practical guide to transforming our schools*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass