

VIEWS OF HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS AND STUDENTS ON THE EXAMINATION OF CRISIS AND CHAOS SITUATIONS MANAGEMENT

*Mert Bastas
Hatice Bilgin
Behçet Öznacar*

*Near East University, Mersin 10, Turkey
Correspondent Author: mert.bastas@neu.edu.tr*

Abstract. The purpose of this study is to determine the opinions and expectations of higher education administrators and students about the crisis and chaos situations management. Research was conducted in 2016-2017 academic year. The study group consisted of 41 people including 10 participants from Gazi, Başkent and Selçuk Universities each and 11 from Ankara University. This study was conducted by semi-structured interview method based on qualitative research approach. In the research, a nine-question form was used by the researcher. Content analysis method was used in data analysis. As a result of the study, it has been revealed that higher education administrators are not effective in crisis management and often intervened after the crisis has emerged and there is no preliminary preparation.

Keywords: higher education, administrator, crisis, chaos.

1. Introduction

Education and training institutions all over the world have their own goals and aims they determine in accordance with their characteristics and structure. Educational institutions of all levels determine some tasks and responsibilities to achieve their goals and objectives. In the process of realization of goals and objectives, school administrators constitute the position that will take maximum responsibility. When the literature is reviewed, there is a task flow that starts with the school administrators' guiding the learnings and continues up to arranging school tools (Işık and Aksoy, 2008). Besides, school administrators are extremely important in terms of proper education and improvement of the environment (Pont, Nusche and Moorman, 2008).

Epstein (1995), who defines the school administrators as instructional leaders by their positions, emphasizes that administrators not only intervene in the problems that arise due to school but also have duties and responsibilities related to the environmental factors that affect the whole educational life of students. Epstein (1995) states that the administrators should address environmental factors in order to achieve the targeted objectives due to the fact that academical achievement, which is one of the goals of educational institutions, has a strong connection with family and different environmental dynamics. Çelenk (2002) states that school administrators, which he sees as leaders with a similar perspective, play an important role in national development and progress. According to Çelenk (2002), the school administrator is a leader in raising the awareness of the society and raising the manpower needed by the country and it is therefore of great importance.

Kowalski (2003) states that higher education managers have duties and responsibilities including representing the institution they are in, leading, management skills, organization, facilitation, mediation, effective communication and supervision. Can (2007) thinks that, "The administrators of higher education institutions are required to prepare educational activities by taking policies and laws into consideration and to support the creation of a tolerant atmosphere by using the value and diversity of creativity".

Özmen and Batmaz (2006) emphasized that it is important for higher education managers to carry out effective coordination of employees and students and to have the necessary financial knowledge. He also stated that the ability to use the knowledge he/she possesses is also important. Oğuz (2009) considered one of the most important responsibilities of school administrators as the decision making and problem-solving steps. He/she should be able to use the process and timing effectively including effective decision making and problem-solving stages. In their study, Oğuz (2009) and Özmen and Batmaz (2006) stated that higher education administrators should have the ability to effectively manage human relations and take effective steps to solve the problem when a problem arises.

Crisis and chaos management, which is a concept that we frequently hear in management science in recent years, is one of the situations where administrators are most needed (Öznacar, Kızıl & Yılmaz, 2018; Matandare, 2018). The crisis and chaos situations are defined as "the moment threatening the core objectives of the organization and sometimes causes the organization to be dissolved, requiring to be immediately responded and renders the organization's precaution and adaptation programs inefficient" (Kuklan, 1988: 21). The tension caused by the crisis can bring about chaos by affecting other institutions around it (Ocak, 2014). According to Erten (2011), the effects and negative consequences of the crisis vary according to how the crisis is managed (Ranjbaran, 2014).

The state of uncertainty in the crisis experienced emphasizes the need to "do something without wasting time" (Öznacar, 2018). The crisis is further strengthened by uncertainty. In order to prevent the crisis from getting stronger, the administrators must make effective decisions and implement these decisions in a short time (Fink, 1989: 133). Can (1997) stated that the management of the crisis emerged includes analysing the crisis and complexities well beginning from its emergence and taking necessary measures.

In the chaos environment faced in crisis periods, leading of all those who will struggle against the crisis to planned, collaborative organized work and the success of these works are undoubtedly closely related to the qualifications of the administrators (Çelik & Öznacar, 2018; Rincon-Flores et al., 2018). According to Demirtaş (2000), the managerial skills of administrators in these times ensure that the dissolving of the organization is prevented, and the situation of concern caused by the crisis is tolerated and the crisis is dealt with in a short period of time. Positive results such as acquiring the ability to adapt to the new conditions created by the crisis, developing competitiveness with organizational strategies and questioning the conventional management approach (Aydemir and Demirci, 2005; Öznacar & Erdağ, 2018; Zare & Zade, 2014).

According to Demirtaş, development and change practices should be planned considering chaos in complex and crowded organizations such as schools. Learning and thinking activities have unpredictable stages. The school, which has a changing, active and dynamic structure, appears as places suitable for disorder. Results can be seen with patient and continuous monitoring. The sustainability of the school system depends on taking risks and continuity. According to Töremen, it is necessary to take into consideration the rules, order, stability, development and transformation structures and risks of the existing organization structures for the realization of change and development in existing organizational structures (Töremen, 2000). According to Bülbül, education has a system that is highly sensitive and has an unpredictable future. Therefore chaos management is of great importance in education management and must be done (Bülbül, 2007).

There are many factors that can reveal crisis and chaos in terms of higher education institutions (Debeş & Öznacar, 2018). Management defined as the production activity of goods and services, which are formed by coordinating the material and human resources available at these times in the most effective way, includes some stages (Öznacar, Şensoy & Satılmış, 2018). How these stages are controlled and implemented directly affects the operation and the goods and services of the institution (Duff, 2007). For this reason, preventing the crisis and chaos that can occur in the higher education institutions and to ensure safety is one of the most important problems for developed countries (Sayın, 2008). It is revealed that, in the solution of these problems, the problems such as the lack of knowledge, skills and accumulation about what to do pre-crisis, during the crisis and after the crisis should be solved urgently (Şahin, 2006).

In literature review conducted by using the keywords for the aim of the study, a study aiming to identify the opinions of higher education administrators about the crisis and chaos management in Turkey could not be found. Generally, studies have focused on the conflicts in primary and secondary education and have the quality of a case study. In this context, below are the studies carried out on this subject in our country and abroad.

2.Method

2.1.Research Model

This research, which is for determining the opinions and expectations of higher education administrators and students on the examination of crisis and chaos situations management, was conducted by semi-structured interview method based on qualitative research approach. In this study, content analysis was performed in data analysis. Content analysis is carried out in the form of creating and analysing themes that are not specific in the theoretical sense and sub-themes, if any (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2006).

2.2. Study Group

The study group consisted of 41 people from 10 Gazi, Başkent and Selçuk Universities each and 11 from Ankara University. 21% of these participants (9 people) were head of department, 6 of them were professors (14,6%), 3 Assoc. Dr. (7,3%), 1 department chief (2,4%) and 1 Head of Department (2, 4%), while remaining 21 people (51,2%) are bachelor, master and doctorate students. The average age of the participants is 37, 8 and the youngest is 20 and the oldest is 70 years old.

2.3. Developing the Data Collection Tool

In the semi-structured interview technique, the interviewer prepares the interview protocol which includes the questions to be asked beforehand. On the other hand, depending on the flow of the interview, the researcher can influence the flow of the interview with different side or sub-questions and enable the person to open and detail his/her answers. The researcher may not ask these questions if the person has answered the certain questions in other questions during the interview (Türnüklü, 2000).

In the preparation of interview questions by the researcher, studies in the literature related to crisis and chaos management were examined. 11 questions were prepared according to the data obtained and the characteristics of the study. Prepared interview form is presented to expert opinion in terms of scope validity, suitability of the questions to the level and application period. While the questions are prepared, attention is paid to make them simple, straightforward to understand and appropriate to the literature. As a result of the answers of the experts, 2 questions were removed from the interview form. The same expert opinions were taken for the prepared interview forms and the interview form was finalized.

Before starting the implementation work, the interviewees were interviewed in order to determine whether the interview questions were clear and understandable, and the time required for the interview. As a result of the preliminary interviews, it was determined that the 20-minute duration was sufficient for the interview. Attention was paid to ask the same questions with the same words and in the same way to each participant in the study.

2.4. Data Collection Process

In this study, face-to-face interviews were conducted along with the e-mail among the electronic questionnaire types. Questionnaires prepared in accordance with the literature were collected by mail and through face to face surveys. The survey was started on completed on 18.01. 2017 with a total of 41 participants.

2.5. Data Analysis

According to Miles and Huberman (1984), the analysis of the data obtained from the interview can be performed within the framework of three activity steps that follow, affect and determine each other: Reduction of data, presentation of data and verification by deduction (as cited in Türnüklü, 2000).

The data obtained by the interviews with the higher education managers and students were coded and the data were reduced. After the raw data is organized according to certain categories, the keywords included in the sub-themes among these data are selected and the frequency values of that theme are tabulated and presented. The findings of the study are listed according to the questions in the interview form.

In order to ensure credibility in interviews with higher education managers and students, the data allocated to the categories were coded by two different researchers. The coding consistency of the two separate codings is calculated and the reliability is provided in this way. In our study, the average agreement percentage for the interview questions of the coders was calculated as 88%. Yıldırım and Şimşek (2006) indicate that coding is reliable if the percentage of coding agreement is 70%.

3. FINDINGS

The findings obtained in this part of the research are given and interpreted under the themes created according to the answers given to the questions.

3.1. Findings on Question 1 in Semi-Structured Interview

The first question asked to the administrators and students within the scope of the research was “*What are the crises likely to occur in your institution?*?”. The answers of the participants to this question are grouped and sub-themes are created and presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Opinions About Possible Problems in the Institution

	Student		Administrator	
	n	%	n	%
Religious-Political conflicts	10	50, 0	9	42, 9
Tensions between the Personnel	1	5, 0	6	28, 6
Teacher-student conflicts	5	25, 0	1	4, 8
Slander, gossip, whistleblowing, mobbing	1	5, 0	5	23, 8
Corruption	0	0, 0	3	14, 3
Other	12	60, 0	8	38, 1
Total	29	-	32	-

When the possible crises in the institution are examined according to the answers of the students and administrators, 50% of the students talked about religious political conflicts, 5% of tensions between the personnel, 25% of teacher-student conflicts, 5% of slander, gossip, whistleblowing, mobbing, and 60% of other reasons. When the other crises mentioned by the students are examined; these included natural disasters, university transport and public transport, difficulties faced by people with disabilities and dining hall issues. 42% of the administrators stated religious political conflicts, 28,6% tensions between the personnel, 4,8% teacher-student conflicts, 14,3% corruption, 38,1% stated other. When the other possible crises mentioned by the administrators are examined; these were the risks such as security weaknesses, data loss, loss of qualified personnel, interpersonal communication crises, terrorist attacks, academic publications, human resources and security.

3.2. Findings on Question 2 in Semi-Structured Interview

The second question to the administrators and students within the scope of the research was “*Is there a preparation for possible crises in your institution?*?”. The answers of the participants to this question are grouped and sub-themes are created and presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Opinions on the Situation of Preliminary Preparation for a Possible Crisis in the Institution

	Student		Administrator	
	n	%	n	%
There is a preliminary preparation	3	15, 0	6	76, 2
There is no preliminary preparation	2	60, 0	5	23, 8
Inadequate	5	25, 0	0	0, 0
Total	0	2	1	2
		100, 0		100, 0

When whether there is a preparation for possible crises in the institution is examined; 15% of the students stated that there is preliminary preparation, 60% stated that there is no preliminary preparation and 25% of them stated that these are inadequate. 76.2% of the administrators stated that there is preliminary preparation, 23,8% stated that there is no preliminary preparation.

3.3. Findings on Question 3 in Semi-Structured Interview

The third question to the administrators and students within the scope of the research was “*Have you had any crisis in your organization?*”. The answers of the participants to this question are grouped and sub-themes are created and presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Opinions on a Situation of a Crisis Experienced in the Institution

	Student		Administrator	
	N	%	n	%
Religious-political conflicts and tensions	5	25, 0	5	23, 8
Dismissals	1	5, 0	7	33, 3
Mobbing, corruption, slander	2	10, 0	3	14, 3
Teachers favouring students	3	15, 0	1	4, 8
Other	9	45, 0	5	23, 8
Total	20	100, 0	21	100, 0

When asked about the crises experienced by students and administrators in their institutions, 25% of students stated religious-political conflicts and tensions, 5% dismissals, 10% mobbing, corruption, slander, 15% teachers favouring some students, 45% other. When the content of the other answers given by the students is examined; these included the relationship between men and women, flying off the roof of the building with storms and damage to the vehicles, problems with the card system, collapse of the roof of the building, cutting off the transport due to snow, fight and fire due to Christmas celebrations. 23, 8% of the administrators gave the answer of religious-political conflicts and tensions, 33,3% of dismissals, 14,3% mobbing, corruption, slander, while 23,8% of other. When the other answers given by the administrators are examined; these included crisis in academic publications, the crisis based on non-communication, while a person stated that there was no serious crisis.

3.4. Findings on Question 4 in Semi-Structured Interview

The fourth question to the administrators and students within the scope of the research was “*If there was one, the level of governance of the administrator before it has turned into chaos?*”. The answers of the participants to this question are grouped and sub-themes are created and presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Opinions on How the Administrator Manages the Crisis in the Institution

	Student		Administrator	
	n	%	n	%
Could not be managed successfully	6	80, 0	2	57, 1
Could be managed successfully	4	20, 0	9	42, 9
Total	10	100, 0	11	100, 0

When management of crises in institutions is examined in students and managers; 80% of the students stated that these crises could not be managed successfully and 20% were managed successfully, while 57,1% of the administrators stated that they were managed successfully, 42,9% stated that they were not managed successfully.

3.5. Findings on Question 5 in Semi-Structured Interview

The fifth question to the administrators and students within the scope of the research was “*Which teams, preparations and studies should be done in your organization for the crisis or chaos environment that are experienced or likely to be experienced?*”. The answers of the participants to this question are grouped and sub-themes are created and presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Opinions on Which Teams, Preparations and Studies Should Be Done for Crisis and Chaos Environments Experienced or Likely to Be Experienced in the Institutions

	Student		Administrator	
	n	%	n	%
Safety and Health Teams	4	0, 0	0	7, 6
Psychological support teams	4	0, 0		8, 6

Crisis teams, crisis desk	2	0, 0		, 5
Administrators and qualified staff prepared for crisis	0	, 0		4, 3
Total	2	00, 0	1	00, 0

When the teams that need to be found in the organization for the crisis and chaos environment experienced or likely to be experienced are examined; 70% of the students stated that security and health teams, 20% psychological support teams and 10% crisis teams and crisis desk should be present. 47,6% of the administrators stated that security and health teams, 28,6% psychological support teams, 9,5% crisis teams and crisis desks should be formed, while 14,3% stated that administrators and qualified staff prepared for crisis should be present.

3.6. Findings on Question 6 in Semi-Structured Interview

The sixth question to the administrators and students within the scope of the research was “Do you think that the crises experienced or likely to be experienced in your institution can be turned into an opportunity before they turn into chaos?”. The answers of the participants to this question are grouped and sub-themes are created and presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Opinions on the Turning of Crises Experienced or Likely to Be Experienced into Opportunity

	Student		Administrator	
	n	%	n	%
Crises can turn into opportunity	5	75, 0	8	85, 7
Crises cannot turn into opportunity	1	25, 0	3	14, 3
Total	6	100, 0	11	100, 0

When opinions of the participants on the crises experienced or likely to be experienced in their institution can be turned into an opportunity before they turn into chaos are examined; 75% of the students stated that crises could turn into opportunities, while 25% stated that crises could not turn into opportunities. 85,7% of administrators stated that crises could turn into opportunities, while 14,3% stated that crises could not turn into opportunities.

3.7. Findings on Question 7 in Semi-Structured Interview

The seventh question to the administrators and students within the scope of the research was “How do you think the crisis and chaos environment experienced or likely to be experienced in your institution will affect your employees?”. The answers of the participants to this question are grouped and sub-themes are created and presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Opinions on the Effect of Crises Experienced or Likely to Be Experienced in the Institution on Employees

	Student		Administrator	
	n	%	n	%
Affects negatively	20	87, 0	1	9, 3
Affects heavily	3	13, 0	2	18, 7
Total	23	100, 0	3	100, 0

When how the crises experienced or likely to be experienced in the institutions affect the employees is examined; 87% of the students stated that they have a negative effect, 13% said that the effects are heavy. 9,3% of the administrators stated that it negatively affects, 18,7% stated that the effects are heavy.

3.8. Findings on Question 8 in Semi-Structured Interview

The eighth question to the administrators and students within the scope of the research was “Do you think that psychological support should be provided to employees in these cases?”. The answers of the participants to this question are grouped and sub-themes are created and presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Opinions on Providing Psychological Support to Employees

	Student		Administrator	
	n	%	n	%
Psychological support should be provided	10	95, 2	1	91, 3
Financial support should be provided	0	0, 0	0	0, 0
Leave opportunity should be given	0	0, 0	0	0, 0

Total	1	0	100,	3	0	100,
-------	---	---	------	---	---	------

95,2% of the students stated that psychological support should be provided while 4,8% of them stated that financial support should also be provided. 91,3% of the administrators stated that psychological support should be provided, 4,3% of them stated that financial support should be provided, while 4,3% of them stated that leave opportunity should be provided.

3.9. Findings on Question 9 in Semi-Structured Interview

The ninth question to the administrators and students within the scope of the research was “*What do you think should be done administratively about crisis and chaos management?*”. The answers of the participants to this question are grouped and sub-themes are created and presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Opinions on What Should Be Done Administratively About Crisis and Chaos Management

	Student		Administrator	
	n	%	n	%
Providing justice	8	6,0	0	7,0
Efficient assignment	9	0	0	7,0
Strengthening communication, preventing rumours and gossip	3	8	6	6,2
Increasing science, art and social activities	,0		2	,4
Ensuring staff satisfaction	,0		1	,7
Determination of communication strategy	,0		1	,7
Considering the students as individuals	,8		0	,0
Establishment of complaint and suggestion system	,8		0	,0
Acting prudently	,0		1	,7
Production of real solutions	,8		0	,0
Campus Security	,0		1	,7
Innovations	,8		0	,0
Including young people in management	,8		0	,0
Acting as a scientist	,0		1	,7
Efficient time spending activities	,8		0	,0
Written assignment	,0		1	,7
Preventive plan	,0		1	,7
Protection of key personnel	,0		1	,7
Education and awareness	,0		1	,7
Total	1	00,0	7	300,0

When what should administratively be done about crisis and chaos management according to the participants are examined; 28,6% of the students emphasized the need to provide justice, 19% of efficient assignment, 23,8% of them emphasized that the communication should be strengthened, and rumours and gossips should be prevented. 4,8% of them each answered as establishing a complaint and suggestion system, considering the students as individuals, production of real solutions, innovations, including the young in management and efficient time spending activities.

27% of the administrators stated providing justice, 27% behaving efficiently, 16,2% strengthening communication, preventing rumours and gossips, 4,4% increasing science, art and social activities, 2,7% ensuring staff satisfaction, acting prudently, campus security, acting as a scientist, written assignment, preventive plan, protection of key personnel and education and awareness each.

4.Result And Discussion

In this study, it is aimed to determine the opinions of the administrators and undergraduate students about the crisis and chaos management skills of the administrators working in the higher education institutions. The findings related to the themes created in this context are presented below.

The results obtained from the research data indicated that there were political-religious conflicts with 31,1% of the 61 opinions on possible crises in the university. When these results are examined, it indicated 42,9% in terms of administrators, and 50% in terms of students as religious-political conflict. When crises experienced are examined, 24,4% of the participants has given religious-political conflicts and tensions and dismissals (19,5%) as an example. The majority of the students (25%) stated the religious-political conflicts and tensions, while 33,3% of the administrators stated dismissals. Since the primary ones are religious-political conflicts among crises experienced or likely to be experienced in the institutions, 58,5% of the participants stated that there should be security and health teams present. When the teams required to be present are examined in terms of students and administrators; 70% of the students and 47,6% of the administrators stated security and health teams. Since the studies conducted in literature are mainly based on primary and secondary education, the possible crises and the crises experienced are exemplified in this context. In this context, Sayın (2008) says that, the problems they have defined as “crisis” according to the data obtained as a result of the interviews with school administrators should be defined as a problem that disrupts the education, disrupts the operation of the school, threatens the safety of the school and the individuals, negatively effects their psychology, affects the school and its environment.

In addition to this, Yılmazçetin (2005) stated in his research that the factors that increase the crises in the school are the students carrying the tools such as knives, pocket knives and firearms, being members of the gang.

Within the scope of the research, 68,3% of the participants stated that crises could not be managed successfully. When management of crises is examined in students and managers; 80% of the students stated that these crises could not be managed successfully, while 57,1% of the administrators stated that they were managed successfully. In this context, Sağlam and Özsezer (2015) generally consider the school management of administrators as adequate in the management of the crisis process. In the study of Savçı (2008), according to the perceptions of the teachers working in the secondary schools, the crises in the schools are partially managed in a scientific and appropriate manner. In a different study, Maya (2014) stated that primary school administrators had a moderate level of crisis management skills. In addition, it was stated by the majority of the participants (46,3%) that there was no preliminary preparation for possible crises in universities. When examined in terms of students and administrators, 60% of the students stated that there is no preliminary preparation, while 76, 2% of the managers stated that there is preliminary preparation. In this respect, Aksoy and Aksoy (2003) stated that school administrations should also be prepared to establish and train a crisis response team and to prepare and implement a response plan among the preparations for crises. In the study conducted by İnandı (2008), some of the administrators expressed that they are prepared for a crisis and some expressed that there is no such preparation against crisis situations. Crisis-prepared ones stated that they had crisis teams, but they did not receive professional assistance. Ocağ (2006), in his study, concluded that most schools have no crisis management team and crisis management plan, and schools with a crisis management team have determinants such as volunteering, experience, personality characteristics in their work. Alaağaçlı (2008), in his research, stated the most important dynamics preventing the crisis and disaster management from being effective as lack of education and not being prepared. Çelik (2001), in another research, stated that school administrators were inadequate to recognize warnings that signalled the crisis. For example, the barbed wires on the garden walls of some schools being worn out and causing student injuries, the carelessness of the staff to comply with the health rules and school toilets being outside the hygiene criteria have been defined as the inadequacy of school administrators to perceive the crisis. Not perceiving the crisis signals in time causes crisis management plan to be delayed.

In the scope of the research, 19,5% of the participants do not think that the crises experienced or likely to be experienced can turn into an opportunity without turning into chaos. 80,5% of participants who think that they can turn into opportunities stated that lessons such as functional communication, thinking as a young/a student, strengthening of communication, treasuring human beings can be taken. When examined in terms of participatory groups; 75% of students and 85,7% of administrators stated that crises could turn into opportunities. According to the data of the research conducted by Ocağ (2006), crises are unavoidable in institutions which are late in receiving signals and are closed to signals and necessary measures may not be taken. For this reason, in an institution which is in crisis period, the administrators should try to get the highest level of benefit by minimizing the future reflections of the crisis. It has been seen that the positive relations and communication with the school and its environment, as well as the leadership provide contribute in crises managed with effective and good decisions (Sayın, 2008). Aksu (2009) also showed a similar result in his study. In his research where primary school teachers have participated, he indicated that school administrators with high crisis management skills can turn the crisis into an opportunity with an effective management during the crisis and that the institutions can gain power from this crisis atmosphere and continue to progress. In another research, Aydemir and Demirci (2005) stated that a crisis experienced in the organization helps them to be more

equipped to a new crisis that may occur in the future and make them evaluate their present situation and eliminate the loose ends and progress, in short the crises experienced have an educative aspect.

In the scope of the research all of the participants stated that the crises that are experienced or are likely to be experienced negatively affect the employees. When examined in terms of participants; 87% of the students and 91,3% of the students stated that employees were negatively affected by the employees. They also stated that in cases of crisis, psychological support should be provided to individuals. When examined in terms of participants; 95,2% of the students and 91,3% of the administrators stated that psychological support should be provided. In this context, the research data obtained by Bakioğlu and Savaş (2001) revealed that the individuals in the school experienced security problems after the crisis, their ties to the school weakened and they wanted to leave the city they were in. Sayın (2008) stated that secondary education institution administrators try to eliminate the negative psychological effects of the individuals in the school due to the crisis and to return the school to its normal order. Following the crisis caused by natural disasters, harmful substances, injury or death, a large number of school administrators provide guidance to school members and parents.

Within the scope of the research, when things on crisis and chaos management that should be done administratively are examined; providing justice with 39% and efficient assignment with 34,1% has stood out. The need for strengthening the communication, preventing rumours and gossips with 26,8% was emphasized. Establishing a crisis desk and crisis support teams, focusing attention on science, art and social activities with 9,8% (4 persons) has stood out. When examined according to the participants; while 28,6% of the students emphasized the need for providing justice and 23,8% of them stated the need for strengthening the communication and preventing rumours and gossips, 27% of the administrators stated the need for providing justice and acting efficiently. In this context, Sayın (2008) stated that, in taking measures for and in preparation of crises that may be experienced, the important factors were the administrators having leadership characteristics, supporting team work, supporting the school and required personnel to work with the management and distributing their authority. He stated that in taking measures and preparation work of school administrators who emphasize that effective crisis management is possible with team work, the personnel in the school is included in the management and that they are in harmony. It is also stated that the inclusion of school administrators in an in-service training program in crisis management makes them more effective during crisis management (Sayın, 2008). Döş and Cömert (2012) stated that administrators should determine and implement the methods that will enable to overcome the crisis in case of danger and risks and minimize the effects of the crisis. Similarly, Çelik (2004), in his research, recommended that schools should already have plans in emergency situations and that these should be renewed continuously, and that necessary persons should be trained for these plans and rehearse them in advance.

As a result, it has been revealed that higher education administrators are not effective in crisis management and often intervened after the crisis has emerged and there is no preliminary preparation.

References

1. Aksoy, E. ve Işık, H. (2008). İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Öğretim Liderliği Rollerini. Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 19, 235-249.
2. Aydemir, M ve Demirci, M. K. (2005). Son Dönemlerde Yaşanan Krizlerin İşletmeler Üzerindeki Olumlu Etkilerinin Analizi *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. (29), 65-81.
3. Can, H. (1997). *Organizasyon ve Yönetim*. Ankara: Siyasal, s. 312.
4. Can, N. (2007). İlköğretim Okul Yöneticisinin Bir Öğretim Lideri Olarak Yeni Öğretim Programlarının Geliştirilmesi ve Uygulanmasındaki Yeterliliği. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 3(2), 228-244.
5. Çelenk, S. (2002). Geleceğin eğitim yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesinde bir model önerisi, *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları*, Yayın No 191. 65-81.
6. Çelik, M., & Öznacar, B. (2018). Evaluation of satisfaction of individuals educated in health sciences. *Quality & Quantity*, 52(5), 2093-2099.
7. Debeş, G., & Öznacar, B. (2018). Evaluation of the opinions of the manager, teacher, employees (secretary and servants) about school management of the digitalization and management processes of the system engineering model in education. *Amazonia Investiga*, 7(16), 243-253.
8. Demirtaş, H. (2000). Kriz Yönetimi, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 6(230), s. 353-373.
9. Duff, E. D. (2007). *Evaluation of crisis management and the implementation of employee training for emergency preparedness in a private college*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova South-eastern University, Florida, United States.
10. Epstein, J. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 701-712.
11. Erten, Ş. (2011). Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Kriz Yönetimi Anlayışı. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta.
12. Fink, S. (1989). *Crisis management: Planning for the inevitable*. New York: Amacom.
13. Kowalski, T. J. (2003). *Contemporary school administration*, New York: Pearson Education Inc.

14. Matandare, M. A. (2018). Botswana Unemployment Rate Trends by Gender: Relative Analysis with Upper Middle Income Southern African Countries (2000-2016). *Dutch Journal of Finance and Management*, 2(2), 04.
15. Ocak, Y. (2006). Ortaöğretim Okullarında Kriz Yönetimi:(Edirne ili örneği). *Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Trakya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Edirne.
16. Ocak, Y. (2014). Ortaöğretim Okullarında Kriz Yönetimi (Edirne İli Örneği). *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Trakya Üniversitesi /Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Edirne.
17. Oğuz, E. (2009). İlköğretim Okul Yöneticilerinin Karar Verme Stilleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 17(2), 415-426.
18. Özmen, F. ve Batmaz, C. (2006). İlköğretim Okul Müdürlerinin Öğretmen Denetimindeki Etkililikleri – Hizmet Yılı Ve Görev Türü Değişkenine Göre Öğretmen Görüşleri. *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 2, 102-120.
19. Öznacar, B. (2018). Examination of the roles of foundations on Turkish education system of Cyprus. *Quality & Quantity*, 52(6), 2709-2722.
20. Öznacar, B., Şensoy, Ş., & Satılmış, A. (2018). Learning Styles and Emotional Intelligence Levels of University Teacher Candidates. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 14(5), 1837-1842.
21. Öznacar, B. Kızıllı, N. & Yılmaz, N. (2018). Evaluating the Views of Directors in Primary Schools Regarding Their Management Process. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods* 8(11) , 760-769.
22. Öznacar, B.(2018), Examination of the roles of foundations on Turkish education system of Cyprus, *Quality & Quantity*, 52(6), pp 2709–2722.
23. Öznacar, B. & Erdag, D. (2018), Physical education and sports education candidate students awareness and knowledge status about physical education lessons designed for physically disabled individuals, *Quality & Quantity*, 52:S1365–S1370
24. Pont, B., Nusche, D., ve Moorman, H. (2008). Improving school leadership, 1 Policy and Practice. Paris: OECD.
25. Ranjbaran, A. (2014). Investigation of Factors affecting in customer fundraising with emphasis on role of social marketing mass media in Saderat bank of Iran, *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 2(2): 31-37.
26. Rincon-Flores, E. G., Gallardo, K., & Fuente, J. M. D. L. (2018). Strengthening an Educational Innovation Strategy: Processes to Improve Gamification in Calculus Course through Performance Assessment and Meta-evaluation. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(1), 1-11.
27. Sayın, N. (2008). *Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında Kriz Yönetimi Stratejisinin İncelenmesi (İstanbul İli Örneği)*. Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
28. Savcı, S. (2008). Ortaöğretim Okullarında Çalışan Öğretmenlerin Kriz Yönetimine İlişkin Algıları. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Pamukkale Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli.
29. Türnüklü, A. (2000). Eğitimbilim Araştırmalarında Etkin Olarak Kullanılabilecek Nitel Bir Araştırma Tekniği: Görüşme. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 24(6): 543-559.
30. Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2006). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
31. Zare, H., & Zade, A. R. S. (2014). The Application of Tichy's Model In Iranian Public Universities, *UCT Journal of Management and Accounting Studies*, 2(1): 8-13.